CORPVS CHRISTIANORVM

Lingua Patrum

II

PAGAN AND BIBLICAL EXEMPLA IN GREGORY NAZIANZEN

TVRNHOLTI
TYPOGRAPHI BREPOLS EDITORES PONTIFICII
MCMXCVI

PAGAN AND BIBLICAL EXEMPLA IN GREGORY NAZIANZEN

A STUDY IN RHETORIC AND HERMENEUTICS

Kristoffel DEMOEN
post-doctoral fellow of the Belgian
National Fund for Scientific Research (N.F.W.O.)
at the University of Gent

TVRNHOLTI
TYPOGRAPHI BREPOLS EDITORES PONTIFICII
MCMXCVI

SVMPTIBVS SVPPEDITANTE
SVPREMO BELGARVM MAGISTRATV
PVBLICAE INSTITVTIONI
ATQVE OPTIMIS ARTIBVS PRAEPOSITO
EDITVM

∞
This book has been printed on paper
according to the prevailing
ISO-NORMS.

© Brepols 1996

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise,
without the prior permission of the publisher.

voor Adelheid, Sofie en Johanna, vader en moeder

πηρὸς δὲ βίος φιλότητος ἄνευθεν
(Gregory Nazianzen. I.2.1. v.288)

PREFACE

> « Ist das Exemplum eine zufällige, eine angemessene oder eine notwendige Form für das, was der Theologe Gregor zu sagen hat? » (1)

When I started the research for what eventually turned into this book, I had in mind a traditional philological study of « the mythological and biblical exempla in the verse of Gregory Nazianzen » (the title of my doctoral research project): a collection of the exempla, an identification of problematical cases, a search for possible sources and parallels in contemporary authors, a few statistics, a discussion of some interesting passages. The material to be treated was abundant, as anyone familiar with only a few hundred of Gregory's verses will know.

Soon I found that the term « exemplum », as well as its Greek equivalent παράδειγμα, is a central concept in ancient rhetorical practice and theory, where it is not unequivocally used. A fascinating investigation of the theory of rhetoric was the result of this discovery, and the purpose of my study changed to a rhetorical analysis of the exemplum in Gregory's œuvre: not of the exemplum merely as a stylistic device, but also as a means of persuasion, implying among other things the analysis of argumentation and its premises, of the ideology behind its use, and of the connection with contemporary rhetoric (which was nearly coextensive with poetics in late antiquity) (2).

Finally, my attention to the hermeneutical and semiotic aspects of the exemplum led me into the field of early Christian exegesis, both of Greek mythology and of the Bible. I became aware of the close relationship between παράδειγμα and τύπος. Their near-synonymity is more than coincidence: both the rhetorical exemplum and the exegetical / theological typology are tokens of an analogical way of thinking and a search for historical correspondence. Thus I found myself, a classical scholar, dealing with typology, salvation history and actualization. the core of early Christian thinking.

---

(1) N. Schneider, Die rhetorische Eigenart der paulinischen Antithesen (Tübingen 1970) p.7, quoted by GUTZEN-OTTMERS p.198. I only substituted « das Exemplum » and « Gregor » for « die Antithese » and « Paulus ».

(2) See e.g. BACHEM, especially pp.515-6 and 527-9, for the tasks to be assumed in a rhetorical analysis of literature. « Die rhetorische Text*analyse* kann nicht scharf von einer Text*interpretation* abgegrenzt werden » (p.515).

This evolution in the nature of my research was, as I now see, inevitable, and happily so. Gregory's παράδειγμα balances between rhetoric and theology (as his whole œuvre does): it has a formal and a semantic aspect, both of which are inextricably linked: « immer geht es darum, Form als Inhalt und Inhalt als Form zu begreifen » (3).

This book is an adapted version of my doctoral dissertation, defended at the University of Gent in February 1993 and originally written in Dutch. It probably bears the marks both of its being conceived as a dissertation and of its author's native tongue.

I wish to express my gratitude to the many people who made my dissertation and this book possible. Prof. H. Van Looy, dr. M. Geerard and prof. M. Sicherl cooperated in defining the original subject of my research project. The Flemish section of the Belgian National Fund for Scientific Research supplied me with a grant so that I could complete this project and rewrite it as a monograph. Dom E. Dekkers and Luc Jocqué offered me the opportunity to have it published in this series of the *Corpus Christianorum*. I am grateful to the following distant or close institutions, colleagues and friends for stimulating talks, written or oral information, practical or logistic help: prof. G. Bartelink (Nijmegen), prof. J. Bernardi (Montpellier), the *Academisch Rekencentrum* of the Universiteit Gent, the *Centre Informatique et Bible* (Maredsous), prof. B. Coulie (Louvain-la-Neuve), prof. C. Crimi (Catania), dr. J. Declerck, B. de Cock, prof. H. de Ley (Gent), dr. V. Frangeskou (Limasol), prof. M. Kertsch (Graz), prof. M.-P. Masson-Vincourt (Montpellier), W. Meeus, prof. J. Mossay (Louvain-la-Neuve), dr. V. Pyykkö (Turku), prof. M. Sicherl (Münster), dr. J. Nimmo Smith (Edinburgh), prof. D. Sykes (Oxford), prof. R. Thibau (Gent), prof. P. van Deun (Leuven), prof. J. Vereecken (Gent). The English version of this book owes a great debt to Bart Eeckhout and especially to Evelien De Vlieger. I cannot properly express my gratitude to Donald Sykes, a life-time scholar of Gregory's verse, who unconsciously inspired me through some of his articles, who encouraged me to follow the chosen direction during an unforgettable meeting in Oxford, and who was prepared to read and improve my English draft. It goes without saying that all remaining linguistic and other errors are my responsibility.

---

(3) GUTZEN-OTTMERS p.200, about the task of the scholars of Christian rhetoric.

Finally, I wish to mention two persons to whom I owe everything that is behind this book: Edmond Voordeckers, the encouraging, perceptive, concerned and modest supervisor of my doctoral research, and my good father Guido Demoen, who is always my first reader, and far more than that.

Gent, 25th January 1995

Ἐλπὶς προκείσθω δεξιοῦ παντὸς τέλους.
(Gregory Nazianzen, I.2.33, v.213)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 19
- Gregory between Christianity and Hellenism . . . 19
- Pagan and biblical παραδείγματα 24
- Συναγωγὴ καὶ ἐξήγησις 26

PART ONE PARADEIGMA AND RHETORIC 33

CHAPTER I THE RHETORICAL ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΓΜΑ 35

- 1.1 The παράδειγμα / exemplum in ancient rhetorical theory 35
  - 1.1.1 Functions 37
    - A. Argument (Πίστις / *probatio* / proof). . . 37
      - 1) Functions of the exemplum probationis 38
      - 2) Logical method 39
      - 3) Degrees of similarity. 41
      - 4) Refutation of the παράδειγμα 42
    - B. Ornament (Κόσμος / *ornatus* / embellishment) 43
  - 1.1.2 Subject matter 44
    - A. Relation to the παραβολή / *similitudo* . . 44
    - B. Λέγειν πράγματα προγεγενημένα 45
  - 1.1.3 Literary form 47
    - A. Elaboration 47
    - B. Insertion 48
    - C. Exempla in series 50
  - 1.1.4 Conclusion 50
- 1.2 The παράδειγμα / exemplum in biblical and Christian practice 51
  - 1.2.1 The exemplum in the Bible 51
    - A. Historical exempla in series 51
    - B. The New Testament παραβολαί 52
  - 1.2.2 The exemplum in early Christian authors 53
  - 1.2.3 The medieval exemplum. 54

CHAPTER II THE RHETORICAL ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΓΜΑ IN GREGORY'S POEMS 57

- 2.0 Introduction 57

2.0.1 The terms παράδειγμα and ὑπόδειγμα in Gregory . . . 59
2.0.2 Justification for the division of the corpus 61
  A. Literary genres . . . 61
  B. Audience . . . 64
  C. Rhetorical species (γένος) . . . 70
2.0.3 The corpus: rough figures . . . 72
  A. General table . . . 72
  B. Distribution of the exempla according to genre and rhetorical γένος . . . 73
  C. Distribution of the material among the individual poems and orations . . . 73
2.1 Functions . . . 74
2.1.1 Rhetorical theory and Gregory's practice 75
  2.1.1.1 Evidence / model (the *exemplum probationis*) . . . 75
    A. Explicit indications and terminology 75
      1) Evidential function . . . 75
      2) Model function . . . 77
      3) Enunciations on the persuasiveness of the exemplum . . . 82
    B. The argumentation . . . 82
      1) Logical method and form of the argumentation . . . 82
        (1) the analogical exemplum . . . 82
        (2) the inductive exemplum . . . 88
        (3) the Hermogenic argumentation 91
      2) Degrees of similarity . . . 95
        (0) general survey . . . 95
        (1) ἀπ' ἐναντίου . . . 97
        (2) ἀπὸ μείζονος . . . 98
        (3) ἀπ' ἐλάττονος . . . 101
      3) Λύσις παραδείγματος . . . 105
        (1) contestation of the validity of the quoted examples . . . 105
        (2) counter examples . . . 109
  2.1.1.2 Ornament (the ornamental exemplum) 111
2.1.2 Macro-analysis . . . 113
  1) Frequency of the different functions . . . 113
  2) Correlation with rhetorical categories and literary genres . . . 113
2.1.3 Conclusion . . . 115

- 2.2 Subject matter 116
  - 2.2.1 Rhetorical theory and Gregory's practice 117
    - A. Terminology 117
    - B. Categories of the historical exemplum 119
      - 1) Old and new 119
        - (1) Old and New Testament 120
        - (2) Earlier and contemporary 121
        - (3) Greek and Roman 121
      - 2) Classification according to historicity 122
      - 3) οἰκεῖα and ἀλλότρια 123
  - 2.2.2 Macro-analysis 123
    - A. Old and New 123
      - 1) Frequency and distribution according to genre and rhetorical γένος 124
      - 2) Correlation with the function 125
    - B. Historical and fictitious 126
      - 1) Frequency and distribution according to rhetorical γένος 126
      - 2) Correlation with the function 127
    - C. Pagan and biblical 128
      - 1) Frequency and distribution according to genre and rhetorical γένος 128
      - 2) Correlation with audience or addressed character 129
        - (1) Explicit statements 131
        - (2) Statistics 133
      - 3) Correlation with the speaking character 138
      - 4) Correlation with the function 138
  - 2.2.3 Conclusion 139

- 2.3 Literary form 141
  - 2.3.1 Elaboration 142
    - A. Types 142
      - 1) Narration 142
      - 2) Name-mentioning 144
      - 3) Allusion 145
      - Hybrid forms 147
    - B. Macro-analysis 151
      - 1) Frequency of the different types of elaboration 151
      - 2) Correlation with the function 152
      - 3) Correlation with the subject matter 152

4) Correlation with rhetorical categories and literary genre 153
2.3.2 Insertion 153
A. Linking terms and formulas 154
1) Explicit announcement: formulas about the insertion itself 154
2) Formulas containing information about the function of the exempla 155
3) Standard formulas 155
(1) Verba declarandi and verba sentiendi 156
(2) Explicit reference to the past . . . 156
(3) Adverbs or conjunctions with causal or adversative meaning or nuance 157
(4) Terms of comparison 157
4) Rhetorical figures 157
(1) Ἀποστροφή 158
(2) Παράλειψις 158
(3) Διαπόρησις 158
(4) Laudatory σύγκρισις 159
B. Types of exempla according to insertion 161
1) Full exemplum 161
2) Minimal exemplum 162
3) Metaphorical exemplum 162
(1) Vossian antonomasia 163
(2) Allegory 166
4) Exempla without insertion 168
C. Macro-analysis 169
1) Frequency of the different types of insertion 169
2) Correlation with the function 170
3) Correlation with the elaboration . . . 170
4) Correlation with the subject matter . . 170
5) Correlation with rhetorical γένος and literary genre 172
2.3.3 Exempla in series 173
A. Organization and conception 174
1) Explicit indications 174
2) Principles of organization 174
I,2,28, vv.139-168 175
I,2,25, vv.183-303 177
I,2,10, vv.214-579 178
I,2,2, vv.152-210 182
3) Fixed clusters 186

B. Paradigmatic prayers 192
1) Gregory's representation of former paradigmatic prayers 192
2) Gregory's paradigmatic prayers . . . 195
2.3.4 Conclusion 197

CONCLUSION OF THE FIRST PART 201
The rhetorical παράδειγμα in Gregory. 201
Pagan and biblical exempla 204

PART TWO
PARADEIGMA AND HERMENEUTICS 207

CHAPTER III GREEK MYTHOLOGY IN GREGORY 211

3.1 Repertory. 211
3.2 Attitude towards the Greek myths 212
3.2.1 Μῦθος and related terms in Gregory . . . 212
A. Word(s) 213
B. Story, fiction 213
1) μῦθος and ἀλήθεια. 213
2) μῦθος: fictitious story. 215
3.2.2 Myth and truth 216
A. Myths and theological truth 218
1) Criticism to the stories of the theologian-poets 218
2) Origin and nature of the mythological gods 223
B. Myths and ethical truth. 226
C. Myths and historical truth 228
3.3 The mythological exemplum 229

CHAPTER IV THE BIBLE IN GREGORY . . . 233

4.1 Repertory: Gregory's Bible 233
4.1.1 Canon 233
4.1.2 Text. 235
4.1.3 Mistakes, distortions, contaminations . . . 235
4.2 Exegesis 237
4.2.1 Typological and allegorical interpretation 237
A. Alexandrian and Antiochene exegesis . . 240

- 0) The common basis 240
- 1) The Alexandrians 241
- 2) The Antiochenes 243
- B. Typology and allegorism 245
- 4.2.2 Gregory's exegesis 249
  - A. Status quaestionis 250
  - B. Gregory on hermeneutics 252
    - 1) Τύπος and ἀλήθεια 252
      - (1) Relation between Old and New Testament 252
      - (2) Τύπος – ἀντίτυπος – μυστήριον . . 254
      - (3) Conclusion 258
    - 2) Γράμμα and πνεῦμα 258
      - (1) κάμνομεν νοῆσαι καὶ μικρὸν βάθος . 258
      - (2) ἡ συνήθεια τῆς Γραφῆς: literal and figurative 259
      - (3) ἀπὸ τοῦ γράμματος ἐπὶ τὸ πνεῦμα: literal and spiritual 261
      - (4) Allegorical explanation of Bible vs. myths 265
      - (5) Conclusion 267
  - C. Gregory as an exegete 268
    - 1) Extensive interpretations. 268
      - (1) Exegesis of pericopes forming the subject of the argument 268
      - (2) Exegesis of biblical passages supporting the argument 273
    - 2) Oblique interpretations 276
      - (1) Historical typology 277
      - (2) Allegorism 278
    - 3) Interpretation of parables 279
  - D. Conclusion 283
- 4.3 The biblical exemplum 286

CHAPTER V MYTHOLOGICAL AND BIBLICAL METAPHORS 289

- 5.1 Towards a standard typology? 290
  - 5.1.1 A similar literary treatment 290
    - A. Apparent hermeneutic indifference . . . 290
    - B. Antonomasias 291
    - C. Allegories 291

5.1.2 Myths in the Bible. 291
5.1.3 « Christianization of Greek myths » . . . 294
5.1.4 « Mythologization of the Bible » 296
5.1.5 Literarization of mythology and Bible . . 299
5.2. Mythological metaphors. 300
5.2.1 Mythology as literature 301
5.2.2 Mythology as demonology 305
5.3 Biblical metaphors 306
5.3.1 Biblical metaphors and typology 307
5.3.2 Biblical metaphors and allegorism. . . . 315
5.3.3 The laudatory σύγκρισις: rhetoric or typology? 317

CONCLUSION OF THE SECOND PART. . . . 321
Mythological exempla and hermeneutics. 321
Biblical exempla and hermeneutics 322

RHETORIC AND HERMENEUTICS IN GREGORY'S *PARADEIGMATA* 325

INVENTORIES 327

General remarks 328

Inventory 1: traditional order of Gregory's works . . 329
Poems. 331
Orations 360
Letters. 387
Discussion of some problematical identifications in the poems 390

Inventory 2: alphabetical order 397
Biblical material 398
1) historical 398
2) parables 418
3) Christian history 420
Pagan material 420
1) historical 420
2) fables 425
3) mythology 425
4) literary characters 433

Inventory 3: traditional order of the Bible (LXX and N.T.) 435
Septuagint 436
Novum Testamentum 450

BIBLIOGRAPHY 459

Abbreviations in the bibliography 459
Primary sources (Gregory) 459
I Poems 459
II Orations 461
III Letters 461
IV Scholiasts 462
Reference works 463
Secondary studies 465

INDEX OF PASSAGES FROM GREGORY . . . 491

INTRODUCTION

Gregory between Christianity and Hellenism

Gregory was born in Nazianzus, a small town SW of Caesarea in Cappadocia, between 326 and 330, to prosperous Christian parents, Gregory, bishop of Nazianzus, and Nonna (1). The young Gregory received a protracted literary and rhetorical education in both Caesareas (Cappadocia and Palestine), in Alexandria and in Athens, where he remained for about seven years (ca. 350 to 356-358), and where he had Himerius and Prohaeresius as teachers, and Basil and the future emperor Julian among his fellow students. There is every indication that he retained excellent memories of his Athenian student days; we need only think of the extensive description of this period in his funeral oration for Basil (or.43,14-24). The extent to which he was completely devoted to the ἐγκύκλιος παίδευσις when studying in Athens is also evident from certain poems written long after his years of study.

Nevertheless, he did not apply his training to a worldly career as a rhetorician. He placed himself in the service of Christ, without ever really deciding whether this could best be done in seclusion as an ascete or in the practice of the office of priest and bishop. After a monastic experiment with his friend Basil, Gregory became the assistant of his father, who ordained him - with mild coercion (Gregory would later call it *sweet tyranny*) - as a priest in 361 or 362. Gregory (literally) fled from this responsibility; it was not until a few months later that he returned to Nazianzus. In an oration which was never delivered (oratio 2), he justifies his behaviour: the text reveals an intense feeling of respect for the priesthood. Some ten years later, when Basil, who had meanwhile become bishop of Caesarea, ordained him bishop of the trading town Sasima, he repeated this tour de force and once more went into hiding. He never took up the office, but did return to help his father in Nazianzus until both his parents died in 374. After that, he retired to Seleucia, by then already in rather poor health.

---

(1) For the study of an author whose work is so strongly autobiographically tinted, a brief biographical delineation is indispensible. In this introductory part, I shall confine myself to the broad outlines; where necessary, I give a concise biographical explanation to the quotations used in the argumentation.
There is a pressing need for a modern scientific biography of Gregory, since the most recent monograph, by GALLAY, goes back to 1943. More recent succinct biographies can be found in the essay by OTIS, and in the introductions to the works of RUETHER, pp.18-54, WITTIG, pp.1-52, and NORRIS, *Faith*, pp.1-12.
At proofreading stage: see now J. BERNARDI, *Saint Grégoire de Nazianze: le théologien et son temps (330-390)*, Paris 1995 [Initiations aux Pères de l'Eglise], an introduction indeed; and the forthcoming « Intellectual Biography » of Gregory by J. MCGUCKIN.

In 379, shortly before or after Basil's death, Gregory was invited by the orthodox community of Constantinople to become its leader. At that time, Constantinople was chiefly Arian, and the orthodox community assembled in a private church, the Anastasia, a symbolic name, as would appear later on. Gregory accepted the invitation, was quite a successful preacher in Constantinople, delivered the five theological orations (orationes 27 to 31) which would provide him with the epithet of the Theologian, and became bishop after the emperor Theodosius had returned the most important churches of the capital to the orthodox community. Still, this period in Constantinople was not a purely positive experience: he was confronted at first hand with the ever more privileged status of Church and clergy, which led to the degeneration of the priesthood and especially the episcopacy. Because of power, prestige and material advantages, the episcopal see was strongly desirable, and personal rivalries were fought out under the pretext of dogmatic points of difference. Gregory himself was menaced by a coup attempted by the philosopher Maximus-Heron, who tried – apparently with support from the Alexandrian episcopacy – to become bishop of the capital during Gregory's term of office.

During the council of Constantinople in 381, over which Gregory presided for a while, his episcopacy was disputed for canonical reasons (theoretically, he was bishop of Sasima), and when he did not succeed in reconciling West (i.e. Alexandria and Macedonia) and East about a personal issue concerning the episcopal title of Antioch, he resigned – deeply embittered. Back in Cappadocia, he supervised the community of Nazianzus for a short time. During this period, he especially challenged Apollinarianism in the dogmatic sphere. He spent what were, in a literary sense, the very productive last years of his life, on his country estate Arianzus, where he died around 390.

In the Greek and orthodox tradition, Gregory was and is exceptionally influential, in the first place as a theologian, but also as a man of letters. Forty-four authentic orations have been preserved from his pen (sixteen of these were read aloud annually in Byzantine liturgy), along with some 250 letters, and about

17.000 lines of verse. These poems form the first extensive poetic corpus in Greek-Christian literature. Their form, language, metre and style are heterogeneous and eclectic, but still they all fit in with the classical or Hellenistic tradition. Only the Christian content is novel: new wine in old bottles. In two poems about his own poetic activity, he places his poems explicitly within the framework of the « cultural strife » of the fourth century: one of the motives which prompted him to write poetry is that he did not want the « refined, polished verses » to remain a monopoly of non-Christian writers (2). Yet at the same time he has to justify himself towards Christians who take offence at his using the poetic form.

The adoption of the classical pagan culture within Christianity was indeed no undisputed matter in the fourth century, and among Christian intellectuals, it was common practice to be condescending about this culture, which was after all theirs as well. Like many of the earlier Christian authors, the fourth century Church Fathers also give evidence of this contradiction: after generally quite long rhetorical studies, they dissociated themselves from this profane education, advised caution in the use of pagan literature (3), and reproached the heterodoxy for corrupting true faith through the application of dialectics and sophistic to it. Gregory is no exception in this matter (4).

On the other hand, such an extended period of study led to the rhetorical characteristics of the second sophistic becoming second nature for Gregory and his intellectual companions. In their literary practice and in their theological reasonings, they too are strongly influenced by Greek literature, rhetoric and philosophy (5).

---

(2) II,1,39 (Εἰς τὰ ἔμμετρα), vv.47-53. Also see the poem II,1,34.

(3) Of course, the most famous example is Basil's tract, Πρὸς τοὺς νέους, ὅπως ἂν ἐξ Ἑλληνικῶν ὠφελοῖντο λόγων, better known under the Latin title *Ad adolescentes de legendis libris gentilium*.

(4) One of the most poignant formulations can be found in the programmatic poem II,1,34, in which he opposes his subjects to those of the pagan poets: Θείοις μὲν λογίοισιν ἐμὸν νόον ἁγνὸν ἔτευξα, / Γράμματος ἐξ ἱεροῦ Πνεῦμ' ἀναμαξάμενος, / Οἷς βίβλων τοπάροιθε πικρὴν ἐδέπτυον ἅλμην, / Κάλλος ἐπιπλάστοις χρώμασι λαμπόμενον (II,1,34, vv.157-160, *PG* 37,1318). Kertsch, *Bildersprache* pp.90-92, points to the revealing fact that the imagery in v.159 is adopted from the pagan diatribe....

(5) For the traces of Greek literature in Gregory's œuvre, see Wyss, *RLAC* pp.835-859 (« Literaturkenntnis Gregors »): with regard to the rhetoric, it suffices to accept Gregory's typification by Kennedy, *Rhetoric*

Where Gregory is concerned, this ambiguity between relativizing or declining statements and literary practice seems explicable through the fact that he was following conventions from the early Christian tradition and adapting to the sensitivities of his audience, sometimes also through literary wit (6). He himself is actually devoted to the λόγοι, or the pagan παίδευσις. Clear manifestations of his « love for the λόγοι » (7) can be found in the two epistolary poems dealing with the education of his great-nephew Nicobulus (II,2,4 and 5) (8). Both poems, written under the names of respectively Nicobulus and his father, also called Nicobulus, form one great ode to the value of the ἐγκύκλιος παίδευσις, more specifically to the « μύθων κράτος » (9). In his funeral oration for Basil as well, Gregory explicitly posits « that all sensible men are agreed upon the fact that παιδεία is the foremost of our advantages, and that not alone the more noble form of it, our own (...). I mean too that external culture which many Christians in their short-sightedness spurn as a treacherous and insidious thing which withdraws us far from God. (...) Rather are we to reckon such critics boorish and untutored, men who would have everyone like themselves in order that in the common levelling their own lack of culture would pass unnoticed » (10).

---

p.215: « the most important figure in the synthesis of classical rhetoric and Christianity »; for the role of the ancient philosophy, see especially FOCKEN, OOSTHOUT, and the thought-provoking NORRIS, *Faith*.

(6) Cf. DEMOEN, *Attitude* pp.251-252.

(7) II,1,11, vv.112-3.

(8) COSTANZA, *attività letteraria* p.228 alleges - to my mind completely erroneously - that II,2,5 is « certamente a torto » ascribed to Gregory, among other things because the author « fa considerazioni estranee a ogni motivazione religiosa » in his praise of the λόγοι. Of course, this poem does not fit in with Costanza's view of Gregory's sincere attitude towards the literary and rhetorical tradition, which is said to be (theoretically, at least) one of disdain. Carmen II,2,5 is quoted in contrast with Gregory's « own, coherent notions. » Other important texts which provide a thoroughly different image of Gregory's standpoint (from the invectives against Julian and from the funeral oration for Basil, cf. infra) are not mentioned in Costanza.

(9) II,2,4, v.58; also see II,2,5, v.1.

(10) Or.43,11 (*PG* 36,508B-509A): Οἶμαι δὲ πᾶσιν ἀνωμολογῆσθαι τῶν νοῦν ἐχόντων παίδευσιν τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν ἀγαθῶν εἶναι τὸ πρῶτον. Οὐ ταύτην μόνην τὴν εὐγενεστέραν καὶ ἡμετέραν, (...) ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἔξωθεν, ἣν οἱ πολλοὶ χριστιανῶν διαπτύουσιν (see n.4: ἐξέπτυον, about his own attitude!) ὡς ἐπίβουλον καὶ σφαλερὰν καὶ Θεοῦ πόρρω βάλλουσαν, κακῶς εἰδότες. (...) Οὔκουν ἀτιμαστέον τὴν παίδευσιν ὅτι τοῦτο δοκεῖ τισιν, ἀλλὰ σκαίους καὶ ἀπαιδεύτους ὑποληπτέον τοὺς οὕτως ἔχοντας, οἳ βούλοιντ' ἂν ἅπαντας εἶναι καθ' ἑαυτοὺς ἵν' ἐν τῷ κοινῷ τὸ κατ' αὐτοὺς κρύπτηται καὶ τοὺς τῆς ἀπαιδευ-

The most important texts in this respect are the invectives against the emperor Julian, which reflect the cultural strife of the fourth century. To my mind, the true purpose of the στηλιτευτικοὶ λόγοι is the definition of and the establishment of the right to the ἐλληνίζειν rather than an attempt at getting even with the dead Julian or with the whole pagan range of thought for which this « antichrist » (11) stands (12). The immediate cause for this was Julian's « school law », which prohibited the Christians from teaching pagan literature as rhetoricians (13). Gregory interpreted this as a total exclusion of the Christians from the field of education, something which he, with his attachment to the λόγοι, could not put up with. Twice, he expands upon the claim of exclusivity which Julian made to the λόγοι, and disputes his equation of Hellenism and paganism (14). He himself separates language and literature from religion (15) and advocates a cultural universality. By stripping « Hellenism » of its religious meaning, and by attributing a purely cultural sense to it, Gregory can claim it as an inheritance to which Christians too are entitled. In this sense, one can also speak of a conscious and well-founded « Hellenization of Christianity » in Gregory's approach - which would eventually clear the way for the Christianization of Hellenism. It is only in this text that this claim is put so explicitly, yet we may well call it omnipresent in the whole of his literary practice. In this way, Gregory provides a clear answer to his own rhetorical questions addressed to Julian: Σὸν τὸ ἐλληνίζειν; (...) Σὸν τὸ ἀττικίζειν; (...) Σὰ τὰ ποιήματα; *Does Hellenism belong to you? (...) Does Atticism belong to you? (...) Does poetry belong to you?* (16).

σίας ἐλέγχους διαδιδράσκωσιν (translation Meehan, *humanism* p.259).

(11) Nowhere in the invectives is Julian expressly spoken of this way, but the idea is behind every sentence. By placing the definitions of Ἀντίχριστος and ἀποστάτης immediately next to each other in I,2,34, vv.245-247, with the addition of ἀνὴρ δυνάστης, Gregory actually seems to allude to Julian.

(12) The attack on paganism of course does take a significant position, especially in the first oration (§§43, 70-72, 115-122), yet there it concerns the commonplaces continually repeated by the Apologists, which are moreover anachronistic in the attack on the myths. These passages are commented upon in part two of this study.

(13) *Cod.Theod.* XIII,3,6, and Julian ep.61, 424cd Bidez.

(14) Or.4,4-6 and 100-109.

(15) Οὐ γάρ, εἰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς τήν τε γλῶσσαν ἐλληνίζοντας καὶ τὴν θρησκείαν εἶναι συμβέβηκεν, ἤδη καὶ τῆς θρησκείας οἱ λόγοι καὶ διὰ τοῦτ' ἂν εἰκότως ἔξω ταύτης ἡμεῖς γραφείημεν (or.4,104, *PG* 35,640B).

(16) Or.4,107-108 (*PG* 35,641C-644B).

Pagan and biblical παραδείγματα

My study should be placed within the broad framework outlined above: this recovery of a « depaganized » Hellenism can in fact be illustrated by the rhetorical use made by Gregory of exempla from Bible, mythology and history.

The studied ELEMENTS (items) are **histories**, or ἱστορίαι. This label also includes names of persons and places, insofar as they are connected with a history (17). Unless they evoke a history, the mass of *quotations* from or *allusions* to Greek authors or the Bible remain outside consideration. Summarizing, it may be stated that the narrative aspect of a proper name, a quotation or an allusion is the decisive factor the elements to be selected as the object of this study.

I investigate two different SOURCES from which Gregory draws. On the one hand, there are the **pagan** elements, for which there is a continuum of *mythological*, *legendary* and *historical* characters from Greek tradition (18). In addition, I count the *fables* (especially Aesopian) among the pagan histories. On the other hand, we have the **biblical** histories; which can be divided into Old Testament and New Testament histories (with their respective Apocrypha), or into *historical* characters/episodes (19), and -

---

(17) Thus, Heracles and Moses are appropriate for the term, because their name is immediately associated with a history (the twelve labors) or a story (the book of Exodus) – except when Moses appears as the author of the Pentateuch: in that case, his mention does not count as material; the same mostly goes, for example, for Plato and David. For the place-names, similarly, the boundary is not always easy to draw. A mention of Delphi or of the Pythia can refer to a myth or a history, as well as to the Apollo cult.

(18) Not only is the dividing line between these categories quite vague (where, for instance, should Midas and Gyges be situated?), but also characters clearly belonging to different groups are sometimes mentioned alongside each other. Even contemporary historical characters are sometimes aligned with heroes from myths, legends and Greek antiquity, e.g. in I,2,15, vv.85-96: Aeacids, Heracles, Cyrus, Croesus, Alexander (the Great), Agamemnon, Irus, and Constantine (also the Great).
In this book, I use 'Greeks' for all characters from ancient Greek tradition, who *ipso facto* are pagan. With regard to the non-Christian contemporaries of Gregory, however, I prefer to use the term 'Hellenes' rather than 'Greeks' or 'pagans'. 'Hellene' implies (as does Gregory's use of "Ἕλλην) both a cultural and a religious designation, without the possibly pejorative connotation of 'pagan'.

(19) As stated, the historical characters from the period after the N.T. are sometimes situated within the course of pagan history; at other times, Gregory treats them as a continuation of the « holy history », e.g. I,2,1,

as a counterpart of the fables - *parables*. The numerous physical *mirabilia* or φυσιολογίαι remain outside consideration in this study, unless they are connected with a myth (20).

Only when these histories fulfil an **exemplary** FUNCTION do they belong to the systematically examined material. The ancient rhetoricians do not agree on the precise meaning of the concept of *exemplum* or παράδειγμα (21). In this dissertation, I use these terms with the following meaning, justified in the first chapter on the basis of the ancient rhetorical theories:

> *the evoking of a history (from the Bible or from pagan tradition) which has or has not actually occurred, which is similar or related to the matter under discussion, which is implicitly or explicitly connected with this matter as argument (evidence or model) or as ornament, and which takes the form of a narration, a name-mentioning or an allusion.*

In the same chapter, I come back to the exemplum's points of affinity with, and of difference from, rhetorical devices such as the metaphor (μεταφορά), the simile (παραβολή), the gnome (γνώμη) and the laudatory comparison (σύγκρισις).

The examined CORPUS first of all consists of the **poems** of Gregory Nazianzen. These appeared to provide more than enough material for studying the described elements. Moreover, they form the most heterogeneous part of Gregory's writings: content, form, intended audience, scope, language and style vary more than in the case of his orations and letters. Furthermore, a number of poems constitute a sort of orations or letters in verse; whereas others correspond to the modern view of poetry as lyric. In such a heterogeneous corpus, an investigation into the distribution of exempla presents extra possibilities. Of course, I have also read through Gregory's **prose** with this aspect in mind; sometimes, a parallel passage in an oration is indispensable for identifying an allusion in a poem. In the first part, exempla from prose will frequently be quoted as illustrative or additional infor-

---

vv.446-469: Cain, Pharaoh, the Assyrian kings (O.T.), Herod, Annas and Caiaphas (N.T.), persecutors of Christians and Julian (church history).

(20) Thus, the Alpheus is included among the mythological items. The function of these *mirabilia* in Gregory's œuvre is actually similar to that of the pagan and biblical histories: mostly they are inserted as exempla. It even happens that biblical and nature exempla are quoted in one and the same series (e.g. II,1,16, vv.63-76).

(21) The Greek and Latin names are used without any distinction in this study. In addition, the adjective « exemplary » has the unusual meaning of « used in an exemplum ».

mation; furthermore, they are treated as equivalent source material in the second part. Nevertheless, the whole of compiled data from prose is not examined in such great detail, nor does it make claims to being exhaustive (22).

Συναγωγὴ καὶ ἐξήγησις

The above description of material sets this study on a par with the work of the eighth-century scholiast Cosmas of Jerusalem, Συναγωγὴ καὶ ἐξήγησις ὧν ἐμνήσθη ἱστοριῶν ὁ θεῖος Γρηγόριος ἐν τοῖς ἐμμέτρως αὐτῷ εἰρημένοις ἔκ τε τῆς θεοπνεύστου Γραφῆς καὶ τῶν ἔξωθεν ποιητῶν καὶ συγγραφέων (*Inventory and explanation of the histories from the Scripture inspired by God and from the pagan poets and (other) authors, mentioned by the divine Gregory in his verses*). I have the same objective as Cosmas, namely συναγωγὴ καὶ ἐξήγησις, making an inventory and explaining.

The συναγωγή is reflected in an **inventory** of the selected material from poetry and prose, included at the end of this book. It can be found in three different orders: first in the order of the œuvre (with explanation of the problematic identifications), then in alphabetical order and finally in the order of the biblical books. Further explanation of the data included can be read in the introductory notes which precede the respective inventories. The ἐξήγησις is subdivided into a formal and rhetorical analysis (part 1) and a semantic analysis (part 2).

In the first part, **Παράδειγμα and rhetoric**, I take ancient rhetoric as a hermeneutic model, which is an obvious approach to an author as highly trained in rhetoric as Gregory. The following questions are treated in this part: Does Gregory's practice correspond to the rhetorical rules regarding the exemplum? What functions do exemplary histories have in his works? Which subject matter does he choose to use? In which way does he represent the histories? How and where does he insert them? How frequent are they and which type of histories does he prefer to use? Do possible variations depend on the content, the genre, the intended audience of the text? And most of all, is there a difference in the treatment of pagan and biblical subject matter?

---

(22) Thus, when reading the poems more thoroughly, I have also attempted to collect the lexical allusions to histories (for the erudite reader, these also have a - mostly ornamental - exemplary function); from the prose, I selected only the most obvious lexical allusions or those already signalled by others. In or.21,36 e.g., Gregory nominates Athanasius at the end of his laudation with the epithets φιλόξενος, ἱκέσιος, ἀποτρόπαιος, ζύγιος, παρθένιος and πομπαῖος: this way Athanasius accumulates the functions of Zeus, Apollo, Hera, Artemis and Hermes, which is already clearly indicated by Gregory himself. Lexical allusions are not always as evident; besides, not using a Homeric form in hexameters may be significant: in I,2,1, v.440 (*PG* 37,555), Gregory has the personified παρθενία speak of πτέρναν ἐμὴν δοκέων πικρὸς ὄφις. The form πτέρναν is that of the LXX, also to be found in Gn 3,15, in which the Lord speaks to the ὄφις; Homer uses πτέρνη. Unless Gregory had chosen the non-Homeric form solely for metrical reasons, we are dealing with a kind of morphological allusion here. It is quite likely that I would have failed to notice such a detail in the rather cursory reading of the prose.

The first chapter provides a survey of the **ancient rhetorical theories of the παράδειγμα**, starting with Aristotle. It establishes the framework for the analysis; the theory is grouped according to three aspects: function, subject matter and literary form. The chapter concludes with a brief outline of the use of exempla in the Bible and in early Christian and medieval literature. In the second chapter, I examine **Gregory's employment of the exemplum**. It would be inadequate only to « retrace » the rhetorical arsenal in Gregory's texts; the idea is also to understand how this rhetorical repertory functions with regard to the subject, the reader / listener and the effect aimed at. To that end, I subdivide the œuvre into genres (internal criterion: usually determined by the subject (23)), and I also try to classify the works according to rhetorical *species* (24), and - insofar as this can still be found out - the intended audience (external criteria: determined by the relation text-audience). The rough outline of frequency and distribution of pagan and biblical material is followed by a detailed analysis according to the framework derived from rhetorical theories: I successively deal with function, subject matter and literary form of the exempla. First, I examine to what extent the theory is reflected in Gregory's practice, after which I investigate - in a « macro-analysis » - the possible correlation between the three aspects themselves, and between these aspects and content, audience and persuasive purpose of the entire text. All in all, in this chapter a rather quantitative approach is taken. The (sometimes long) quotations from Gregory have been chosen as much as possible with a view to their « recyclability » for the semantic analysis in the second part.

---

(23) In the subdivision of classical poetry into genres, it is sometimes quite difficult to establish whether the criteria are made up by form or content.

(24) Judicial (dicanic), deliberative (symbouleutic) and epideictic (demonstrative), the three types of oratory or rhetorical γένη (δικανικόν, συμβουλευτικόν and ἐγκωμιαστικόν / ἐπιδεικτικόν) distinguished by Aristotle.

This second part, **Παράδειγμα and hermeneutics**, aims to contribute to the study of Gregory's attitude towards Greek mythology and his interpretation of the Bible.

The exemplum reveals a semantic « Doppelschichtigkeit »: the quoted history has a meaning in itself (the « Eigenbedeutung »), and a semantic intention within the context (the « Ernstbedeutung ») (25). The purpose of this second part of the book is to confront the *Eigenbedeutung* (26) with the *Ernstbedeutung*, i.e. to examine the nature of the relation between on the one hand Gregory's view on the Greek myth and his exegesis of the Bible, and on the other his incorporation of these in παραδείγματα.

In the chapter about **Greek mythology in Gregory**, first, with reference to the inventory, the repertory is discussed and its size evaluated. The aim is not to carry out a systematic study of the source material with a view to detecting which sources Gregory (may have) made use of. The pagan material in general typically concerns *histories* in the restricted sense of the term, as distinct from *stories* (texts in which these histories are told). This exemplary material gradually developed into a sort of stock. Apparent exceptions are the rare explicit references to a source, the quotations from or lexical allusions to literary examples, and the fables, most of which are stories by definition. The inquiry into Gregory's attitude towards the Greek myths - the most significant objective of this chapter - concentrates on the relationship between μῦθος and ἀλήθεια. The chapter concludes with a comparison of this explicit standpoint with the general image of the mythological exemplum, as was described in the first part.

The composition of the fourth chapter, **the Bible in Gregory**, parallels that of the preceding one. First, the repertory is looked at. Unlike the pagan histories, the biblical ones are actually related to a story, namely the Bible. This implies that the study of the source material is basically unnecessary (27): the correct biblical reference in the inventory suffices. The relationship with biblical texts involves other specific problems, which are briefly touched upon here: which text was read by Gregory, and which canon did he use? In this study, the Bible is hence looked upon as a *story* of *histories* of which Gregory disposes; consequently, in the repertory we find especially the narrative Bible books.

---

(25) Lausberg §421.

(26) I refer to the *Eigenbedeutung* according to Gregory here. It is not at all my ambition to depart from or pronounce upon the « actual meaning » of the Greek myths or the Jewish-Christian Bible.

(27) Of course, it may happen that Gregory adopts the exemplary employment of a biblical episode or character from a Christian predecessor; this will be indicated sometimes. Still, it would be inaccurate to speak of second-hand knowledge here, as is the case for many pagan histories:

The distinction between story and history is more than a narratological piece of cleverness, since it helps in the – significant – definition of the concepts allegorism and typology. This definition, within the context of the early Christian exegesis, forms the framework of the discussion of Gregory's Bible exegesis. I comment upon Gregory's theoretical sayings about the hermeneutics to be followed and about the relation between O.T. and N.T., giving special attention to the terminology he uses. A brief summary of his exegetical practice completes the image of Gregory's hermeneutic position. This fourth chapter concludes with a comparison of his attitude towards the Bible with the « blueprint » of the biblical exemplum made in the first part.

Finally, the fifth and last chapter studies the **relation between interpretation** (*Eigenbedeutung*) **and exemplary use** (*Ernstbedeutung*) of mythological and biblical histories in a specific kind of παράδειγμα: the metaphorical exemplum. This study builds both on the first part and on the previous chapters of the second part: it starts from the observation that two kinds of subject matter which are explicitly valued in a completely divergent manner are formally incorporated in an identical way. The treatment of the question of whether hermeneutics yields to rhetoric in the metaphorically inserted histories serves as the conclusion of the whole study.

* * *

---

there, it is often quite likely that Gregory does not know the original text, or does not have it to hand. For biblical histories, this is different: inspiration drawn from an Apologist or another Church Father only complicates the intertextuality: next to the Bible and Gregory's text, there is still another text – or possibly already a tradition – involved in the process of incorporation.

Of course, the above described theme has been touched upon here and there, and partial aspects of it have been more or less elaborately treated, but with the exception of Cosmas of Jerusalem, no one has chosen this as a subject for a monograph. There are two previous doctoral dissertations devoted to **the exemplum in the writings of a Latin Church Father**: Alfons SCHNEIDERHAN obtained his doctorate in 1921 with a dissertation on Jerome, and Hélène PÉTRÉ obtained hers in 1940 with a study on Tertullian (28). These provided part of the material for Adolf LUMPE's article « Exemplum » in the *Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum* (1966), which presents a compilation from the Latin tradition in particular. His brief but fundamental article is one of the bases for the formal classification of the exemplum used here. In Albert WIFSTRAND's chapter about « L'univers des exemples », a more general treatment of the exempla in the Church Fathers is explicitly situated within the relationship between Christianity and Hellenism. He indicated a gap in the investigation into the pagan culture of the Christians: « Ce qu'on a trop peu examiné, c'est la manière dont les allusions entrent dans le contexte, l'occasion qui provoque leur emploi, leur relation avec les exemples bibliques, et en quelle mesure elles conservent leur sens premier dans cet emploi nouveau » (29).

Wifstrand's call, in 1962, for a rhetorical and semantic analysis of the pagan exempla has been partly answered for Gregory by now, at least as far as mythology is concerned. Until 1962, certain scholars had felt somewhat embarrassed when confronted with the remarkable amount of **mythological material** in Gregory's œuvre, which they obscured rather than studied (30). The first to devote a serious study to mythology (in 1958) was Friedhelm LEFHERZ, who confined himself to a brief general survey and a critical discussion of six passages with problematical identifications (31). In 1973, Marie-Paule MASSON-VINCOURT wrote a (never published) *thèse de troisième cycle* about the allusions to pagan mythology and religion in Gregory (32). Unfortunately, her work has remained totally unknown and unused. Neither Bernard COULIE, who wrote a licentiate's thesis in 1982 about mythology in the invectives against Julian, nor Vaappu PYYKKÖ, who took her doctoral degree with a dissertation about mythology in the Cappadocians and John Chrysostom, refers to their French predecessor (33).

---

(28) The first study, which never appeared in print, consists for more than half (90 of 155 pp.) of long quotations from Jerome, and does not include a table of contents, an index or titles; the second one is better organized, but rather superficial. Both are more interesting for the parallels (certainly in the case of Jerome, younger contemporary and pupil of Gregory) than for methodology.

(29) WIFSTRAND p.131.

(30) Thus GUIGNET, *Procédés*, pp.50-51: « on conçoit qu'il se soit appliqué de toutes ses forces à l'exclure (sc. la mythologie) de ses œuvres » ... « il essaya de la remplacer »; and FLEURY p.34: « il laissait tomber d'un oeil souriant les fables ridicules de la mythologie », namely during his rhetorical training.

About Gregory's **interpretation of the Bible**, many divergent statements can be found, usually in passing and often without any illustration, or at the most with reference to the few explicit assertions by Gregory himself. Only Paul GALLAY devoted special attention to Gregory's view on the Bible, in a brief contribution in an anthology from 1984. For discussions of the exemplary use of biblical histories we have to turn to *ad hoc* explanations in editions and to the few comments on separate poems or orations, where we often find references to parallels.

* * *

In the footnotes, works are quoted only with the name of the author and on occasion the abbreviated title (the abbreviation used follows the full reference in the bibliography).

---

(31) His original intention was to spend an entire doctoral dissertation to this subject, « doch stellte sich bald heraus, daß zu einer Monographie über Mythologie bei Gregor die Grundlagen nicht ausreichten » (LEFHERZ p.31), - which has been challenged since. The rest of the thesis (the largest part by far) is a very useful encyclopedic outline about the tradition, scholiasts and publications of Gregory's œuvre.

(32) She provides a reasoned index of these allusions (although it is incomplete and contains some mistakes). Her interesting though sometimes quite chaotic study reveals a lacunal familiarity with secondary literature, for example about some questions of authenticity. The fact that the chapter « Mythologie et rhétorique » only treats those allusions which are inserted exclusively « par jeu d'esprit » and « comme pur ornement » points to a limited view on rhetoric (in which this is equated with *elocutio*), which is not in keeping with the point of departure of my study (in which also, indeed especially, *inventio* is highlighted).

(33) Pyykkö's work is extremely interesting for the possibilities of comparison with the other fourth-century Church Fathers: like Masson-Vincourt, she gives an (unexplained) index of mythological characters, which is - at least with regard to Gregory Nazianzen - rather incomplete. See also my review in *Antiquité Classique* 62 (1993) 344-346.

The numeration of the footnotes starts anew with each part; only for references to notes from a part other than the current one do I indicate the numbers of both page and footnote.

Gregory's œuvre - with the exception of the letters - is still waiting for an *editio critica maior*, which will probably still be published this millenium in the *Corpus Christianorum*. For the quotations, I follow the traditional system of reference: I refer to the edition of the Maurists in the *Patrologia Graeca*. In the Greek text itself, I have used more recent editions where possible (34), and I have taken into account the corrections which have been suggested in comments on separate texts. I try to represent as faithfully as possible what is stated in the edition used, which sometimes leads to contradictory forms: thus, for instance, modern editions no longer use the grave accent before the comma or the capital at the opening of the verse and with *nomina sacra*, both commonly used in the *PG*. With regard to quotations from the letters, I refer to the paragraphs from the edition of Gallay in the Budé-series.

Where the Bible references are concerned: with regard to the O.T., the LXX is referred to with the abbreviations used by Nestle-Aland; for the N.T., I have adopted the abbreviations of the *RSV*.

Quotations from Gregory longer than a few words are translated throughout in the text (not in the footnotes). Wherever it was possible, I have adopted existing English translations, sometimes slightly adapted. When no source is mentioned, translations are my own (this is the case for most of the verse passages). They are merely intended as an aid for understanding the Greek text.

---

(34) For the letters, I quote the edition of Gallay (Budé); for the orations 1-5 and 20-43, the editions in the *Sources Chrétiennes* series. For only a few major poems, a critical text is available: I,2,8 (Werhahn), I,2,9 (Palla-Kertsch), I,2,10 (Crimi-Kertsch), I,2,29 (Knecht), II,1,11 (Jungck), II,1,12 (Meier), and most of the epigrams (Beckby, *AG* VIII in the Tusculum series).

PART ONE
PARADEIGMA AND RHETORIC

CHAPTER I

THE RHETORICAL ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΓΜΑ

In this chapter, I describe the framework within which Gregory's use of the παράδειγμα / exemplum should be placed: the ancient rhetorical theory concerning it, and the application of it in biblical and early-Christian practice. In the analysis of Gregory's exemplum, the rhetorical theory will serve as a starting point; the studies about the exemplum in Christian (especially Latin) literature provide reference material for locating his practice.

1.1 The παράδειγμα / exemplum in ancient rhetorical theory (35)

The essence of the exemplum comes down to the fact that an appeal is made to a similar or illustrative incident (the « illustrans »), which is not intrinsically connected with the matter under discussion (the « illustrandum ») (36). The phenomenon is universal as such: practice precedes theory, which is, as in the whole of rhetoric, in the first place descriptive and only later - for example in the school system at the time of Gregory - becomes prescriptive. Due to the rhetoricians' attempts to classify existing language phenomena by means of likewise already existing terms, general terms acquired an often fluctuating technical meaning; thus παράδειγμα (with its synonym ὑπόδειγμα, hardly ever used by the rhetoricians) and the Latin equivalent *exemplum* (37).

---

(35) The discussion of the Greek rhetoricians is based on my own reading of the sources; for the Latin ones I have relied upon verified scholarly literature; in the case of Greek quotations, I refer to the edition used, for Latin quotations, to the secondary source. The most important examinations of the rhetorical exemplum incorporated in this part are those of Alewell, pp.5-54 (as an introduction to the study of the exemplum in Latin literature from the imperial age), Lumpe (article in the *RLAC*), McCall (especially for the exemplum's connection with figures of comparison), Lausberg passim, in particular §§410-426 (fundamental, even though a rather over-systematized static picture based on Quintilian), Martin particularly pp.119-124 (more attention to the Greeks, but with careless paraphrases and inaccuracies) and Price.
The last (an unpublished Ph.D. dissertation) is the most thorough and comprehensive study of the ancient exemplum to date. Price treats five important classical corpora (the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, Aristotle, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, Cicero, Quintilian), and finds both continuity and discontinuity. The contradictions within these corpora make him conclude that it is « impossible to come to a « universal » definition of example. (...) There is little profit in constructing such definition here » (p.215). His main concern being a purely theoretical analysis of rhetorical theory for its own sake, he does not provide his reader with an applicable paradigm for the research of the exemplum in literary corpora. (Yet he points out that descriptive studies of the exempla in Greek and Roman orators, and in poetry, are promising areas for further research.) With regard to our subject, another disadvantage of Price (and in fact of most other above-mentioned studies) is that he keeps to the classical period and does not go beyond Quintilian.

The ancient rhetorical theories devote attention especially to the *function*, the purpose (πότε χρηστέον, often to be derived from the position of the treatment of the παράδειγμα within rhetoric), and the *subject matter* (ὕλη, εἴδη, φύσις), and less to the *literary form* (πῶς χρηστέον, usually not more than some occasional remarks). Among other things, these vague rules for the literary form cause

---

Only in the final editing stage of this book have I come across the book by Von Moos, which deals mainly with the exemplum in John of Salisbury but contains important introductory chapters on the ancient and medieval exemplum. This book would have had a greater effect on my study (especially in the paragraphs 1.1.1 and 1.2.3) had I read it at an earlier stage. Now its impact will be limited to a few footnotes. I take comfort in Von Moos' own « Gedanken über den Sinn wissenschaftlicher Schriftstellerei » (preface pp.xxvii-xxxv, worthy of consideration for several reasons): « Wer vor zwanzig Jahren annahm, es sei möglich, ein relativ sauber abgrenzbares Thema in Kenntnis aller dazu bestehenden neueren Forschungsergebnisse zu behandeln, wäre heute, hätte er seine Meinung nicht geändert, ein Träumer. (...) Nein, es gibt, wo ein Thema wie das vorliegende exemplarisch auf Allgemeines verweist, auch nur *eine* adäquate Behandlungsweise: den exemplarischen Umgang sowohl mit der Primär- wie mit der Sekundärliteratur. Dies erfordert mehr als den vielbeschworenen Mut zur Unvollständigkeit (meist ein obligater Demutstopos): den Mut nämlich, jenseits eigener Fachgrenzen unbedenklich als *Dilettant* aufzutreten » (pp.xxviii-xxx).

(36) I adopt the terms illustrans (i.e. the exemplary history or character) and illustrandum (i.e. the case, or the matter under discussion) from Price, who himself refers to H. Friis Johansen. « The illustrans helps embellish, prove, clarify, etc. the illustrandum » (Price p.219 n.1). He also uses the terms « probandum » and « ornandum », which I consider too closely related to one specific function of the exemplum.

(37) The original, concrete meaning of the terms παράδειγμα and ὑπόδειγμα is that of (architectural or plastic) *model*, *pattern*, cf. Von Blumenthal. In Platonic metaphysics, παράδειγμα was used for the heavenly forms (e.g. *Rep.* 592b), and thus this meaning was retained, yet on the ontological plane. (Conversely, in the N.T., namely in the Epistle to the Hebrews 8,5 and 9,23, ὑπόδειγμα, as a synonym of σκιά and ἀντίτυπον, refers to the copy, portrayal or adumbration of divine reality, the τύπος.)

the παράδειγμα partly to overlap with σύγκρισις, γνώμη, διήγημα, κρίσις, μεταφορά, and necessitate elucidation when the term *exemplum* is used. In the conclusion of this theoretical introduction, I will define the « παράδειγμα » studied in Gregory, and I will use the term in this sense throughout the rest of this work.

The starting point of the theory concerning the παράδειγμα is Aristotle, who devotes attention mainly to the **rhetorical function**, and to a lesser extent to the subject matter. As is well known, he treats rhetoric by analogy with logic. Within the ἔντεχνοι πίστεις (technical means of persuasion - artificial types of proof), he distinguishes between the ethical, the pathetical and the logical; the last category can be subdivided into ἐνθύμημα (the rhetorical counterpart of the syllogism) and παράδειγμα (rhetorical induction) (38). In the traditional division of rhetoric, the Aristotelian παράδειγμα falls within the εὕρεσις (*inventio*).

Aristotle makes a distinction between two types of **subject matter**: historical and fabricated, namely comparisons and fables (39).

After Aristotle, there is evolution towards both a stricter description of the subject matter, to which more attention is devoted, and a broader conception of the function, which is interpreted less « logically ».

1.1.1 Functions

A. Argument (Πίστις / *probatio* / proof)

Following Aristotle, most ancient rhetorics treat the exemplum in the theory on the types of proof (πίστις / *probatio*) within the εὕρεσις / *inventio*. Anaximenes (Ῥητορικὴ πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον, ca.330 B.C.), the *Anonymus Seguerianus* (Τέχνη ῥητορική, fifth century A.D., compilation from the second-century sophists Neocles, Alexander and Zeno), Minucianus (Περὶ ἐπιχειρημάτων in the peripatetic tradition, third century A.D.), Apsines (Τέχνη ῥητορική, third century A.D.) and the anonymous compiler of Longinus' Τέχνη ῥητορική (third century A.D.) consider the παραδείγματα as ἐπιχειρήματα (the logical πίστεις ἔντεχνοι) next to (among other things) the ἐνθυμήματα. Also Quintilian discusses the *exemplum* as a part of the *probatio artificialis*, next to *argumentum* (ἐνθύμημα) and *signum* (σημεῖον).

---

(38) *Rhet.* A2 and B20-24. καλῶ γὰρ ἐνθύμημα μὲν ῥητορικὸν συλλογισμόν, παράδειγμα δὲ ἐπαγωγὴν ῥητορικήν (A2 1356ᵇ4¹-5 KASSEL); this parallel is often repeated in the whole *Rhet.*

(39) *Rhet.* B20 1393ᵃ27-30 (KASSEL): ἓν μὲν γάρ ἐστι παραδείγματος εἶδος τὸ λέγειν πράγματα προγεγενημένα, ἓν δὲ τὸ αὐτὸν ποιεῖν. τούτου δ' ἓν μὲν παραβολὴ ἓν δὲ λόγοι, οἷον οἱ Αἰσώπειοι καὶ Λιβυκοί.

In Ps.-Hermogenes' Περὶ εὑρέσεως (third century A.D.) (40), the παράδειγμα occupies a different position, even though still within the argumentation.

Finally, also in Rufus' rather unsystematic Τέχνη ῥητορική (second / third century, an enumeration of definitions), the παράδειγμα is placed within the category Περὶ ἀποδείξεως.

1) *Functions of the exemplum probationis*

(1) Convincing: the example as evidence

Examples may be quoted to convince the audience that the speaker is right, thus influencing a (democratic) decision process or judicial pronouncement. Two out of the three traditional rhetorical γένη, the συμβουλευτικόν and the δικανικόν - the two types of agonal oratory -, are originally intended in this sense (Aristotle considers the παράδειγμα most appropriate for the former (41)). Consequently, it is no surprise that most of the rhetoricians cited above, consider this *evidential function* as *the* function of the παράδειγμα.

(2) Exhorting: the example as a model for imitation / deterrence

Examples can also be appealed to as edifying or deterrent models, so as to influence the attitude and opinions of the audience or addressee more efficiently. This is a favourite technique among moralists, for example in the cynical-stoical diatribe. This *model function* of the παράδειγμα, which fits in better with the general meaning of the term (cf. n.37), is indicated especially by the later rhetoricians, possibly alongside the evidential function (42).

---

(40) As part of the standard rhetorical corpus of Hermogenes, it was profoundly influential in late antiquity and the Byzantine period.

(41) *Rhet.* A9 1368^{a}26-33 (KASSEL).

(42) Exhorting and convincing are put next to one another in Ps.-Aelius Herodianus (second century A.D.): προτροπῆς χάριν ἢ ἀποτροπῆς ἢ δηλώσεως ἁπλῆς (SPENGEL III p.104) and Polybius Sardianus (probably third century A.D.): λόγος (...) προτροπὴν ἢ ἀποτροπὴν ἢ ἀπόδειξίν τινων ἔχων (SPENGEL III p.107).

2) *Logical method: relation of the illustrans to the illustrandum, and type of argumentation*

(1) The analogical exemplum

Aristotle specifies that the παράδειγμα is an induction from particular to particular on the basis of similarity (43). He postulates that the παράδειγμα can be used as a form of demonstration when there are no enthymemes available (44). In this case, the exemplary histories must precede the probandum, and it is necessary to give several of them.

This παράδειγμα is based on similarity, analogy (« just as ... thus also »; it is no coincidence that the παραβολή is a species of the παράδειγμα for Aristotle); hence, one might call it the « **analogical** » παράδειγμα. As a matter of fact, it actually makes a (possibly implicit) detour via the universal or at least the common: the particular illustrans (μέρος) is quoted because of an *Ernstbedeutung* (45) which is assumed to have a more general validity (a kind of ὅλον), and from which a conclusion is drawn for the particular illustrandum (πρὸς μέρος) (46).

(2) The inductive exemplum

If it *is* possible to give an enthymeme, the παράδειγμα serves as μαρτύριον according to Aristotle: support of (the probable premise of) an ἐνθύμημα; in that case, it must follow the enthymeme and one example suffices. (Later rhetoricians have abandoned this link with logic; besides, they do not provide any rules for the order illustrandum-illustrans (47) nor impose limits to the number; in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, the device is « the more, the better. » (48))

---

(43) παράδειγμα δὲ ὅτι μέν ἐστιν ἐπαγωγή, εἴρηται. ἔστι δὲ οὔτε ὡς μέρος πρὸς ὅλον οὔθ᾽ ὡς ὅλον πρὸς μέρος οὔθ᾽ ὡς ὅλον πρὸς ὅλον, ἀλλ᾽ ὡς μέρος πρὸς μέρος, ὅμοιον πρὸς ὅμοιον, ὅταν ἄμφω μὲν ᾖ ὑπὸ τὸ αὐτὸ γένος, γνωριμώτερον δὲ θάτερον ᾖ θατέρου (*Rhet.* A2 1357b25-30 KASSEL).

(44) δεῖ δὲ χρῆσθαι τοῖς παραδείγμασιν οὐκ ἔχοντα μὲν ἐνθυμήματα ὡς ἀποδείξεσιν (...), ἔχοντα δὲ ὡς μαρτυρίοις (*Rhet.* B20 1394a9-16 KASSEL).

(45) Cf. introduction p.28.

(46) In fact, this παράδειγμα is not logically identical to the ἐπαγωγή (despite nn.38 and 43), which Aristotle himself defines as proceeding from the particular to the general. Since it (implicitly or explicitly) argues « up » to a universal and « down » to a new particular, this παράδειγμα could be said to combine induction and syllogism (or ἐνθύμημα): see PRICE pp.58-62, speaking of the « inductive-deductive paradigm ». I prefer not to use this term, as it is based on the outdated deduction induction dichotomy. The analogical argument is a third mode of reasoning: abduction. (See ANTTILA pp.13-21. « Analogy is weaker than induction, because the description of similarities and differences is notoriously inaccurate, incomplete, and inconclusive. In other words, it feeds on abduction », p.18.) Hence my choice of « analogical παράδειγμα ».

This παράδειγμα is based on a generalization of a particular instance (and fits in with the general meaning of the term in the expression παραδείγματος χάριν). In this case, Aristotle's own specification that it concerns an argument from particular to particular actually does not hold any longer: the premise (whether or not pronounced) of an enthymeme is indeed a generalization, so that the logical method of such an exemplum *does* seem to be ὡς μέρος πρὸς ὅλον. Hence, I would call it the « **inductive** » παράδειγμα (49). The *Ernstbedeutung* of the exemplary history usually coincides here with the probandum. (50)

---

(47) See e.g. Apsines (Spengel I p.373): ἤτοι προτάττομεν τοὺς λογισμοὺς τῶν παραδειγμάτων ἢ ἐπάγομεν, without further explanation.
About the position, he mentions in the same sentence that the παράδειγμα does not belong in the proem, – a prohibition which Quintilian ascribes to *cauti illi ac diligentes*, with which he refers to the conservative Atticists (McCall p.185 and n.24). Of course, normally the *exemplum probationis* occurs in the *argumentatio*.

(48) III,5,9, cf. Alewell p.34.

(49) The illustrans relates to the illustrandum as the part to the whole, as in the *συνεκδοχή* the *signifié* of the substitute term to the *signifié* of the « replaced » term. Bremond (Bremond-Le Goff pp.115-116) uses the term « synecdochic exemplum » for this type.
Analogously, he calls the preceding form « metaphorical exemplum », for with these exempla, the relation is – as for the metaphor – based on analogy. I shall use the term « metaphorical exemplum » to a more limited extent to indicate the *tropical form* of the analogical exemplum: « metaphorical » against « full » as « metaphor » against « comparison » (cf. p.49, about the insertion), not as « metaphor » against « synecdoche. »
« Il n'est personne s'occupant de rhétorique qui ne soit tenté de classer à son tour et à sa manière les figures » (Barthes p.219).

(50) Von Moos, §§7 and 9-15, draws a different distinction, logically and terminologically. He distinguishes « zwischen aktuellen und virtuellen, einmalig applizierten, eindeutigen und für immer verfügbaren, potentiell vieldeutigen Geschichtsanalogien » (p.18). The former, which is closest to my analogical exemplum, he calls the real, the « pragmatisch-finite », the « empirisch-praktische », the truly inductive exemplum; the latter, which is comparable to my inductive exemplum, he calls the virtual, the « didaktisch-infinite », the « illustrierende » exemplum. The difference is stated most clearly on p.27: « Der Weg führt entweder vom 'besonderen Fall' zur Erkenntnis des Tunlichen, oder der Weg führt vom notwendigen Axiom zum beliebigen Illustrations- und Applikationsbeispiel ».

(3) The Hermogenic exemplum

In the third book (about the κατασκευή, *argumentatio*) of Ps.-Hermogenes' Περὶ εὑρέσεως, the παράδειγμα is given a totally different place within the argumentation from that which it holds in the Aristotelian tradition. The entire counterargumentation or refutation of a κεφάλαιον (*status*, a concept from Hermogenes' στάσεις-theory) consists in a λύσις, supported by an ἐπιχείρημα, elaborated in its turn by an ἐργασία, and concluded by an ἐνθύμημα. For each of these elements, forms and topoi are provided; one of the forms of ἐργασία is the παράδειγμα. Hence, in this theory of argumentation, the meaning and mutual relation of ἐπιχείρημα, παράδειγμα and ἐνθύμημα have been shifted considerably (51).

3) Degrees of similarity

As pointed out, the (analogical) exemplum refers to a history which is actually outside the matter under discussion, but which reveals a certain similarity to it (52). In his definition, Aristotle only speaks of ὅμοιον πρὸς ὅμοιον (53); Anaximenes subdivides the παραδείγματα in πράξεις ὅμοιαι καὶ ἐναντίαι (54). The most detailed elaboration of these topoi can be found in Quintilian, who classifies the exempla in

1) *exemplum simile*,
2) *exemplum dissimile*,
3) *exemplum contrarium*

---

(51) Περὶ εὑρέσεως Γ' (RABE pp.126-170); for the ἐργασία and thus, among other things, the παράδειγμα §7 (pp.148-150). The fact that terminology and succession are different does not imply that Aristotle's logical method(s) (analogical and inductive) are no longer applicable.
The author polemizes with the traditional theory which considers the παράδειγμα as a sort of ἐπιχείρημα: δεησόμεθα πάλιν ἐργασίας εἰς τὴν κατασκευὴν τοῦ ἐπιχειρήματος. ἐργάζεται δὲ πᾶν ἐπιχείρημα ἀπὸ τούτων, ἃ δοκοῦσιν εἶναι τινες ἐπιχειρήματα, οἷον ἀπὸ παραβολῆς, ἀπὸ παραδείγματος, ἀπὸ μικροτέρου, ἀπὸ μείζονος, ἀπ' ἴσου, ἀπ' ἐναντίου (pp.148-149; the last four are topoi which are indicated in the work of other rhetoricians as topoi of the παράδειγμα itself, cf. infra, *degrees of similarity*). For a full discussion, see KENNEDY, *Rhetoric* pp.87-91.

(52) In the case of the inductive παράδειγμα, the illustrans is a particular instance of the illustrandum, and is thus not merely similar to it.

(53) Cf. supra n.43.

(54) Anaximenes §8.1 (FUHRMANN p.34).

4) *exemplum impar* (either *ex maiore ad minus ductum*, or *ex minore ad maius ductum*) (55).

The difference between *dissimile* and both *simile* and *impar* is rather vague; hence, the Greek four-part classification, as found in Apsines and Ps.-Hermogenes, seems more practicable:

1) ἀφ' ὁμοίου (ἀπ' ἴσου, *simile*)
2) ἀπ' ἐναντίου (*contrarium*)
3) ἀπὸ μείζονος (*ex maiore ad minus*)
4) ἀπ' ἐλάττονος (ἀπὸ μικροτέρου, *ex minore ad maius*) (56).

Of each of the last two topoi (both are forms of *a fortiori*), Apsines gives two illustrating examples. The incomplete similarity (*impar*) between illustrans and illustrandum can indeed be caused by several factors (which may coincide, of course). The most significant of these are

- the performed act (« even *that* one has / you have done / been able to do; a fortiori ... »).
- the performing character (« even *(s)he* / *they* has / have done / been able to do that; a fortiori... »).

In the case of the last topos, Apsines speaks of ἀπὸ ἐλαττόνων προσώπων. In accordance with Apsines' term, I would like to distinguish between ἀπὸ μείζονος (ἐλάττονος) πράξεως and προσώπου.

4) *Refutation of the παράδειγμα*

About the λύσις (*refutatio*) – also characteristic of the agonal oratory – of the παράδειγμα, Aristotle writes that one counter example suffices to negate the argumentation with παραδείγματα; later rhetoricians indicate that the παραδείγματα quoted by the opposition can be disputed by calling upon the non- or incomplete similarity of illustrans and illustrandum (57). There does not seem to have been a fixed theory on the λύσις παραδείγματος.

---

(55) For the entire theory of Quintilian (V,11,5-14), see Lausberg §420 and Price pp.154-173. They propose quite divergent subdivisions of Quintilian's classification.

(56) Apsines §8 (SPENGEL I pp.373-374); for Ps.-Hermogenes see n.51.

(57) Aristotle *Rhet.* B25 1403A5-9 (KASSEL): πρὸς δὲ τὰ παραδειγματώδη ἡ αὐτὴ λύσις καὶ τὰ εἰκότα· ἐάν τε γὰρ ἔχωμεν <ἕν> τι οὐχ οὕτω, λέλυται, ὅτι οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον. For the challenging of the validity of individual exempla in, among others, Quintilian and Apsines, cf. Alewell pp.34-35.

B. Ornament (Κόσμος / *ornatus* / embellishment)

Some rhetoricians view the exemplum (also) as a figure or as a trope: they treat it (again) as part of the theory on the *κόσμος* / *ornatus* (one of the *ἀρεταὶ τῆς λέξεως* / *virtutes elocutionis*). In that case, the exemplum does not - or at least not in the first place - have an evidential or model function, but an **ornamental function**.

In the Greek tradition, we come across this kind of *παράδειγμα* only in later tracts, which are not intended as extensive *τέχναι ῥητορικαί* and which have merely the *λέξις* as object. In this way, it is treated in Ps.-Aelius Herodianus' Περὶ *σχημάτων* (second century A.D.), Polybius Sardianus' Περὶ *σχηματισμοῦ*, Ps.-Trypho's Περὶ *τρόπων* (third century A.D.) and Georgius Choeroboscus' Περὶ *τρόπων ποιητικῶν* (ninth century?), usually next to *παραβολή* and *εἰκών*. Menander, who casually brings up the *παράδειγμα*, also considers it in the first place as a means to adorn and illustrate the argument (58).

The exemplum's ornamental function is most clearly voiced by the Latin tradition, namely by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*: the author considers the exemplum as one of the *exornationes sententiarum* (figures of thought); in an explicit rejection of the Greek theories, he denies it any evidential function, and thinks it apt only to clarify or adorn the rest of the text (59). Both in his *De oratore* and in his *Brutus*, Cicero too classifies the exemplum among the *figurae sententiae*, closely connected with the *simili-*

---

(58) Menander Περὶ *λαλιᾶς* 389 (RUSSELL): *οὐκοῦν ληψόμεθα πρὸς τοῦτο παράδειγμα ἱστορίαν ἀρχαίαν ἢ πλάσαντες αὐτοί* (where the exemplum's *subject matter* is concerned, it is notable that Menander follows precisely Aristotle's division here, cf. supra n.39), *ἵνα μὴ δοκῶμεν αὐτοῖς γυμνοῖς τοῖς πράγμασιν ἐγχειρεῖν· οὐ γὰρ ἔχει τοῦτο ἡδονήν· (...) παραγένοιτο δ' ἂν ἡ γλυκύτης τῷ λόγῳ, εἰ παραδείγματα λέγοιμεν δι' ὧν ἐμφανιοῦμεν ὃ προαιρούμεθα, ἱστορίας ἡδίστας τοῖς ἀκροαταῖς μαθεῖν ἐκλεγόμενοι.* Similar advice in 392 (RUSSELL pp.120-122).

(59) IV.3.5: *primum omnium exempla ponuntur hic non confirmandi neque testificandi causa, sed demonstrandi (...) hoc interest igitur inter testimonium et exemplum: exemplo demonstratur id, quod dicimus, cuiusmodi sit; testimonio esse illud ita, ut nos dicimus, confirmatur.* Further on, four (scarcely distuinguishable) functions are summed up, the third of which does lean closely towards the evidential function: *exemplum (...) sumitur iisdem de causis, quibus similitudo. Rem ornatiorem facit (...); apertiorem (...); probabiliorem (...); ante oculos ponit* (IV,49,62). Quotations in ALEWELL p.29 and partly in McCALL p.78. Cf. also PRICE pp.85-101.

tudo (60). According to Lausberg, this ornamental function prevails in poetry (61).

1.1.2 Subject matter

While the range of functions of the παράδειγμα expanded after Aristotle, the subject matter developed in the opposite direction: the παράδειγμα was increasingly identified with the historical exemplum, the λέγειν πράγματα προγεγενημένα – which were further specified and subdivided. In theories on the exemplum, there was no more mention – apart from a few exceptions – as to the creative half of Aristotelian material (τὸ αὐτὸν ποιεῖν): the λόγος (fable) was only seldom brought into connection with it, and the παραβολή retained its special relationship with the παράδειγμα, but hardly ever again functioned as one of its εἴδη.

A. Relation to the παραβολή / *similitudo*

In the writings of most rhetoricians, the term παράδειγμα thus developed from the γένος to an εἶδος; in those of rhetoricians from the peripatetic tradition it kept its general meaning as well: Minucianus and Rufus subdivided the παράδειγμα into, among other things, the historical παράδειγμα and the indefinite, non-historical παραβολή (62). Quintilian calls attention to this double meaning of the Greek term, and passes it on to the Latin equivalent *exemplum*: he splits up the *exemplum* into (historical) *exemplum* and *similitudo* (63).

---

(60) *De Oratore* III.53,205; *Brutus* 40,138 (cf. McCall pp.100 and 114). Quintilian, on the other hand, thinks *similitudo* and exemplum are forms of expression too ordinary to be called figures of thought (McCall p.181).

(61) Lausberg §1244 (index, p.699): « In der Dichtung wiegt die *ornatus*-Funktion vor, so daß das *exemplum* hier als Gedankenfigur fungiert. »

(62) Minucianus §2 (Spengel I pp.418-419). Rufus §§29-32 (Spengel I p.468).

(63) V,11,1-2: *Tertium genus ex iis, quae extrinsecus adducuntur in causam, Graeci vocant* παράδειγμα, *quo nomine et generaliter usi sunt in omni similium adpositione et specialiter in iis, quae rerum gestarum auctoritate nituntur. (...) Nos, quo facilius propositum explicemus, utrumque* παράδειγμα *esse credamus et ipsi appellemus exemplum* (quoted in McCall pp.187-188 and Price p.132). Chapter V,11 successively treats the historical exemplum (§§6-21) and the *similitudo* (§§22-31).

Quintilian himself points to the fact that he does not follow the common Latin terminology. The general notion of the *omnis similium adpositio* is indeed usually called *similitudo* or *comparabile*, further subdivided into exemplum, *collatio / similitudo* in a stricter sense, and *imago* (64). Most later Greek rhetoricians follow this practice, and use παράδειγμα solely for the historical exemplum; next to παραβολή and εἰκών (and sometimes other figures as well) it forms a part of the ὁμοίωσις, the new general term, equivalent of *comparabile / similitudo*. The essential difference between παράδειγμα and παραβολή, which are now on the same level, is that the former compares to deeds or people, the latter to objects (65).

B. Λέγειν πράγματα προγεγενημένα

Aristotle deals with the historical exemplum in general terms; and, in his advice to use deeds (πράξεις) as exempla, Anaximenes only distinguishes between former and contemporary (66). Later on, the divisions and directions become more precise, and the historical material is seen in a broader perspective, as already emerges from Quintilian's definition of the exemplum in a limited sense:

> *quod proprie vocamus exemplum, id est rei gestae* aut ut gestae *utilis ad persuadendum id, quod intenderis, commemoratio* (67).

Following Quintilian's addition *aut ut gestae*, the subject matter for the exemplum can be subdivided according to **historicity** into (68):

- the historical exemplum (*verae res*);
- the poetic exemplum (*neque verae neque verisimiles res*), distinguished in *fabula* (« material for tragedy »: mytholo-

---

(64) Cf. LAUSBERG §422 and MCCALL passim.

(65) Thus for example in Ps.-Aelius Herodianus: παραβολὴ δὲ πράγματος ὁμοίου παράθεσις (...) παράδειγμα δὲ πράξεων ἔκθεσις πρὸς ὁμοιότητα (SPENGEL III p.104); Apsines: παραβολὴ παραδείγματος τούτῳ διαφέρει, ὅτι ἡ μὲν παραβολὴ ἀπ' ἀψύχων ἢ ζώων ἀλόγων λαμβάνεται (SPENGEL I p.372).

(66) §8,14: πολλὰ δὲ λήψῃ παραδείγματα διὰ τῶν προγεγενημένων πράξεων καὶ διὰ τῶν νῦν γινομένων (FUHRMANN p.36).

(67) V,11,6, quoted by MCCALL p.193, by PRICE p.149, and partly by LAUSBERG §410.

(68) Freely rendered from LAUSBERG §§411-414, who bases himself on the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, Quintilian (V,11,17-20) and Fortunatianus.

gy ((69))) and *fabella* (Aesopian fable, which is recovered in this way);
- the *exemplum verisimile* (*verisimiles res*): fictitious events and characters from literature (« material from comedy »).

Another division, frequently made by both Greek and Latin rhetoricians, is the one according to what might be called **nationality**: *οἰκεῖα* vs. *ἀλλότρια*, or *interna / domestica* vs. *externa*. The exempla from one's native history are preferred (the *externa* are appropriate for an argumentation *ex minore ad maius*); this preference also seems to be connected with the requirement that the exempla should be unambiguous and well-known ((70)).

The only preserved rhetorical **collection of paradigmata**, Valerius Maximus' *Factorum et dictorum memorabilium libri IX* employs the distinction *interna-externa*; the first are in the majority by far. That there must have existed similar Greek collections, emerges from Cicero, who complains that these provide only Greek exempla ((71)). There are enough related genres in which material for exempla was collected: the Hellenistic narrative elegy, paradoxography, collections of apophthegms.

---

(69) It surprises CANTER pp.201-204 that the mythological exempla, so popular among poets - especially in the shorter and personal poetic forms -, are hardly treated in rhetorical theory. The only ancient Greek rhetoricians in whom I found indications with respect to mythology as material for paradigmata (unless perhaps Minucianus, cf. n.62), are Menander, who continually recommends the use of it (cf. n.58: because of the γλυκύτης, - from his examples it appears that ἱστορία ἀρχαία also includes mythology in his writings) and Apsines, who actually advises against the use of it: μὴ πάνυ ἀρχαῖα μηδὲ μυθώδη (SPENGEL I p.373; because of the combination with ἀρχαῖα, μυθώδη seems - possibly along with fables as well - to relate to myths here). This opposite appreciation of Menander and Apsines might have to do with the different function ascribed to the παράδειγμα by these contemporaries. It is tempting to deduce from this that Greek rhetoric recommended the use of myths with an ornamental function, and advised against including exempla with evidential function, yet, therefore, the testimonies I actually discovered are far too scarce. Canter (p.222-223) asserts that mythological and historical exempla are not used in combination in Greek literature, in contrast with Latin practice. Nowhere in the writings of the Greek rhetoricians did I find a prohibition in this sense, and Gregory positively intermingles them.

(70) E.g. Apsines §8: πᾶν παράδειγμα ἔχει μὲν τὴν ὕλην ἐκ τῶν γεγονότων, λαμβάνεται δὲ ἢ ἐξ οἰκείων ἢ ἐξ ἀλλοτρίων. τὰ μὲν ἐξ οἰκείων ἀγωνιστικώτερα καὶ προσεχέστερα (...) εἰ μὲν οὖν ἀπ᾿ ἀλλοτρίου προσώπου ἀδόξου δὲ γίνοιτο, χρὴ κατ᾿ ἐπιτίμησιν (a fortiori, here *ex minore ad maius*) αὐτὸ εἰσάγειν (... followed by a textbook example from Demosthenes). χρὴ δὲ τὰ παραδείγματα γνώριμα εἶναι καὶ σαφῆ (SPENGEL I p.373). Similar suggestions in Minucianus §2.

(71) *Tusc.*I,116.

1.1.3 Literary form

Most ancient rhetoricians give few explicit directions about the elaboration which should or can be applied to an exemplum, and about the manner in which it should or can be inserted. They usually keep to vague terms as λέγειν, ἀπομνημόνευσις or *commemoratio*. We can deduce a few things from the examples they provide as illustration.

A. Elaboration

The **elaboration** of the history quoted in the exemplum can, depending on how well known it is and on the persuasive or stylistic requirements, vary from an elaborate *narration*, through a short *mentioning*, to an anonymous *allusion*, for example an antonomasia (noun or description instead of proper name) or a proverb (for instance as distillate from a fable) (72).

The allusion appeals to the erudition of listener or reader: it sharpens his attention and gratifies his vanity. It may cause identification problems for present-day readers. The more elaborate παράδειγμα can take the progymnasmatic shapes of διήγημα (narration), χρεία (anecdote) or σύγκρισις (laudatory comparison) (73).

---

(72) Inspired by LAUSBERG §§415-418, who quotes Quintilian V,11,15-16: *quaedam autem ex iis, quae gesta sunt, tota narrabimus, (...), quaedam significare satis erit (...) haec ita dicentur, prout nota erunt vel utilitas causae aut decor postulabit*. For the abridged Aesopian fable cf. Quintilian V,11,21 (quoted by PRICE p.193).
Also Apsines advises to recount some παραδείγματα incompletely: ἐνίοτε δὲ καὶ ἀτελῆ ταῦτα ἐῶμεν (SPENGEL I p.375).

(73) Cf. the definitions in Aphthonius' προγυμνάσματα (SPENGEL II pp.22,23 and 42): διήγημά ἐστιν ἔκθεσις πράγματος γεγονότος ἢ ὡς γεγονότος (compare with Quintilian's *res gestae aut ut gestae commemoratio*): χρεία ἐστὶν ἀπομνημόνευμα σύντομον εὐστόχως ἐπί τι πρόσωπον ἀναφέρουσα (subdivided into λογικόν – about an enunciation of the character in question –, πρακτικόν – an act –, and μικτόν); σύγκρισίς ἐστι λόγος ἀντεξεταστικὸς ἐκ παραθέσεως συνάγων τῶ παραβαλλομένω τὸ μεῖζον ἢ τὸ ἴσον.
Another element from the προγυμνάσματα, the γνώμη, is treated by Aristotle just after the παράδειγμα (*Rhet.* B21; one of the gnomes cited by Aristotle - 1394^b2 = Eur. fr.661 Nauck - is also quoted by Gregory: I.2.10, v.376), but is rather connected with – in fact a part of – the ἐνθύμημα (through the addition of an explanation, the gnome turns into an enthymeme, 1394^a31-32). The κρίσις (*auctoritas*) is related to the gnome and to

B. Insertion

The ancient rhetoricians do not seem to have developed a theory about the way in which the relation between illustrans and illustrandum is made explicit, i.e. about the **insertion** of the exemplary history in the context. A further distinction can be based on the transitional forms between comparison and metaphor. Depending on the presence of (a) comparans, (b) comparandum, (c) motif of the comparison (tertium comparationis), and (d) linking term, one speaks of a full comparison (abcd), an unmotivated comparison (abd) and a metaphor (b = a, or just a) (74).

Parallel to the four elements of the comparison, one might speak of (a) illustrans, (b) illustrandum, (c) *Ernstbedeutung* or conclusion drawn from it (the universal), and (d) linking term or formula (75). I would like to distinguish between three types of insertion, according to the way in which the *Ernstbedeutung* is indicated by the context:

> 1) « *full* » *exemplum* (abcd), in which the *Ernstbedeutung* and / or conclusion is explicitly indicated (76);

---

the exemplum. It concerns a general proverb of wisdom from literature or with a historical background, which, like the exemplary history, stands separate from the matter under discussion, but which is brought in connection with it (LAUSBERG §426 and PRICE pp.194-207).

(74) See e.g. LAUSBERG §846, who calls the metaphor the « Unterschreitung des minimalen Umfangs der *similitudo*. » GENETTE, *Rhétorique* pp.164-165, distinguishes even more transitional forms in these « figures d'analogie »: the forms (ab), (ac) and (abc), he calls « assimilation », respectively « non motivée », « motivée sans comparé » and « motivée. »
This traditional relation between comparison and metaphor has been seriously questioned in contemporary metaphor-theories (cf. VAN NOPPEN for a survey of the shifting point of discussion in this area), but as a help in the descriptive classification of exempla, it seems perfectly tenable to me.

(75) In the (often identical) examples from Homer and Euripides, quoted as illustration by Ps.-Herodianus (SPENGEL III p.104), Polybius (SPENGEL III p.107), Trypho (SPENGEL III p.200) and Cocondrius (SPENGEL III p.241), we find some typical linking terms and formulas: ἢ οὐκ ἀΐεις... / ὡς... / μέμνημαι τόδε ἔργον ἐγὼ πάλαι... / τῷ ἴκελον... / οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδέ... / ὁρᾷς ....

(76) E.g. Aristotle *Rhet.* B20 1393^a31-1393^b3 (KASSEL):
δεῖ πρὸς βασιλέα παρασκευάζεσθαι καὶ μὴ ἐᾶν Αἴγυπτον χειρώσασθαι (illustrandum: probandum)
καὶ γὰρ πρότερον (linking formula)
Δαρεῖος οὐ πρότερον διέβη πρὶν Αἴγυπτον ἔλαβεν, λαβὼν δὲ διέβη, καὶ πάλιν Ξέρξης οὐ πρότερον (...) (illustrantia: implicit universal: those who have

2) « *minimal* » *exemplum* (abd), in which a linking term indicates that a history or character is quoted as illustrans, without its *Ernstbedeutung* being made explicit: the reader or listener is supposed to perceive the similarity or relation between illustrans and illustrandum himself, and to draw the conclusion from it;
3) « *metaphorical* » *exemplum* (b = a or a): the illustrans is used as a trope (is quoted as the symbol or image of someone or something else) and gives a further account of (b = a) or even substitutes for (a) the illustrandum. The *Ernstbedeutung* is merely implied here, and can sometimes give rise to a diversity of interpretations. Depending on the elaborateness, the exemplum takes the shape of an *allegory* (77) (in the case of elaborated exemplary histories of which the *Eigenbedeutung* is of no important relevance to the case: each different character or episode is a symbol or image of something else) or of a *Vossian antonomasia* (when only the name of the exemplary character is mentioned or the *Eigenbedeutung* of the exemplary history remains intact) (78).

---

captured Egypt, come across afterwards)
ὥστε καὶ οὗτος ἐὰν λάβῃ, διαβήσεται· (particular conclusion drawn from the *Ernstbedeutung*)
διὸ οὐκ ἐπιτρεπτέον (probandum).
In the analogical παράδειγμα, the presence of the conclusion is determinant, in the inductive, the *Ernstbedeutung* itself. Since the *Ernstbedeutung* usually coincides with the illustrandum in the latter, most inductive exempla are « full ».

(77) Thus already Quintilian VIII,6,52: *est in exemplis allegoria, si non praedicta ratione ponantur* (quoted by Lausberg §421).

(78) As pointed out when the allusive elaboration of the exemplum was discussed, the « normal » antonomasia comes down to the substitution of a proper name by a noun or a description (*commune pro proprio*). Since Vossius (1643, quoted in Lausberg §581), the term - analogously with the double direction of metonymy and synecdoche - is also used for the reverse substitution (*proprium pro communi*): a proper name is used as prototype for a category, and can afterwards - through a regular antonomasia - substitute for another proper name. A Vossian antonomasia is frequently indicated by an actualizing attribute, e.g. ἡ ἐμή, ὁ νέος. « Die Vossianische Antonomasie (...) ist für das exemplum das gleiche, was die Metapher für die *similitudo* ist: die Unterschreitung des minimalen Umfangs durch Ineinssetzung des Vergleichenden mit dem Verglichenen » (Lausberg §1244 p.699). One also speaks of « metonymical » use of historical, mythological or biblical characters: thus e.g. Canter p.216 (« The paradigm embodies the figure of *metonymy*. The employment of a name of a mythological person or event is sufficient to indicate distinct types of persons or action. ») and Sundermann p.146 (with reference to Ruether p.103, but this last author speaks - more correctly - of *typology*). Strictly speaking, in classical rhetoric, *metonymy* is only used when the original meaning changes into the figurative sense on the grounds of a connection

C. Exempla in series

Finally, I discovered some indications about the **number** of exempla (79). In Apsines, we see that exempla are frequently linked (80); the literary practice since Homer shows that this is indeed the case: we often encounter exempla in series, sometimes in priameln (81). A special type is the *paradigmatic prayer*, in which a deity is besought, as it were, to take action, by reminding this god of previous similar deeds. Already in Homer, we find a prototype of these prayers (Il.16,236-238).

1.1.4 Conclusion

The above rhetorical theories can be summarized in the following definition of the παράδειγμα / *exemplum* (82):

> *the evoking of a history (from the Bible or from pagan tradition) which has or has not actually occurred, which is similar or related to the matter under discussion, which is implicitly or explicitly brought into connection with this matter as argument (evidence or model) or as ornament, and which takes the form of a narration, a name-mentioning or an allusion.*

This description more or less coincides with Quintilian's *exemplum* in the narrow sense. It excludes the παραβολή (comparison), which Aristotle, among others, considered as a possible form of the (broad) παράδειγμα.

The above discussed aspects of the exemplum serve as the foundation for the « συναγωγή καὶ ἐξήγησις » of Gregory's παραδείγματα: in inventory 2, they are classified according to the subject matter, and in inventory 1 (the order of Gregory's

---

based on reality, not on account of a similarity (as in the case of the metaphor) or of a quantitative relation (as in the case of the synecdoche). In a rhetorical analysis, it is catachrestic to speak of *metonymy* instead of *(Vossian) antonomasia.*

(79) Aristotle's indications about the number of παραδείγματα were determined by the logical form of argumentation (cf. supra p.39), not by a concern over literary form.

(80) πολλάκις δὲ προσπλέκεται παραδείγματα παραδείγμασιν (SPENGEL I p.374).

(81) LUMPE pp.1231-1234.

(82) « Our conception of the example must be formed not from the lowest common denominator but by an agglutinative process, one which can patch together a more complete - if necessarily inaccurate - picture » (PRICE p.215).

œuvre), the subject matter, the function (evidence / model / ornament), the literary elaboration (narration / mention / allusion), and the insertion (full / minimal / metaphorical) are indicated for all of these exempla. The rhetorical analysis examines whether Gregory, in the employment of the *exemplum probationis*, takes the principles of argumentation of Aristotle and / or Ps.-Hermogenes into account; whether he knows and follows the common topoi for the degrees of similarity; whether he distinguishes between οἰκεῖα and ἀλλότρια, and how he interprets these terms; which literary or progymnasmatic shapes the elaborated exempla take; which insertion terms and formulas he uses; whether he prefers to link up several exempla, and whether he does so along established lines; whether he uses the special form of the paradigmatic prayer.

Along with this internal or « micro »-analysis of the exempla, for which this theoretical introduction was a prerequisite, I also investigate whether there exists a correlation between these aspects and other factors (genre, rhetorical species, intended audience); in other words, if and how the type of exemplum serves the purpose of the text.

1.2. The παράδειγμα/exemplum in biblical and Christian practice (83)

1.2.1 The exemplum in the Bible

A. Historical exempla in series

In the psalms and the books of wisdom of the O.T., we find several so-called *summaria*: (extensive) historical reviews with parenetic intention (e.g. Ps 77, 104, 105; Sap 10–12 and 16–19; Sir 44–50). In the later historical books, events from the previous Jewish history are quoted as *full exemplum* with evidential or model function (e.g. 1Mcc 2,50–61; 4Mcc 16,16–23) (84). The same history also occurs in the form of *paradigmatic prayers* (e.g. 2Esr 19,6-31 and 3Mcc 2,3-8).

---

(83) This brief survey is particularly based on the works of LUMPE, PÉTRÉ, SCHNEIDERHAN and PYYKKÖ, and makes no claims to being original.

(84) The first passage is a textbook example of a full exemplum: 1Mcc 2 (Mattatias speaks to his sons) 50: νῦν, τέκνα, ζηλώσατε τῷ νόμῳ... (illustrandum)
51: μνήσθητε (linking term)
51–60: τὰ ἔργα τῶν πατέρων ... (illustrantia: Abraham, Joseph, Phinehas,

Examples of summaria and paradigmatic prayers are also found in the N.T.: the most elaborated are those in the oration of Stephen (Acts 7,2-52) and the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Besides, the N.T. also contains separate exempla, a couple of times indicated explicitly with the term ὑπόδειγμα (never with παράδειγμα, in contrast with the practice in the LXX, in which both terms occur) (85).

B. The New Testament παραβολαί

Both Lausberg and Lumpe classify a number of the New Testament παραβολαί among the exempla. The former considers them as a form of *exempla verisimilia* (86); the latter posits that four histories which occur solely in Luke (Luke 10,30-35, the good Samaritan; 12,16-21, the rich fool; 16,19-31, the rich man and Lazarus; 18,10-14, the Pharisee and the tax collector) « nicht als Gleichnisse (Parabeln), sondern als Beispielerzählungen zu bezeichnen sind » (87). When we look upon the παραβολαί as literary material for incorporation by later authors, these are indeed possible *exempla verisimilia*, - yet Lausberg does not specify this, and this is not the point here either. The separate classification of the « Beispielerzählungen » considered as Lucanic « Sondergut », derives from the pioneering but still authoritative work on the parable by Jülicher (late nineteenth century), yet is no longer followed by everyone in contemporary hermeneutics (88). Anyway, in some cases, the evangelist seems to have Jesus recounting a « Gleichniserzählung » with an explicitly moralizing intention (model function): in these instances, one might speak of a self-invented exemplum (89).

Joshua ... up to Daniel) 61: καὶ οὕτως ἐννοήθητε κατὰ γενεὰν καὶ γενεάν, ὅτι πάντες οἱ ἐλπίζοντες ἐπ' αὐτὸν οὐκ ἀσθενήσουσιν (*Ernstbedeutung*).

(85) John has Jesus presenting himself as a model at the pedilavium: ὑπόδειγμα γὰρ ἔδωκα ὑμῖν, ἵνα καθὼς ἐγὼ ἐποίησα ὑμῖν, καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιῆτε (John 13,15). Cf. also s.l. ὑπόδειγμα in *ThWNT* Bd.2, pp.32-33.

(86) Cf. LAUSBERG §414 « manche neutestamentlichen παραβολαί », without further explanation.

(87) LUMPE pp.1243-1244.

(88) See e.g. HARNISCH and WEDER.

(89) E.g. Luke 18,1: ἔλεγεν δὲ παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς πρὸς τὸ δεῖν πάντοτε προσεύχεσθαι αὐτοὺς καὶ μὴ ἐγκακεῖν (followed by the story of the widow and the judge).

1.2.2 The exemplum in early Christian authors

Like the N.T., **Clement of Rome** does not speak of παράδειγμα but of ὑπόδειγμα. His epistle to the Corinthians, which betrays his familiarity with Hellenistic rhetoric, continually appeals to biblical characters with a model function (90). As for his subject matter, he distinguishes between old (O.T.) and recent (N.T.) ὑποδείγματα (91), without designating either as qualitatively superior. Despite the fact that the Apostolic Fathers and Apologists usually display reticence about the pagan tradition, he uses the image of Δαναΐδες καὶ Δίρκαι for the persecuted Christian women (ὑπόδειγμα κάλλιστον) (6,1-2: exemplum with ornamental function, in the form of a Vossian antonomasia).

In **later Church Fathers**, especially from Clement of Alexandria (92) on, pagan exempla occur more frequently; when they serve as a positive model, it is often as *exemplum ex minore ad maius*. In general, exempla remain quite popular among these authors (93). Nevertheless, inquiry into the use of these exempla has only been conducted in the case of a few Latin-Christian authors.

Tertullian is one of these: Hélène Pétré examined the « exemple-preuve » and the « exemple-modèle » (she does not deal with the ornamental function) from different areas: nature (the *mirabilia* as *exempla imparia*; quoted particularly as model); pagan history (both functions, in works addressed to non-Christians as well as Christians, in the latter instance as *exempla ex minore ad maius*; manifesting his erudition and secular education); the O.T. (often the same ones, more as evidence than as model); the N.T. (less numerous; Tertullian uses the parables as non-historical exempla); the *imitatio Christi*.

Alfons Schneiderhan wrote a dissertation on the exempla in **Jerome**. This author is said positively to make a theoretical distinction between exemplum and *similitudo* and *parabola*; purpose is *probatio*, for the *simpliciores*. It appears that exempla occur very frequently in Jerome, especially in his letters and polemical works; that they are often found in series, preferably in threes; that they nearly exclusively have a positive evidential function (there are almost no *exempla contraria* or *ex minore ad maius*); that he does not distinguish between Greeks and Romans in the choice of his pagan material; that his insertion formulas are highly heterogeneous; that they are often elaborated in the form of a preterition. Jerome as well often quotes the same biblical exempla with fixed characteristics and uses identical terms for that purpose, which Schneiderhan considers to be a solid argument to accept the existence of a Christian collection of exempla.

---

(90) E.g. explicitly in 46,1: τοιούτοις οὖν ὑποδείγμασιν κολληθῆναι καὶ ἡμᾶς δεῖ, ἀδελφοί (JAUBERT, *SC* 167).

(91) E.g. 5,1: Ἀλλ' ἵνα τῶν ἀρχαίων ὑποδειγμάτων παυσώμεθα, ἔλθωμεν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἔγγιστα γενομένους ἀθλητάς (JAUBERT, with note 5 p.107: « c'était un procédé de la diatribe de faire appel aux exemples du passé, puis à ceux du présent »).

(92) Cf. his *Paedagogus* III,8, dealing with ὅτι αἱ εἰκόνες καὶ τὰ ὑποδείγματα μέγιστον μέρος τῆς ὀρθῆς εἰσι διδασκαλίας.

(93) LUMPE p.1245.

In her study on the Cappadocians and John Chrysostom, Vappu Pyykkö devotes a chapter to the « praktische Anwendung der Exempla Mythologica » (94). This chapter is fairly disappointing: nothing is done with the brief but lucid theoretical introduction (based especially on Lausberg); some of the passages treated incoherently under this title do not even comply with her own definition of the exemplum's basic characteristic, namely that it is drawn from outside the issue. Pyykkö gives some interesting commentaries on rather disparate texts, but a true rhetorical analysis of the mythological exemplum is out of the question. The only noteworthy conclusion is that Basil hardly ever uses this exemplum.

1.2.3 The medieval exemplum

In **medieval Latin literature**, the exemplum became highly important. It is not within the scope of this study to pursue this matter here; I only intend to report the most significant points of difference between ancient and medieval exemplum, indicated by Jacques Le Goff, seeing that he looks upon the late-antique Christian exemplum as a stage in this evolution (95).

First of all, in the medieval definitions the term *exemplum* is no longer used for a rhetorical or literary device (as in Aristotle's τὸ λέγειν, Quintilian's *res gestae ... commemoratio* and the other definitions quoted), but is now employed for the subject matter itself (the illustrans) (96). Hence, Le Goff can define the medieval exemplum as « un récit bref donné comme véridique et destiné à être inséré dans un discours (en général un sermon) pour convaincre un auditoire par une leçon salutaire. » The following points are significant dissimilarities from the ancient exemplum:

---

(94) Pyykkö pp.50-82.

(95) Bremond - Le Goff pp.27-38 for the definitions, pp.44-48 for the differences.

(96) Le Goff compares *facti aut dicti (...) propositio* of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (IV,49,62) with *dictum vel factum* ... of John Anglicus (thirteenth century): Bremond - Le Goff p.29.

- *means of persuasion*: the ancient exemplum preferably appeals to heroic days of old, and the persuasiveness is connected with the prestige of the hero; the medieval exemplum emphasizes the (actual or assumed) historicity and the credibility depends more upon the history gone through by the hero than upon the hero himself;
- *relation orator / listener*: the ancient exemplum is used especially to convince, it is essentially a part of a plea; the medieval exemplum is used primarily in preaching and its purpose is to convert, to transform (hence model rather than evidential function);
- *logical method*: the ancient exemplum links up one particular with another (cf. indeed Aristotle's description supra n.43); the medieval exemplum generalizes (in other words, is more inductive than analogical in its method);
- the *ornamental function*, regularly exerted by the ancient exemplum, is rare for the medieval exemplum.

Even though the above description deals with the Latin-Christian evolution, it seems interesting enough to be compared with the results of the analysis of Gregory's practice (97).

---

(97) Of course, the relevance of this comparison depends on the value of Bremond and Le Goff's theses, which, as a dilettante (see n.35), I had no reason to doubt. But Von Moos, pp.xxii-xxvi and §16, voices serious reservations in this respect: referring to the fallacious homonymy of the inductive rhetorical argument and the medieval homiletic short story (both *exemplum*), he stresses the « logische Unvergleichbarkeit des argumentativen Exemplums und des 'Predigtmärleins' ». « Spezialistengruppen » (among whom he reckons the group around Le Goff) are said to deny or neglect the problem, and to commit the error « eine gattungsgeschichtliche Kontinuität zwischen antikem und spätmittelalterlichem Exemplum aufgrund der gleichen Bezeichnung weniger *nachzuweisen* als durch Einebnung manifester Unterschiede *vorauszusetzen* und zu behaupten, etwa indem man einleitend die Geschichte des volksliterarischen Predigtexempels *ab ovo* bei Aristoteles beginnen läßt, oder indem man einer altphilologischen Darstellung des rhetorischen Exemplums einen Anhang über das mittelalterliche Fortleben in der homiletischen Tradition beigibt » (p.42-44). Yet he concludes the same §16 by admitting « daß die antike Beispielgestalt und das spätmittelalterliche Predigtexemplum trotz aller Unterschiedlichkeit im Sinne allgemeiner Rhetorik doch mehr miteinander gemein haben als den Namen » (p.47-8).

The **Byzantines** seem to have adhered to the rhetorical tradition laid down in late antiquity (98). Thus also Joseph Rhakendytes (ca.1280 - ca.1300, contemporary of John Anglicus, quoted in n.96): in his Σύνοψις Ῥητορικῆς, in which he liberally draws upon Gregory's œuvre to illustrate rhetorical figures, he mentions the sources from which παραδείγματα can be drawn: history, fable, mythology, Bible (99).

---

(98) See Kennedy's concluding paragraph, *Rhetoric* p.325: « The Byzantines provided few new insights into the nature of rhetoric: they preserved the heritage of antiquity in its technical, philosophical, and sophistic strands as these had been defined in late antiquity. » Compare Hunger, *Rhetorik* p.93: « nennenswerte Änderungen oder gar eine Entwicklung fand in der mittel- und spätbyzantinischen Zeit nicht mehr statt. » Conley on the other hand observes in his survey of the Byzantine teaching on figures and tropes (including the παράδειγμα) « that the 'Byzantine tradition' is even more complex and less stable and static than is usually recognized » (p.337-8). He is certainly right in concluding that « there are many aspects of this subject that have not been investigated ».

(99) Σύνοψις Ῥητορικῆς III (Walz III pp.524-525): αἱ δὲ ἱστορίαι σφόδρα χρήσιμοι τοῖς ῥήτορσιν ἐν τοῖς παραδείγμασιν· χορηγήσουσι δέ σοι ἱστορίαν ἡ Ἰλιάς, ἡ Ὀδύσσεια, πάντες οἱ ποιηταί, ἡ βιβλιοθήκη τοῦ Ἀπολλοδώρου, ὁ Ἡρόδοτος, καὶ εἴ τις τοιοῦτος, καὶ τὰ λεγόμενα χρονικά· ἐγγὺς δὲ ὡς αἱ ἱστορίαι χρήσιμα πολλάκις καὶ τὰ μυθικὰ τοῦ Αἰσώπου, ἔχεις καὶ θειογραφικὴν ἱστορίαν ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ τῇ ὀκτατεύχῳ, ἐν τῷ τετραβασιλείῳ, καὶ τοῖς ὁμοίοις.

CHAPTER II

THE RHETORICAL ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΓΜΑ IN GREGORY'S POEMS

2.0 INTRODUCTION

The questions at issue in this chapter have their origins in ancient rhetoric (cf. p.51). They can be summarized as follows: to what extent is it possible to make a systematic distinction, with regard to the literary and rhetorical incorporation, between pagan and biblical histories in Gregory's poems?; to what extent do genre, rhetorical species, and audience influence the selection of his exemplary material?

As stated in the introduction, this dissertation is the first extensive study of the pagan and biblical exemplary material in Gregory. Of course, this does not mean that entirely new territory is hereby opened. There have been a number of stimulating preliminary explorations: by Justin MOSSAY, in the conclusion of his study on death and the hereafter (1966), and especially by Donald SYKES, in a brief but densely informative lecture at the patristic conference of 1982 in Oxford, on « The Bible and Greek Classics in Gregory Nazianzen's Verse ». Mossay starts from the observation that Gregory's treatment of the themes investigated by him is considerably influenced by rhetorical and classical-literary factors, with the required adaptations according to the kind of audience. Sykes investigates whether the interweaving of biblical and classical exempla and (literary) allusions is as firm as their linguistic and stylistic interrelation. Therefore, he examines the different groups of poems according to the classification of the Maurists and establishes the differences between these.

Their conclusions diverge, but they are formulated similarly, and give two possible answers to the stated question. I quote them both, as a kind of double hypothesis:

« Il n'existe cependant aucun motif d'ordre littéraire qui permette de distinguer l'utilisation des sources païennes de celle des sources bibliques, judaïques ou ecclésiastiques dans l'œuvre de Grégoire » (100).

---

(100) MOSSAY, *Mort* p.291.

« There is then, I suggest, a certain variety of practice to be discerned in Gregory's dealing with classical and biblical sources » (101).

The structure of this part is in accordance with that of the theoretical treatment of the rhetorical παράδειγμα: successively, function, subject matter and literary form are discussed. First I check whether the rhetoricians' descriptions / indications can be retrieved in Gregory's practice (« micro-analysis » of the exempla as separate entities, or in their immediate context). To that end, I investigate whether explicit enunciations in poetry and prose reveal familiarity with the rhetorical theory of exempla (devoting special attention to the use of παράδειγμα and ὑπόδειγμα as rhetorical terms) and I give a survey of the reflection of this in Gregory's œuvre, by means of figures and interesting concrete examples.

Afterwards, I consider the same data from the viewpoint of the content and (persuasive) purpose of the entire text (« macro-analysis » of the exempla): is there a correlation between functions, subject matter and literary form on the one hand and genre, types of oratory, audience and (in some cases fictitious) author on the other, and amongst the former three aspects mutually? For the solving of these problems, a statistical approach is taken. Statistics about the prose are mentioned mainly for the purpose of comparison.

---

(101) Sykes, *Bible* p.1130. His findings can be summarized as follows: the *dogmatica* (I,1) contain virtually no classical material: Greek philosophical views are mentioned only in a refutation; in the *moralia* (I,2), Greek authors and characters are present in a more direct way (Sykes only discusses four of the most significant poems: 1,2.1, 2, 10 and 25); Gregory freely selects and integrates Christian and classical sources, using the latter in assenting or polemical ways; in the *historica* (II, 1-2), classical allusions occur less frequently, and serve especially as contrast with the dominating biblical material. Concerning these biblical passages, Sykes also notes « Gregory's desire to identify himself with characters and situations in scripture » (p.1129).
According to Norris, *Faith* p.14, Sykes' conclusion is « one of the most important claims about the poetry (...). In the continuing debate over Nazianzen's mastery of classical culture for Christian purposes, Sykes' observation is crucial. » Still, Sykes' study is no more than a directional initiation to analysis: the questions and findings are general, there are only few references to Gregory's passages, and the four-part division of the poems by the Maurists (in fact only a three-part division in Sykes) does not allow for much profundity.

Before this detailed analysis, I deal with some preliminary points: a general survey of Gregory's (also non-technical) use of the terms παράδειγμα and ὑπόδειγμα, as background for the specific use; a discussion of the corpus according to genre, rhetorical γένη, and audience; and a table with overall figures of the pagan and biblical material according to genre and rhetorical γένος, as the foundation for the statistics given further on.

2.0.1 The terms παράδειγμα and ὑπόδειγμα in Gregory

In Gregory's writings, the term ὑπόδειγμα, hardly used by the rhetoricians, occurs nearly twice as often as παράδειγμα: 39 instances versus 20. Both signify more or less the same thing, and can hence be called synonyms; yet for certain meanings, Gregory seems to prefer a specific term: thus, for a « particular instance, exemplar », only παράδειγμα is used (4 / 20 against 0 / 39), and on the other hand, ὑπόδειγμα is used especially for « paragon » (13 / 39 against 3 / 20), and also as a term for the rhetorical phenomenon (16 / 39 against 4 / 20). Precisely with these last two functions, we came across ὑπόδειγμα exclusively in the N.T. and in Clement of Rome.

The terms occur in the following three general senses (102):

* *model, exemplary act or character, paragon*

In 20 cases, the terms are used in this sense from the point of view of the follower / imitator: the *following* of an example is emphasized here; they form recurring expressions with the verbs βλέπω πρός, ἕπομαι, λαμβάνω, ἔχω, ἀκολουθῶ (103). Conversely, from the point of view of the exemplary one, they stand for « paragon »: the *setting* of an example is emphasized in 16 cases; this emerges from the co-occurence with δίδωμι, and very frequently with γίγνομαι (104). Gregory regularly uses formulas such as γίνῃ πολλοῖς ὑπόδειγμα τῆς καρτερίας (ἀρετῆς, εὐγνωμοσύνης, φιλοσοφίας...) (105) especially in his hortatory letters. As synonyms of παράδειγμα and ὑπόδειγμα (meaning *paragon*) he also uses, for example, πίναξ, πρόγραμμα σωτήριον, στάθμη, ἔμπνοος εἰκών (106).

---

(102) The original, plastic meaning and the ontological meaning derived from it are notably absent; conversely, the verb παραδείκνυμι positively occurs in this typological semantic scope.

(103) παρ.: or.2,30; or.4,120; or.18,21; or.21,5; or.22,6; or.24,5; or.25,3; or.43,8 and 12; ὑπ.: or.4,38; or.7,5; or.8,5; or.14,35; or.15,1 (twice) and 11; or.17,11; or.33,13; or.40,31; or.44,11.

(104) παρ.: or.21,4 (*bis*); or.24,15; ὑπ.: ep.32,1; ep.61,9; ep.66,3; ep.76,4; ep.219,8; ep.222,5; or.5,37; or.6,4; or.7,11; or.8,8; or.9,3; or.43,62.

This general meaning is in keeping with the rhetorical exemplum in its model function: the *quoting* of a model which is to be followed. Gregory almost exclusively uses ὑπόδειγμα for this (seven passages, against one with παράδειγμα).

* *illustrating or concrete case, realization, specimen*

As pointed out, for this meaning we only find παράδειγμα (four times), each time in a negative sentence, to emphasize the singularity of the actually successful realization, like for example Gorgonia's virtues: τῆς δὲ φρονήσεως καὶ τῆς εὐσεβείας οὐ (...) πολλὰ ἂν εὑρεθείη τὰ παραδείγματα (107).

The rhetorical exemplum in its inductive evidential function (the quoting of an illustrating case as argument) fits in with this general meaning. Remarkably, Gregory uses both ὑπόδειγμα (four times) and παράδειγμα (two times) for it. In his writings, we also come across the expression δείγματος χάριν three times.

* *comparison, image, likeness*

In six passages (two παράδειγμα, four ὑπόδειγμα), the terms are near synonyms of παραβολή, and seem used in a technical sense. As this practice reminds us of the Aristotelian classification of the παραβολή among the παράδειγμα, I shall come back to this in the discussion of the subject matter.

Finally, with a view to our subject, it is relevant to note that Gregory uses παράδειγμα or ὑπόδειγμα in fifteen cases when he quotes a biblical or pagan history (two παράδειγμα, thirteen ὑπόδειγμα). Compared with the total of twenty cases of technical use, this seems sufficient to see the above definition of the exemplum / παράδειγμα confirmed by Gregory's use of these terms, even though he clearly prefers the form ὑπόδειγμα.

---

(105) The example with καρτερία is from ep.3.1. (*LSJ* s.v. ὑπόδειγμα mentions several inscriptions with the expression πρὸς ὑπόδειγμα ἀρετῆς, a formula we read 6 times in Gregory).

(106) Respectively I.2.28, v.220 and or.43.80; *ibidem*: ep.76.4; II.2,6, v.98.

(107) Or.8.11 (*PG* 35,801A); similar constructions or.9,5; or.24,16; or.37,8.

2.0.2 Justification for the division of the corpus

A. Literary genres

To classify the **poems** on account of an internal criterion, I adopt a finer subdivision than that of the Maurists in PG 37-38 (108).

* the **dogmatic poems**: these poems are traditionally indicated as *arcana* (I,1,1-5 and 7-9), which form a unity both *qua* form and content (109). Also I,1,6, 10 and 11 are dogmatic, the last two against Apollinarianism.

* the series of **biblical poems** (I,1,12-28) gives enumerations of the canonical books of the Bible, patriarchs, plagues of Egypt, wonders of Elijah, Jesus' genealogy, New Testament marvels and parables.... Except for three poems, they are passed down as one « group of poems » (110), which leads one to suspect that they have been conceived by Gregory as one whole, probably with didactic purposes, in which the use of verses might have had a mnemotechnical function (111).

* the **hymns and prayers**: a part of these are written in response to concrete events; of some other, more general ones, the authenticity is disputed. Conversely, there are also some apotropaeic poems (112).

---

(108) Therefore, I rely on some passages in which Gregory speaks about his poetry himself: II,1,34, vv.69-91 (repudiation of pagan themes and presentation of his own Christian subjects, treated in the *dogmatica*), and II,1,39 (Εἰς τὰ ἔμμετρα), in which he spurs people on to read his poetry (vv.63-67, *PG* 37,1334): Αὐτοὶ διδάξουσ᾽ οἱ λόγοι θέλοντά σε. / Τὰ μὲν γάρ ἐστι τῶν ἐμῶν, τὰ δ᾽ ἔκτοθεν· / Ἢ τῶν καλῶν ἔπαινος, ἢ κακῶν ψόγος, (cf. the *moralia*) / Ἢ δόγματ᾽ (cf. the *dogmatica*), ἢ γνώμη τις (cf. the gnomologies), ἢ τομαὶ λόγων. / Μνήμην ἔχουσαι τῇ θέσει τοῦ γράμματος (cf. the *biblica*).

(109) Cf. Keydell, *Lehrgedicht* and Sykes, *Arcana* and *Literary Questions*.

(110) Cf. Werhahn, *Übersichtstabellen*.

(111) Cf. Palla, *Ordinamento*. The extremely deviating order of the connected poems 12-15 and 18-27, suggested by Palla, is much more relevant than the order presented by the Maurists. Still, due to the alternating metres and the inadequate transitions, one cannot escape the impression that Gregory never finished the whole. I,1,16, 17 and (the spurious) 28 are passed down in another connection.

(112) Hymns and prayers: I,1,29-38, and the « autobiographical » II,1,3, 20-22, 24-26, 38 (probably to be split into two Easter hymns, to be distinguished at v.39), 62, 63, 69-71 (70 consists of two separate poems). Apotropaeic: II,1,54-60, 64.

* the **moralia** aim at, in Gregory's own words, ἢ τῶν καλῶν ἔπαινος, ἢ κακῶν ψόγος (see n.108). The « praise of goodness » we find in the usually quite extensive poems about παρθενία and ἁγνεία, πενία, ἀρετή, especially in the form of parenesis or σύγκρισις (113). The « disapproval of evil » is carried out in « poetic diatribes (114) » against general vices as πολυορκία, θυμός, πλεονεξία, καλλωπισμός, and in satirical indictments against corrupt bishops (115).

* the **gnomologies**: these are parenetic alphabets and other acrostics, and also loose sequences of gnomes or definitions (116).

* the **θρῆνοι** are elegiac pieces of writing in which Gregory laments the *condition humaine*, whether or not starting from his own experiences (117).

* the **autobiographical poems**, in which his own experiences form the actual theme, make up the most extensive part of the corpus. They can be subdivided into *programmatic*, in which the author looks ahead, for example with respect to his literary activity (118); *elegiac*, in which description of life and complaints go hand in hand (119); *polemical*, in which the account of events results in an attack on the (especially Constantinopolitan) clergy,

the Apollinarians, Maximus (120); *apologetic*, the most significant of which is the longest poem from the corpus, II,1,11 (121).

---

(113) Praise of the unmarried life in I.2,1-7 and II,44b (from v.25 on, a separate poem starts), praise of poverty in I,2,8, 35, 36 and II,1,88 (parenesis to his own soul and body); praise of virtue in I.2.9 and 10. According to Keydell, *Stellung* pp.138-139, and Knecht, p.110 n.292, I,2,1 and 2 form one long poem; Sundermann, on the contrary, holds the opinion, based on (among other things) the Syriac tradition, that I.2,1 in itself consists of two separate poems; he only comments upon the second (vv.215-732). Palla-Kertsch subdivide I,2,9 into two separate poems, the second starting from v.84 on.

(114) The term « diatribe » concerns both form and content, and is hence quite controversial as indication of a specific genre, cf. Werhahn, Σύγκρισις pp.15-20, Beuckmann pp.20-29, Oberhaus pp.25-26. It is a fact that these poems are in keeping with what is usually called the cynical-stoical diatribe.

(115) Respectively I,2,24, 25, 26-28, 29; and II.1,12 (from v.176 on) and 13.

(116) I,2,17, 20-23, 30-34.

(117) I,2,11-14, 15a (vv.1-156), 16, 37, 38 (the θρῆνοι 18 and 19 are spurious); II,1,18, 23a-b (vv.1-12 and 13-16), 27, 28, 32, 42, 46-51, 61, 65-67, 72-81, 83-87 and 89. The poems II.1,27, 51, 77, 87 and 89 seem made up of several shorter poems.

(118) II,1,2, 4, 39, 82.

(119) II,1,1, 5, 6, 8, 15-17, 19, 31, 33, 35, 43, 45, 52, 53.

* the seven relatively long **epistolary poems** (II,2,1-7), three of which are not written under his own name.

* the **epigrams**, finally, can best be subdivided as was done by the Maurists: into *epitaphs* (including II,1,90-99, funeral epigrams for himself) and *historical epigrams*.

These categories refer to content and/or form of the poems; in any case, they consider the text in itself. They will be employed in the further discussion; however, when individual poems give evidence of remarkable deviations within the group, or when the poems within a genre are heterogeneous *qua* content (as the epistolary poems and the epigrams), this classification may be abandoned. It goes without saying that the poems which are certainly not of Gregory's hand remain outside our consideration (122).

The **orations** are divisible into:

* four types of **(auto-)biographical** orations: apologetic (2, 9-12, 26, 33, 36, 42), ψόγοι (4,5), ἐγκώμια/ἐπιτάφιοι λόγοι (25/7, 8, 18, 43) and occasional speeches (6, 13, 16, 17, 19, 22, 23, 34); and

* five types of **pastoral** orations: sermons/panegyrics on holy days (1, 3, 38-41, 44, 45), ἐγκώμια about saints and martyrs (15, 21, 24), theological (20, 27-31, 32), moral (14) and exegetical (37) orations.

---

(120) I,2,15b (v.157-164); II,1, 7, 9, 14, 23c (vv.17-23), 29, 30, 36, 37, 40, 41.

(121) Also II,1,10, 12 (vv.1-175), 34a (vv.1-150), 34b (vv.151-210), 44a (vv.1-24), 68 belong to this category.

(122) These are the Χριστὸς Πάσχων; the epistolary poem II,2,8; the gnomic poem I,2,32; the long epitaph 129; and some shorter *nugae*: I,1,28; I,2,18-21; I,2,23; I,2,39-40; epg.30. Despite numerous discussions, opinions are still divided about some other poems: I,1,29, probably a neoplatonic hymn, and the only two non-prosodic poems I,1,32 (Ὕμνος ἑσπερινός) and I,2,3 (Πρὸς παρθένους παραινετικός). Only the last poem contains material appropriate for this study; the employment of the biblical ἱστορίαι here fits in so well with Gregory's practice that holding back this poem from the treated corpus would not influence the conclusions. On the contrary, we may even consider this concordance as a modest argument for authenticity.

I consider the **letters** as one group, except for the theological letters (101, 102, 202), which are ranged under the genre of the theological orations.

In inventory 1, I indicated the genre of the poems and orations with a code, elucidated there.

B. Audience

The intended audience (listener, reader, addressee) is an external criterion in the subdivision of the corpus. The problem is that we have very little information, especially with regard to the poems, and that we have to go by the indications, usually implicit, of Gregory himself.

A preliminary remark concerns the difference between the addressed character within the text and the intended or effective reader / listener. It is comparable to the distinction between (speaking) character and author; due to the highly autobiographical and didactic nature of Gregory's poetry, the last two nearly always coincide (123).

The addressed character and the actual reader / listener may coincide as well, but this is much less often the case, and it is more difficult to establish. In a number of instances, this coinciding is physically impossible, for example when a deceased person is addressed; often also God, Christ or the Trinity is addressed: I do not consider these as actual readers. In other cases, the addressed character may be rather vague and function as a symbol for the intended audience, or a group of people may be addressed, only some of whom can have actually set eyes on the text. An additional complication is that in many texts, Gregory alternately has different « you's » in view. Undoubtedly, it can be interesting to employ the addressed character as a parameter, as for the speaking character - and I shall do so at times -, but in that case we no longer deal with an external criterion. Here, I comment upon the addressed character especially in its relation to the actually intended audience. Identity of or difference between both may be of overriding importance in determining the rhetorical γένος of a text.

---

(123) Only in the following cases, Gregory is not the speaking character:
- three poems consisting of a fictitious dialogue: I,2,8, Σύγκρισις βίων, I,2,11, Πρὸς κόσμον διαλογισμός, and I,2,24, Πρὸς πολυόρκους διάλογος. In fact, in these three cases, there is evidence that the author uses this method to enhance the liveliness of the text, and it is certainly Gregory hiding behind respectively the πνευματικὸς βίος, the κόσμος and character A;
- the epistolary poems II,2,3-5 and a number of traditional epitaphs in which the grave or the deceased speak;
- I,2,1b, in which Gregory allows the μυστίδες γάμοιο and the παρθενίη to speak in an ἀγών. From several indications, including many parallels with other poems, it appears that the second speaker conveys Gregory's point of view.

Unlike for most orations, which are effectively pronounced in front of an audience whose composition can be more or less retrieved, and for the letters, which were addressed to someone specific in the first place, we usually do not know for certain in which circumstances or for which audience the **poems** were written.

There are indications that at least a part of these poems were intended for publication: to these, carmen II,1,39 seems to have functioned as a kind of prologue, in which the *moralia*, the *dogmatica*, the *gnomologies*, and perhaps also the *biblica* and the *hymns* were announced (cf. n.108). In the same II,1,39, Gregory expressly and repeatedly names a young audience for this poetry, towards whom he had didactic intentions with his verse. This is confirmed in some of these poems themselves: the acrostic of I,2,31, the γνῶμαι δίστιχοι, runs as follows:

> Γνῶμαι Γρηγορίου, δίστιχος εὐεπίη,
> ἐσθλὸν ἄθυρμα νέοις καὶ χάρις ἐξοδίη (*PG* 37,910-5).
> *Maxims of Gregory, eloquent distichs,*
> *gentle recreation for young people and a parting gift.*

And in the prologue of the longest *carmen morale*, περὶ ἀρετῆς (I,2,10, vv.1-13, *PG* 37,680-1), Gregory addresses a young person who remains nameless, about whom he has heard promising rumours by people οἷς πάντα τηρεῖν ἐπιμελὲς τὰ τῶν νέων (v.4). From the same poem, we learn that the young man in question is a Christian (v.877, *PG* 37,743: τοῖς σοῖς διδάγμασι, on the Christian doctrine) and studied secular literature (I,2,10, v.368, *PG* 37,707: βίβλων παλαιῶν αἷς ἐνετράφης). This young Christian intellectual is probably representative of the readers whom Gregory wants to reach with the mentioned genres. This also appears from indirect indications: he considers the Christian doctrine and tradition as known (I,2,10, v.584, *PG* 37,722: πᾶσιν γάρ ἐστι περιφανῆ καὶ γνώριμα), and can say about an episode from the history of Saul and David (1Rg 24): καὶ τοῦτο δ' ἴστε (I,2,25, v.207, *PG* 37,828). And the ease with which he expresses quotations from and allusions to the classical tradition points to the fact that he assumes that his readers share his cultural level and interest (124). In other words. Gregory seems to aim at readers with the profile of his great-nephew Nicobulus (see p.22).

Still, the *addressed character* of a poem does not often comply with this description. Especially in the dissuasive *moralia* (the « poetic diatribes » against all kinds of vices), Gregory continually addresses – according to a technique typical for these diatribes – a fictitious opponent who embodies or defends the vice in question.

In his *autobiographical* poems, Gregory addresses existing persons or groups rather than fictitious opponents. The major part of his *polemical* and *apologetic* poems deals with his Constantinople period: the addressed characters in these are alternately (sometimes within the same poem) his fellow-priests and -bishops, the community of the Anastasia, the Emperor, Maximus; or (the inhabitants of) Constantinople without further specification. If these are at all intended as real readers (which seems rather improbable in the case of the bishops, the Emperor and Maximus, judging by the harsh tone), they are clearly not the exclusive addressees of these texts: the poems rather seem a kind of open letters. We can assume that these circulated in Constantinople (from his correspondence, we know that he kept in touch with his confidants there), but we do not have any actual facts about this. From the prologue of II.1,12, we can deduce that this « retaliation » was not only meant for an audience of insiders: Gregory announces that he will not mention any names in his polemic. Here as well, he explicitly expects a certain degree of erudition from his readers (he accuses some bishops of lacking this very erudition): ἴστε τοὺς Θρασωνίδας (125).

The apologetic and polemical poems not dealing with Constantinople concern his silent Lent of 382 (II,1,34-37). Again, the addressed audience varies, as is best summarized by the opening lines of II.1,34b:

> Εἶ δ' ἄγε, καὶ λόγον ἄλλον ἐμῆς ἀΐοιτε σιωπῆς,
> Ὅστις ἀπεχθαίρων, ὅς τε φίλα φρονέων.

---

(124) An exception is formed by the *biblica*. PALLA, *Ordinamento* p.171, presumes that they have been collected for catechetical purposes.

(125) II,1,12, v.137 (*PG* 37,1176): the officer from Menander's Misoumenos, and a name of a type from Hellenistic comedy.

Come on, hear another explanation of my silence,
whether you are hostile or favourably disposed towards me (126).

In his *elegiac* autobiographical poems, the question of whether addressed character and effective audience are one and the same does not even arise: Gregory addresses himself especially to Christ, and at times also to the human race. The same goes for the θρῆνοι, the *hymns* and the *prayers*: complaints to the earth, his own soul or body, or in the *apotropaica* to the demon, do not make us any wiser about the possible audience for whom Gregory wrote all of this.

The situation is different where the seven *epistolary poems* are concerned: these are addressed to specific persons from Gregory's surroundings, about whom other sources provide us with some information to a varying degree.

- II,2,1: to Hellenius, an acquaintance of Gregory and Basil, Armenian, Christian, peraequator of Nazianzus in 372. Subject: request for exemption from taxation for monks; the major part of the poem (vv.27-280) is actually a praise of monastic life.

- II,2,2: to Julian, fellow student of Gregory, Christian, peraequator of Nazianzus in 375. Similar intention as the previous letter (127).

- II,2,3 is the first of the three poems which Gregory did not write in his own name. Peter, the fictitious author, addresses himself, also on behalf of his brother Phocas, to his father Vitalianus, in an attempt to reconcile him with his sons. From the text, it emerges that Vitalianus was a Christian and an acquaintance of Gregory (128).

- II,2,4 and 5 are written under the name of Nicobulus, referring respectively to his great-nephew and nephew (cf. introduction p.22). In the first letter, the son addresses the father; in the second, an answer is formulated. Both are relatives of Gregory, are Christians and are skilful in the λόγοι or on their way to becoming so. The (fictitious?) situation - the uncertain permission for son Nicobulus to take up studying - seems only an occasion for Gregory to put praise for the λόγοι in another's mouth.

---

(126) II,1,34, vv.151-152 (34a, vv.1-2) (*PG* 37,1318).

(127) On the same occasion, three letters and one or two orations are addressed to Julian as well, cf. Hauser-Meury pp.110-111 and Coulie, *Richesses* pp.63-70 and 75-86.

(128) This man should probably be identified with the addressee of letters 193 and 194, congratulations to a father on his daughter Olympias' marriage, cf. Gallay, *Lettres 2* p.163.

- II,2,6 is an incitement to σωφροσύνῃ addressed to Olympias, on the occasion of her wedding. From the poem it appears that she is a Christian. Taking into account the serious objections against the traditional equation of this Olympias with the deaconess Olympias, who played an important role in the ecclesiastical environment of Constantinople under Nectarius and John Chrysostom, I would consider it much more likely that Vitalianus' daughter is referred to here, to whose marriage her brothers Peter and Phocas were not allowed. In that case, II,2,3 and II,2,6 might be brought into connection with each other.
- II,2,7 is a προτρεπτικός addressed to the pagan Nemesius, a high authority in Cappadocia in the years 380 (129).

We can assume that the addressees of the epistolary poems were also (or at least among) their actual readers. In the analysis of these poems, we can hence examine whether the nature of the addressee influences the use of exemplary material.

The majority of the *epigrams* are funeral epigrams about acquaintances (128 in the edition of the Maurists, plus 10 about himself), but due to the endless varying series on the same persons, their epigraphic intentions should be questioned. Hence, they are probably meant for reading, but it is impossible to retrieve the audience – possibly friends and relatives of the deceased? It does seem relevant to take the « addressees », the deceased, into account in the further analysis (in ept.5 and 40–53, pagans are mourned for); yet this criterion is actually internal, since it is determined by the subject.

Most other epigrams are more clearly addressed to a specific character. In a number of cases, the epigrams show striking parallels with another poetic genre: epg.7–9 against the φθονοῦντες fit in with the elegiac-autobiographical genre, epg.10–24 about the συνείσακτοι with the *moralia* on the παρθενία, the epigrams about his own poetry can be called programmatic. Some (epg.1–6) are addressed to friends; I look upon them as the true addressees. Finally, there are 64 epigrams against the desecrators of graves; whether the addressed characters are the actual readers here depends on the possible epigraphical character of each of these (and if so, on the degree of literacy of the fourth-century desecrators). Judging by the quite conventional nature of the genre, I am not inclined to accept this.

---

(129) The letters 198–201 are also addressed to him. From ep.200 it appears that Gregory had talked with him about Christian belief; in II,2,7, he resumes this conversation.

All things considered, we do not have much information about the intended or actual reading / listening audience for Gregory's poetry. In general, Gregory seems to have written for a rather homogeneous reading public: Christian (with the exception of II,2,7 and some epigrams) and cultivated, that is with a classical education (except perhaps for the addressees of the *biblica*). Only in the case of the epistolary poems and to a certain extent also of the epigrams, can we make a somewhat more subtle distinction. In these instances, I have added the name of the addressee in inventory 1, with the identification of whether this person was a Christian or not.

The major part of the preserved **orations** was in fact pronounced, and often they can be located as well; this provides a first, even though quite modest indication for the composition of the audience (130). About half of the preserved orations were delivered in Cappadocia, mainly for the community in Nazianzus (131), the other half in Constantinople, principally in the Anastasia, some probably in the SS. Apostles (132). Orations 2, 4, 5, 42 and perhaps also 33 seem never to have been pronounced (133). In line with the rhetorical nature of Gregory's writings, he chose the form of a fictitious oration for his apologetic treatise on priesthood, his invectives against Julian, and his apology about his term of office in Constantinople. With the last mentioned, he apparently had the same audience in mind as with his apologetic poems about that period; with the publication of the invectives, he aimed at an even wider audience, that is, the pagan as well as the Christian intelligentsia.

---

(130) For the discussion of the audience and the circumstances of the *orationes*, I particularly follow Bernardi, *Predication*.

(131) In the parish of Nazianzus (thus, for a modest audience, with, for example, a strong presence of monks): 1, 3, 6, 9-12, 16, 17, 19, 44, 45 and perhaps also 23. In the same place, but certainly for a more comprehensive audience with (ecclesiastical and other) authorities: 7 and 18, the funeral orations for, respectively, his brother Caesarius and Gregory sr. Probably in Caesarea, thus with Gregory as guest speaker for an « urban audience »: 14, 15 and 43, the funeral oration for Basil. Furthermore, 13 in Doara, a small episcopal town in Cappadocia comparable to Nazianzus, and 8, the funeral oration for his sister Gorgonia, probably in Iconium (Lycaonia), where she lay buried.

(132) In the Anastasia: 20-22, 24-32, 34, and perhaps 23 and 33. In the SS. Apostles (and thus for a wider audience) certainly 36 (in the presence of Theodosius) and probably also 37-41.

(133) Bernardi, *Predication* pp.165-168, strongly doubts whether 33 was ever pronounced, because Gregory addresses himself especially to the Arians. Moreschini, *SC 318* pp.20-28, considers this argument insufficient, with which view I agree, regarding the difference between addressed character and actual audience.

Finally, the **letters** present the most complete information and the most interesting variation concerning the audience. Of most addressees, we know what relationship they had with Gregory (relatives, friends, acquaintances, authorities) and if they were Christians or not. In the major part of the letters, this was the case (over 180 of the 243 authentic letters are addressed to Christians; of more than 30 letters, the religious persuasion of the addressee is unknown or uncertain), but a sufficient number of letters to pagans has been preserved to draw a comparison. As in the case of the orations, it is not certain here either that the version which has been passed down exactly parallels the letters actually sent: we know that Gregory collected and perhaps also revised his letters for the personal attention of the younger Nicobulus; but still, the diversity of style and content was maintained in these new versions.

C. Rhetorical species (γένος)

The ascribing of Gregory's poems and orations to one of the three traditional types of oratory is quite a precarious undertaking (I did not venture to do this for the letters); besides, in previous authors, I found no more than some vague directions (134).

---

(134) Namely in KENNEDY, *Rhetoric* p.217: he considers the moral poems and orations as deliberative, the dogmatic ones as judicial, and the panegyric ones as epideictic; I adopt his classification. In his *Interpretation*, p.19, he gives some general guidelines for the determination of the three *species* of rhetoric, applicable to all discourse (see also *ibidem* p.36). These are partially in contradiction with his classification of Gregory's œuvre: if « the species is (...) epideictic when the author seeks to persuade the audience to hold or reaffirm some point of view in the present, as when he celebrates or denounces some person or some quality » (p.19), the *moralia* should be considered as epideictic. Consequentely, I do not entirely follow Kennedy's guidelines.
For the problematic classification of Gregory's speeches, see also MILOVANOVIC p.22.

The following question served as a guiding principle in the determination of the rhetorical purpose of a text: which effect does the author (or orator) attempt to bring about in the reader (or listener)? When this comes down to

1) passing judgement on the accuracy (the reader as judge), then the text is judicial;

2) altering the behaviour or exhorting to perform the correct act (the reader as person to be influenced), then it is deliberative;

3) admiring (of content and / or form), applauding, sympathizing (the reader as spectator), then it is epideictic.

In this way, I arrive at the following classification for the **poems**:

1) as judicial, I consider the *dogmatica*, the apodictic gnomologies, the programmatic poem II,1,39 (because of its polemical bias), the polemical and apologetic poems, and the epistolary poem II,2,7, which leans closely towards the *dogmatica*;
2) as deliberative, the *moralia* (135), the moralizing gnomologies, the epistolary poems II,2,1-4 and 6 (136), and the epigrams 4-6 and 10-24 (against the συνείσακτοι), similar to the *moralia*;
3) as epideictic, the *biblica*, the hymns, prayers and *apotropaica*, the θρῆνοι, some programmatic and the elegiac poems, epistolary poem II,2,5, and the majority of the epigrams.

The subdivision of the **orations** runs as follows:

1) judicial: the theological and the one exegetical, the apologetic, and the στηλιτευτικοὶ λόγοι (related to the polemical poems and with II,2,7);
2) deliberative: the one moral, and five of the eight occasional orations (or.6, 16, 17, 19, 22);
3) epideictic: the ἐγκώμια and ἐπιτάφιοι λόγοι, the panegyrics on holy days, and the three remaining occasional orations.

Like the genre, the rhetorical γένος of the poems and orations is indicated in inventory 1.

---

(135) To be subdivided into προτροπή and ἀποτροπή.

(136) The deliberative situation of epistolary poems 3 and 4 is entirely literary, namely between fictitious author (respectively Peter and Nicobulus jr.) and addressed character (respectively Vitalianus and Nicobulus sr.).

2.0.3 The corpus: rough figures

A. General table

For each literary genre and rhetorical γένος, the following table first gives the number of biblical histories (« bib »), the number of exempla among them (« exe »), these exempla further subdivided according to function (« ev »idence, « mod »el, « orn »ament), after that, the same for the pagan elements – including those from recent and contemporary history – (« pag », « exe », etc.), and finally the total, the sum of both sorts of subject matter. Between brackets, the number of verses is indicated, which is significant for the relative frequencies.

The counting of the material is stricter here than in the inventories, and the same goes for most statistics of the « macro-analyses » in this chapter: dubious cases of which the inventories include the different alternative identifications are counted only once in this table, just like the histories on which is focused from the point of view of several characters: these are also entered in the inventories under different headings. In this way, the total number of items is smaller here (1199) than in the inventories (1233).

TOTALS PER GENRE

	BIB	EXE	EV	MOD	ORN	PAG	EXE	EV	MOD	ORN	TOT	EXE	EV	MOD	ORN
Dogmatica (979)	62	14	9	4	1	3	3	1		2	65	17	10	4	3
Biblica (454)	126	27		27							126	27		27	
Hymns and prayers (499)	46	41		27	14	4					50	41		27	14
Moralia (5797)	234	185	56	90	39	196	150	43	35	72	430	335	99	125	111
Gnomologies (660)	20	5	3	2		2	1		1		22	6	3	3	
θρῆνοι (1045)	48	38	6	20	12	28	19	11	2	6	76	57	17	22	18
Autobiographical (4573)	126	114	10	43	61	49	26			26	175	140	10	43	87
Epistolary poems (1685)	41	40	4	15	21	94	42	14	8	20	135	82	18	23	41
Epigrams (1295)	27	27	3		24	93	40		7	33	120	67	3	7	57

TOTALS PER RHETORICAL ΓΕΝΟΣ

Judicial (4647)	143	74	19	21	34	102	36	9	3	24	245	110	28	24	58
Deliberative (7383)	277	228	65	106	57	229	174	44	41	89	506	402	109	147	146
Epideictic (4957)	310	189	7	101	81	138	71	16	9	46	448	260	23	110	127
TOTAL (16987)	730	491	91	228	172	469	281	69	53	159	1199	772	160	281	331

B. Distribution of the exempla according to genre and rhetorical γένος

About these figures, two general points can be established.

1. The division according to rhetorical γένος is in keeping with Aristotle's consideration that the use of παραδείγματα is most appropriate for the deliberative γένος (cf. supra p.38): in these, there are on average 55 exempla per 1000 verses, versus 52 in the epideictic and 24 in the judicial γένος.
2. The distribution of the exempla among the literary genres is even more irregular: their concentration varies from 9 per 1000 verses (gnomologies) to 82 (prayers). Of the numerically important genres, the *moralia* (59) score clearly higher than the autobiographical poems (31) (137).

C. Distribution of the material among the individual poems and orations

In the rhetorical analysis of the παράδειγμα in Gregory's poetry, as it is carried out further on, the individual poems fall somewhat by the wayside: the « micro-analysis » starts from the individual exempla, the « macro-analysis » from the poems grouped according to genre and rhetorical γένος. Some poems *will* be regularly quoted because of their high number of exempla: peaks are I,2,10 with 86 - especially pagan - exempla (out of 998 verses); I,2,2 with 51 (out of 689 verses); I,2,1b with 50 – particularly biblical – (out of 518 verses). I,2,27 shows a remarkably high concentration with 26 exempla (all parables) out of 106 verses. Finally, II,2,7 is also quite notable, with 63 - especially pagan - *items* out of 334 verses; yet of these, only 18 are used in an exemplary way.

---

(137) The distribution of the material among genres and rhetorical γένη seems less irregular for the *orationes*: per 25 columns from the *Patrologia Graeca* (approximately equivalent to 1000 verses), the concentration varies according to genre from 29 (in the one exegetical homily) to 66 (in the ψόγοι and the panegyrics), and according to rhetorical γένος merely from 41 (deliberative) to 51 (epideictic). The low figure for the letters is quite striking: 18 items per 25 columns.
In the prose, it concerns all pagan and biblical items, non-exemplary ones included.

In general, it can be stated that the pagan and biblical material is not dispersed evenly among Gregory's poems. There is a much larger number of poems containing exclusively biblical material, which seems to point out that especially the pagan material is concentrated. And indeed, of the pagan exempla, more than 50% is concentrated in 6 poems (I,2,10, I,2,2, I,2,29, II,1,12, I,2,15a, II,2,7, which make up only 20% of the total corpus with their total of 3347 verses); of the biblical exempla, this is in 10 poems (together 6522 verses, or 38%).

The same goes for the orations: 50% of the pagan material is derived from the two invectives against Julian, 70% from the four orations commented on by Ps.-Nonnus (next to the invectives, also orr.39 and 43); 20 of the 44 *orationes* contain no pagan items at all, six one single and another six only two. On the other hand, there are no orations without biblical histories; the absolute frequency of this is usually in proportion to the size of the orations. Hence, here as well, there is a remarkable concentration of pagan exempla. This conclusion anticipates the discussion of the subject matter in Gregory's exempla.

2.1 FUNCTIONS

The functions fulfilled by the exemplary histories are indicated in inventory 1; in the above table one only finds the totals for each genre and rhetorical γένος. It was not always as obvious to define the function of an individual exemplum. Within the three-part division (evidence, model, ornament) one can distinguish - as was done in the theoretical introduction on the παράδειγμα - between the *exemplum probationis* (the παράδειγμα as πίστις) and the *exemplum exornationis* (the παράδειγμα as κόσμος). The first (evidence/model) is informed by the εὕρεσις, the second by the λέξις, – but for the literary critic this is extremely hard to find out and hence it is not a manageable criterion in problematic cases. Therefore, I started from the question of whether quoting the history under investigation determines the course of the argument; if it does, the exemplum functions as evidence or model.

Between these two also, the difference is not always clear. Insertion (especially introductory and concluding formulas) and context mostly give a decisive answer (138); in a few cases I was guided by the extensive context, that is, by the entire text and especially by its purpose or rhetorical situation. Indeed, one can make a similar split within the threepart division of the rhetorical γένη (judicial and deliberative are forms of agonal oratory). And the parallel goes further: each of the three functions of the exemplum corresponds with a function of the text: to convince (respectively evidence and judicial), to exhort (respectively model and deliberative), and to embellish / to spur on to admiration (respectively ornament and epideictic). The macro-analysis will elucidate whether this parallel is indeed revealed in a correlation between functions of the exempla and rhetorical γένος of the poems. Anyway, we can start from this hypothesis. The cases in which I defined the function of the exemplum on account of the rhetorical γένος are not sufficiently numerous to influence the statistics and to make this hypothesis into a self-fulfilling prophecy.

In the micro-analysis I comment upon evidential and model functions in the same part (as in the theoretical introduction), since some aspects of the argumentation are common to both functions: the logical method, the λύσις (refutation), the degrees of similarity.

2.1.1 Rhetorical theory and Gregory's practice

2.1.1.1 Evidence / model (the *exemplum probationis*)

A. Explicit indications and terminology

1) Evidential function

It has been mentioned in the discussion of the terms παράδειγμα and ὑπόδειγμα in Gregory's work that he uses the first twice and the second term four times for « quoting an illustrating case as argument. » The two passages with παράδειγμα (one in poetry, one in prose) contain a λύσις, and are quoted in the discussion of this form. The four with ὑπόδειγμα are found in the orations: I quote two of them, with a biblical exemplum (139).

---

(138) These linking terms and formulas are discussed systematically in 2.3.2.

* In the exegetical homily (on Matt.19,1-12) or.37, §§5-7, Gregory stresses the equivalence of man and woman within marriage. For that purpose, he appeals to Gen.2,24, and mentions that also Paul referred to that ὑπόδειγμα (i.e. in Eph.5,31-32):

> « Ἔσονται μὲν οὖν οἱ δύο, φησίν, εἰς σάρκα μίαν » καὶ ἡ μία σὰρξ ἐχέτω τὸ ὁμότιμον. Παῦλος δὲ καὶ τῷ ὑποδείγματι τὴν σωφροσύνην νομοθετεῖ.
> *They two, He says, shall be one Flesh: so let the one flesh have equal honour. And Paul legislates for chastity by His example* (140).

* The prologue of or.14 is a laudatory enumeration of some twenty different ἀρεταί, each with the introduction Καλὸν (πίστις, ἐλπίς, ἀγάπη...) and all illustrated with biblical ὑποδείγματα. In one case, the term itself is mentioned:

> Καλὸν ἡ ταπεινοφροσύνη, καὶ πολλὰ ταύτης, καὶ πολλαχόθεν τὰ ὑποδείγματα, καὶ πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων, ὁ πάντων Σωτὴρ καὶ Δεσπότης, οὐ ταπεινώσας ἑαυτὸν μόνον μέχρι δούλου μορφῆς, (...) ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν νίπτων τοὺς πόδας ἐν δουλικῷ τῷ σχήματι.
> *Humility is a good thing, and numerous and from many sources are the examples of it, and above all other: the Saviour and Lord of all, who did not only humiliate himself by taking on the outward shape of a slave (...) but who also washed his followers' feet in the position of a slave* (141).

On the basis of this fragment alone, one might as well ascribe a *model* function to the *exemplum Christi* (as in the Gospel itself, cf. supra n.85), which would match the deliberative character of the entire text. Yet, the biblical characters who illustrate other virtues are indicated with the addition μάρτυς or forms of the verb μαρτυρέω (together 9 times), πειθέτω σε (4 times), διδάσκει με (2 times) (142): they make clear that it is the examples' function to prove that the quoted virtues are indeed genuine.

---

(139) The other two passages are or.6,19: διὰ πλείστων παραδειγμάτων ἐστὶ μαθεῖν (*PG* 35,745C, but without naming any) and or.40,30 (Christ's baptism).

(140) Or.37,7 (*PG* 36,292A, translation Browne-Swallow p.340).

(141) Or.14,4 (*PG* 35,861C-D).

(142) Admittedly, the verb διδάσκω can also introduce exempla with model function, see for instance or.4,120 (quoted on p.79).

On three occasions, illustrative examples are explicitly announced with the formula *δείγματος χάριν*. Twice, episodes from the recent past are dealt with, respectively Julian's outrages and events from Gregory's stay in Constantinople (143). The third passage, in which pagan and historical exempla are set forth, is a marginal case: the exempla seem quoted as evidence *and* as model.

2) *Model function*

The passage in question comes from I,2,10, which is, as pointed out before, the largest furnisher of exempla. To provide a clear insight into the function, a wider context is necessary. The principal part of the poem (vv.214-928) deals with four aspects of the *ἀρετή* (*εὐτέλεια, ἐγκράτεια, ἀνδρεία* and *σωφροσύνη* (144)) , in which each time Greeks and characters from the biblical and Christian tradition are placed next to or opposite one another. In advance, Gregory speaks to the young man to whom the text is addressed, about man's true vocation (elevate oneself towards God, vv.14-152) and praises himself as the ideal counsellor (vv.153-176). Eventually, Gregory wonders in a sort of *προδιόρθωσις* (vv.177-213) whether wisdom is to be found at all with the Greeks, since how can those who deny the existence of the *one* God be called wise?

> Τίς οὖν τοσοῦτον ἄσοφος, ὡς τούτους σοφοὺς
> θέσθαι; ὅμως ἔστωσαν, εἰ δοκεῖ, σοφοί·

---

(143) In both cases, Gregory states that he only mentions one (or two) of the numerous significant examples: or.4.79 (*PG* 35.605B): *ἀντὶ πάντων ἓν ἢ δύο δείγματος ἐρῶ χάριν*, and II,1,11, v.1441 (*PG* 37,1129): *ἓν δ' ἐξ ἁπάντων δείγματος λέξω χάριν*.

(144) North, who briefly analyses this poem in her book on *σωφροσύνη* (p.341), mentions *ἐγκράτεια, ἀνδρεία, σωφροσύνη* and *φρόνησις* as treated virtues, apparently in an attempt to make Gregory's distinction fit in better with the four Platonic-stoical « cardinal virtues » (*σοφία / φρόνησις, ἀνδρεία, δικαιοσύνη, σωφροσύνη*). These four are also summed up in the book of Wisdom (Sap.8,7) - which was probably written in Hellenistic Alexandria - and Gregory knows this list, as is clear from I,2,34, vv.54-62, in which he successively defines *ἀνδρεία, σωφροσύνη, δικαιοσύνη* (with their opposites), and *φρόνησις* and *σοφία*.
Yet, in I,2,10, he deals with only two of the four traditional virtues: even though the word *εὐτέλεια* is never mentioned, the transitions are indubitable for that matter (between 1 and 2 vv.579-580 (*PG* 37,722): *Εἶεν· τὰ μὲν δὴ χρημάτων οὕτως ἔχει. / Τῆς δ' ἐγκρατείας…*; and between 3 and 4 vv.767 and 772-773 (*PG* 37,735-6): *'Επεὶ δὲ τὴν ἀνδρείαν ἐν τούτοις ἴδες, / (...) δεῦρο σκόπει μοι καὶ τὰ τῆς αἰνουμένης / ἡμῖν μάλιστα σωφροσύνης*).

200 τούτους ἂν εὕροις τοῖς μὲν ἄλλοις δόγμασιν
ἀσυνθέτους τε καὶ διεστῶτάς τισιν
τοῖς περὶ νοητῶν καὶ ὁρωμένων λόγοις.
(...)
ἀσυνθέτους μὲν ταῦτα, πάντας δ' ἐξ ἴσου
210 ἐπαινέτας τε τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ σύμφρονας,
οὐδὲν τιθέντας τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀνωτέρω,
κἂν μυρίοις ἱδρῶσι καὶ πολλοῖς πόνοις
χρόνῳ τε μακρῷ τυγχάνῃ κρατουμένη (145).
Μεμνήσομαι δέ, **δείγματος χάριν**, τινῶν,
ὡς ἂν μάθῃς κἀνθένδε τὴν ἀρετὴν ὅση,
ῥόδ' ἐξ ἀκανθῶν, ὡς λέγουσι, συλλέγων,
ἐκ τῶν ἀπίστων μανθάνων τὰ κρείσσονα.
Τίς οὐκ ἀκούει τὸν Σινωπέα τὸν κύνα;
Who is so foolish, then, as to regard those men as wise?
But well, let them be considered as wise men, if you wish.
You will find that they are usually inconsistent in their opinions·
and that they disagree in some of their explanations
about the spheres of the mental and visible.
(...)
They are indeed inconsistent in these fields, but equally all of them
praise goodness and are in agreement on this,
and think most highly of virtue,
even though it turns out that virtue can only be acquired
through much sweat, numerous efforts and a lot of time.
I will mention some of them, as examples,
so that you might learn from them also how important virtue is,
picking the roses amongst the thorns, as the saying goes,
and learning the best from the faithless.
Who does not know the dog of Sinope from hearsay? (146)

Upon this, the story of Diogenes in the barrel is told, as the first example of εὐτέλεια; afterwards Crates and other unnamed cynics make their appearance. They serve a double function: on the one hand they have to show that σοφοί are *indeed* to be found among the Greeks (evidence of the premise Εἰσὶ δέ τινες καὶ παρ' Ἕλλησι σοφοί, postulated in v.181), and on the other hand they should incite the reader to pursue their virtue, i.e. their sobriety (model of εὐτέλεια). The formula δείγματος χάριν rather seems to point at the evidential function, the addition ὡς ἂν μάθῃς κἀνθένδε τὴν ἀρετὴν at the model function. The deliberative nature of the text was the deciding factor in the eventual allocation of one function in the inventory.

---

(145) Cf. Hesiod, *Erga* 289: τῆς δ' ἀρετῆς ἱδρῶτα θεοὶ προπάροιθεν ἔθηκαν (signaled by Rzach p.207).

(146) I.2.10, vv.198-202 and 209-218 (*PG* 37.694-6).

As pointed out before, Gregory uses ὑπόδειγμα seven times to indicate a model quoted for imitation, each time in prose, and mostly in relation with biblical or – in one case – pagan exempla. The three following examples illustrate this.

Near the end of the first λόγος against Julian, Gregory ridicules this man's intentions to organise a sort of antichurch, which would supposedly be propagandized by way of public lectures enunciating the pagan theology and morality.

> Τί δ' ἂν εἴποις περὶ τοῦ ἠθικοῦ μέρους αὐτῶν; Πόθεν κἀκ τίνων ὁρμώμενοι καὶ τίσι χρώμενοι λόγοις πλάττειν αὐτοὺς εἰς ἀρετὴν δυνήσονται καὶ πλείστου ποιεῖν ἀξίους ταῖς παραινέσεσιν; Ἄριστον ὁμόνοια καὶ τὸ συμφρονεῖν ἀλλήλοις πόλεις καὶ δήμους καὶ οἰκίας (...). **Τίσι τοῦτο διδάξουσιν ὑποδείγμασιν;** Ἆρα τοὺς πολέμους λέγοντες τῶν θεῶν καὶ τὰς στάσεις καὶ τὰς ἐπαναστάσεις (...) ὧν μικροῦ πᾶσα πεπλήρωται συγγραφή τε καὶ ποίησις;
> *What is to be said about the ethical aspect of their doctrine? What are their starting points and methods of argument in their effort to educate them* (sc. the listeners) *in virtue, and to lead them to a higher value through suggestions? An excellent thing is unanimity and mutual understanding of cities and countries and families (...). What examples will they use to teach this? Probably by citing the wars between the gods, and the dissensions and the revolutions (...) with which nearly all of their literature and poetry is teeming?* (147)

The purpose of the ὑποδείγματα here is πλάττειν εἰς ἀρετήν, thus προτροπή. This is also the case in a letter from 379 to a Theodorus, a friend who apparently still bore a grudge against the Constantinopolitans who had attempted to stone Gregory. At the beginning of his letter he uses the term ὑπόδειγμα in a non-technical sense (set an example):

> Ἀλλ' ἴσως μακροθυμεῖν ἄμεινον καὶ πολλοῖς ἐξ ὧν πάσχομεν **διδόναι** μακροθυμίας **ὑπόδειγμα**· οὐ γὰρ οὕτως ὁ λόγος πείθει τοὺς πολλοὺς ὡς ἡ πρᾶξις, ἡ σιωπῶσα παραίνεσις.
> *But perhaps it is better to be patient, and to give an example of patience to many by our sufferings; for words are not so persuasive for most people as is action, that silent exhortation.*

---

(147) Or.4.120 (*PG* 35.660B).

He then refers to some ten biblical histories in which forgiveness is granted or at least discussed. and deduces from that:

> Τοσαῦτα **ἔχοντες ὑποδείγματα**. μιμησώμεθα Θεοῦ φιλανθρωπίαν.
> *Having so many examples let us imitate the mercy of God* (148).

In a letter to the deacon Adelphius - who slipped off with some ordained virgins - Gregory points at the deterrent of Eli's sons, who brought ruin upon the whole family through their father's too lenient intervention. The exemplum is directed at ἀποτροπή here, as is clear from the addition:

> Τοῦτο **φοβούμενος τὸ ὑπόδειγμα** καὶ αὐτός, ἐπὶ ταύτην ἦλθον τὴν παραίνεσιν.
> *Myself also fearful of this example, I have proceeded to this admonition* (149).

The one passage with παράδειγμα is extremely interesting: before Gregory elaborates on the exemplary history of Jonah. he explicitly accounts for the legitimacy and even advisability of using the biblical ἱστορίαι as παραδείγματα with model function. either as deterrence, or with a view to imitation. The terms he uses at this point are striking. because they remind us of the rhetorical theories on the παράδειγμα:

> «Ἐμνήσθην ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων» (Ps 142,5) καὶ πρός τινα τῶν **παλαιῶν ἱστοριῶν** ἀναδραμών. ἐκεῖθεν εἵλκυσα **συμβουλὴν** ἐμαυτῷ **πρὸς τὰ παρόντα**. (...)
> Οὔποτε δεξόμεθα. οὐ γὰρ ὅσιον, οὐδὲ τὰς ἐλαχίστας **πράξεις** εἰκῇ σπουδασθῆναι τοῖς ἀναγράψασι καὶ μέχρι τοῦ παρόντος μνήμῃ διασωθῆναι, ἀλλ' ἵν' ἡμεῖς ἔχωμεν **ὑπομνήματα καὶ παιδεύματα** τῆς **τῶν ὁμοίων**. εἴ ποτε συμπέσοι καιρός, διασκέψεως, ὥστε τὰ μὲν φεύγειν, τὰ δὲ αἱρεῖσθαι, οἷον **κανόσι** τισὶ καὶ **τύποις** τοῖς προλαβοῦσιν **ἑπόμενοι παραδείγμασιν**.
> Τίς οὖν **ἡ ἱστορία** καὶ πόθεν ἡ συμβουλή;
> *I remembered the days of old, and, recurring to one of the ancient histories, drew counsel for myself therefrom as to my present conduct. (...)*
> *We will never admit the impious assertion that even the smallest matters were dealt with with haphazard by those who have recorded them, and have thus been borne in mind down to the present day: on the contrary, their purpose has been to supply memorials and instructions*

---

(148) Ep.77.4 and 12

(149) Ep.206,3. Other passages in which ὑπόδειγμα is used for a biblical exemplum: or.14.15 and or.15.9.

> *for our consideration under similar circumstances, should such befall us, and that the examples of the past might serve as rules and models for our warning and imitation.*
> *What then is the story, and wherein lies its application?* (150).

Explicit indications of the insertion of exempla functioning as model are not necessarily accompanied by the use of the terms δεῖγμα, ὑπόδειγμα or παράδειγμα; I shall illustrate this with the following verses from the poem against anger (I,2,25). In a first part (vv.31-180), Gregory has provided arguments which are supposed to show how unreasonable and humiliating outbursts of anger are. Then, the transition to the exempla follows:

> Τούτοις μὲν οὖν μάλιστα κάμπτεσθαι λόγοις·
> Οὐ γὰρ δεήσῃ πλειόνων, ἂν εὖ φρονῇς.
> Εἰ δ' ἔστ' ἐπῳδῆς χρεία σοι καὶ μείζονος,
> Βίους σκόπει μοι τῶν πάλαι καὶ τῶν νέων.
> *Such arguments should be particularly persuasive:*
> *hence, you will not need more words, if you are sensible.*
> *But if, however, you need a stronger invocation,*
> *then take a look at the life of people from the remote and from the recent past.*

Next, some ten biblical exempla are mentioned, which he indicates conclusively with a term also found in the above fragment of or.2:

> Ἀρκεῖ τάδ' ἡμῖν εὐγενῆ **παιδεύματα**.
> *Where we are concerned, these noble lessons suffice,*

but he additionally gives five pagan exempla. The whole list is closed with a traditional medical image:

> Τοσαῦτ' ἔχεις σὺ τοῦ πάθους τὰ φάρμακα.
> Πάντων δὲ μεῖζον, ὧν ἔφην, τὴν ἐντολήν.

---

(150) Or.2.104-106 (*PG* 35.504B-505A, translation BROWNE-SWALLOW p.225).

Strictly speaking, the history of Jonah is not an *exemplum probationis* here: it does not function as a means of persuasion, either in the rhetorical situation, or in the text itself: it is not quoted as model with a view to future imitation, but it has functioned like that in the past. Precisely because Gregory presents it in that manner (he himself followed a model from the Bible as it were), I thought that these and similar passages should be considered as exempla functioning as model, not as ornament. In his poetry, such » retrospective « *exempla probationis* are found especially in the autobiographical poems, e.g. II,1,11, vv.292-295 (*PG* 37,1049): Ἠλίαν εἶχον ἐν λόγῳ τὸν Θεσβίτην,...; II,1,68, vv.63-66 (*PG* 37,1414): Οὐκ ἠγνόουν Ἰωνᾶν,....

> *Such a strong antidote have you got against your disease,*
> *but beyond all my words, you have the commandment* (151).

3) *Enunciations on the persuasiveness of the exemplum*

In two quoted fragments - the letter to Theodorus and the poem against anger - Gregory sets a higher value upon the persuasiveness of the example than upon that of the word; in the first case the *setting* of an example was meant, in the second, the *quoting* of it as « stronger incantation ». He repeats the same commonplace several times, in which word and example or deed are compared as didactic forms (152), usually in favour of the example. As an argument, the ὑπόδειγμα is surpassed only by the divine commandment, the ἐντολή, as was clear from the last quoted verse from I,2,25 (153).

B. The argumentation

1) *Logical method and form of the argumentation* (154)

(1) the analogical exemplum (ὡς μέρος πρὸς μέρος, ὅμοιον πρὸς ὅμοιον)

Here, the type of παράδειγμα is meant which Aristotle called the rhetorical « induction » from one particular - the illustrans -

---

(151) I,2,25, vv.181-184, v.253 and vv.304-305 (*PG* 37,826/831/834).

(152) Also see one of the « rough definitions » (ὅροι παχυμερεῖς), I,2,34, v.127 (*PG* 37,954): Διδασκαλία τύπωσις ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ. Besides ep.77, Gregory puts ὑπό- or παράδειγμα on a par with - or above - λόγος in or.2,30, or.9,3, or.24,5, and ep.66,3.

(153) Along with this passage, see also or.14,35 (*PG* 35,904C). Before, he has urged his listeners with all sorts of arguments - including exempla - to φιλανθρωπία and εὐσπλαγχνία. With the most important argument, however, he waits until the end: Ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ μὲν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο (sc. the preceding argumentation) δοκεῖ ἀναγκαία τυγχάνειν ἡ φιλανθρωπία, καὶ τὸ πρὸς τοὺς δεομένους εὔσπλαγχνον, (...)· πάντων δὲ τὴν **ἐντολὴν** αἰδώμεθα πλέον, καὶ τὸ **ὑπόδειγμα** (sc. the example of Jesus himself).

(154) Cf. supra p.39. For Gregory in particular, FOCKEN and NORRIS, *Faith*. In his second chapter, *De artis rhetoricae inductione* (pp.25-35), Focken distinguishes between three types of induction: « Inductionem ergo in orationibus invenimus, atque earum tria genera: 1. Inductionem, in qua exemplo allato explicatur ratio, quae adhibetur ad demonstrandum. 2. Inductionem, in qua quaestio ipsa demonstratur similitudine, quam praebet exemplum allatum. (...) 3. Inductio invenitur, quae est contracta, collatio » (p.30). The last type is actually the reduction (the metaphorical type) of one of the other two: the first matches the analogical παράδειγμα, the second corresponds to the inductive exemplum. These two are dealt with here successively. Along with these types of argumentation, which

to the other - the illustrandum - on the basis of similarity and the postulated common legitimacy of the *Ernstbedeutung*. In the passage from or.2 quoted on p.80. Gregory posits that the biblical histories are applied according to this analogical procedure (παιδεύματα τῆς τῶν ὁμοίων διασκέψεως), - or have even been written and passed down for that purpose. And indeed. precisely as Gregory quotes the specific story of Jonah as exemplum for his own particular situation, he adopts this same technique in his poems. I give some representative examples, first with exempla functioning as evidence, then as model.

In I,2,1b, the personified Παρθενίη advocates celibacy, and refutes a number of arguments of the proponents of marriage. Against the objection that some celibates cannot sustain sexual abstinence and cave in, she says that it is better that some fail than that no one tries. To prove that the fall of a few does not affect the merit of the others, she appeals to two exempla:

> Ἄγγελος ἦν τοπάροιθεν Ἑωσφόρος. Ἀλλὰ πεσόντος,
> Οὐρανίοις παρέμιμνεν ἑὸν κλέος, ὡς δὲ μαθηταῖς
> Οὐδὲν Ἰούδας ὄνειδος, ἐπεὶ πέσεν, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ μὲν ὦκα
> Ἐξ ἀριθμοῦ λογάδων, οἱ δ᾽ ἕνδεκα μίμνον ἄριστοι.
> *Initially, Lucifer was an angel; yet despite his fall*
> *the celestial beings retained their glory. Thus too,*
> *Judas' fall was not shameful for the disciples, but he immediately disappeared from the number of the chosen, and the eleven others remained beyond reproach* (155).

As Aristotle advised, Gregory quotes more than one example here; yet, they do not precede the illustrandum.

---

reach back to Aristotle's logic and rhetoric, (cf. Norris p.26: « Focken's work makes it difficult to doubt that Gregory had studied Aristotelian logic and rhetoric seriously. »), the Hermogenic type is mentioned as well, even though the Hermogenic corpus seems to have left its marks in the overall construction of Gregory's works rather than in the specific arguments (where the exempla are situated), cf. Norris p.32.

(155) I.2,1. vv.680-683 (*PG* 37,574). These two exempla are followed by a comparison (vv.684-686) out of the maritime sphere: the shipwreck of some does not stop the others from sailing. (Sundermann p.222 points to a parallel in a letter - preserved only in Coptic - of Athanasius to the παρθένοι, in which failed celibates are successively compared with Judas and with a shipwrecked person).
Lucifer and Judas are mentioned repeatedly in Gregory's work with the same *Ernstbedeutung* as here: I,2,3, vv.47-48; I,2,6, vv.20-23; epg.2c. vv.1-3.

In I.2.17 as well, Gregory discusses the choice between celibacy and marriage. The poem starts with a number of beatitudes on different lifestyles (hence the title διαφόρων βίων μακαρισμοί), out of which everyone should make his own choice (I.2.17, v.33, *PG* 37,784: Τούτων, ἣν ἐθέλεις, τάμνε τρίβον), adapted to his own possibilities. Thereupon, two examples are quoted on the basis of analogy, examples which precede the probandum here (a chaste marriage is better than a stained celibacy):

> Καὶ Ῥαὰβ οὐκ εὔκοσμον ἔχεν βίον, ἀλλ' ἄρα καὶ τὴν
> Κλεινὴν ἀκροτάτῃ θῆκε φιλοξενίῃ.
> Ἐκ δὲ μόνης πλέον ἔσχε Φαρισσαίοιο τελώνης
> Τῆς χθαμαλοφροσύνης, τοῦ μέγ' ἀειρομένου.
> *Rahab led a not too decent life, but still she too*
> *earned a reputation from her exceptional hospitality.*
> *And the tax collector was superior to the Pharisee,*
> *if only because of his humility: the latter was puffed up with pride* (156).

From II,1,11, I take another exemplum with evidential function: when recounting his first vicissitudes in Constantinople, Gregory alludes to the schism of Antioch which divided his community as well:

> Ἔπειτα δεινὸς τῶν ἐμῶν οἰδεῖ φθόνος
> εἰς Παῦλον ἑλκόντων με κἀπολλώ τινα,
> τοὺς μήτε σαρκωθέντας ἡμῖν πώποτε
> μήτ' ἐκχέαντας αἷμα τιμίου πάθους·
> ἀφ' ὧν καλούμεθ', οὐχὶ τοῦ σεσωκότος.
> *At this stage an intense discussion flared up in my group.*
> *I was being torn between Paul and Apollos.*
> *They never became incarnate for us,*
> *or showed their blood in memorable sufferings,*
> *and now we name ourselves after them, not after the Saviour* (157).

The allusion, which is not further elaborated in this passage, is clear, reinforced through a pun on the first name: Paul and

---

(156) I.2,17, vv.37-40 (*PG* 37,784). The conclusion follows: Βέλτερον ἀζυγίη, καὶ βέλτερον· ἀλλ' ἐπίμικτος / Κόσμῳ, καὶ χθονίῃ, χειροτέρη δυάδος / Σώφρονος. The *Ernstbedeutung* of both exempla is something like: it is better to live a modest life (respectively whore and publican) as virtuously as possible, than a demanding one in an arrogant fashion. In the parable of the Pharisee and the publican, this is already the *Eigenbedeutung* according to Luke (Luke 18,14: ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ὑψῶν ἑαυτὸν...).

(157) II,1,11, vv.679-683 (*PG* 37,1076, translation freely rendered from Meehan, *Three Poems* p.96).

Apollos represent Paulinus and Meletius (the two rival bishops of Antioch). By adopting not only the names but also the indignant additional ideas from the first Epistle to the Corinthians (158), Gregory implicitly appeals to Paul's intervention in the Corinthian quarrel to justify his own attitude towards the schism of Antioch (the failing of his attempt at reconciliation was one of the reasons for his later dismissal; the whole poem is meant to prove that he was right).

In the above cases, biblical histories are quoted as an argument for the accuracy of a concrete decision, advice, attitude (159). In I,1,3, the dogmatic poem on the Holy Spirit, the same type of rhetorical reasoning is applied in the argumentation of theological truth, namely the ὁμοουσία of Son and Spirit:

> Εἰ δὲ τέθηπας
> Υἱόν τ' οὐχ Υἱόν τε μιῆς θεότητος ἀκούων,
> Μύθοις τ' ἀντιθέτοισιν ἐϋστροφέεσσι πέποιθας
> Δώσει κἀνθάδ' ἔμοιγε Θεὸς λόγον αὐτὸς ἐπελθών.
> Ἐξ ἑνὸς ἀρχεγόνοιο δάμαρ καὶ Σὴθ ἐγένοντο,
> Ἡμίτομος, δυάδος τε γόνος θεσμοῖσι γάμοιο·
> Οὐ τεκτή, τεκτός τε. βροτοί γε μὲν ἔσκον ὁμοίως.
> Τῶν σὺ μνωόμενος μηδὲν Θεότητος ἀτίζειν,
> Πρόσθε φέρων τόδ' ἔνερθεν. Ἴη φύσις ἐστίν, ἄμετρον,...
>
> *But if you are astonished*
> *to hear that the Son and one who is not Son are of one Godhead*
> *and trust in neatly turned contrary arguments,*
> *God himself will come to my help in giving me utterance at this point also.*
> *His wife and Seth came into existence from Adam, the one progenitor,*
> *she cut from Adam's side and he the offspring of a couple joined by the laws of marriage.*
> *Eve was not begotten, while Seth was, yet both were equally human.*
> *With these in mind, refrain from dishonouring Godhead in any way,*
> *bearing in front of you this analogy drawn from below. There exists a single nature, beyond measuring,...* (160).

---

(158) 1 Cor. 1,12-13: λέγω δὲ τοῦτο ὅτι ἕκαστος ὑμῶν λέγει· ἐγὼ μέν εἰμι Παύλου, ἐγὼ δὲ Ἀπολλῶ (...). μὴ Παῦλος ἐσταυρώθη ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν,...

(159) In the poems, I have not found any clear cases in which pagan exempla are used in this type of analogical argumentation.

(160) I,1,3, vv.33-41 (*PG* 37,410-1, translation SYKES, *translation*). FOCKEN p.49 speaks of an *argumentatio a minore ad maius*. Gregory regards theological questions as matters of probability. As these cannot be proved with formal syllogisms, he discusses them with probability arguments (cf. NORRIS, *Faith* pp.17-39).

The logical method ὡς μέρος πρὸς μέρος is also used in the case of exempla functioning as model. The paradigmatic prayers are typical examples, but these are discussed further on in the text. Here, I shall make use of two illustrations from the epistolary poems, one with biblical, one with mythological exempla (161). The request to Julian for mildness in the distribution of the financial burden starts with the following illustrantia:

> Ὄμβρῳ διψάδα γαῖαν ἐπέκλυσεν, ὅς μιν ἔδησεν·
>
>   Ἄλλος τ᾽ ἐξ ὑδάτων ἥρπασε κόσμον ὅλον·
>
> Καὶ νούσοις τις ἄρηξεν, ὁ δ᾽ ἐκ πολέμων ἐσάωσεν.
>
>   Ἄλλος δ᾽ οὐρανόθεν λαὸν ἔθρεψε μέγαν.
>
> Σοὶ δὲ Θεὸς χείρεσσι φόρων ἐνέθηκε τάλαντον,...
>
> *He who had stopped the rain flooded the parched earth with rain;*
>
>   *another snatched to safety the entire world from the Flood;*
>
> *someone came to the aid of the sick, someone else brought salvation from wars,*
>
>   *still another fed a great people with food from heaven.*
>
> *And in your hands, God placed the scales of fiscal justice...* (162).

Through his examples, Gregory suggests that the people of Nazianzus are in distress as well, and that Julian has the chance to place himself on the same line as the great biblical saviours: the exempla serve as προτροπή.

In « Peter's » letter to his father, we find exempla as ἀποτροπή; the similarity of the quoted myths with the situation of conflict in which the Vitalianus family finds itself is clearly suggested in the first verses of the following fragment. The *Ernstbedeutung* of the illustrantia is evident: family conflicts may end tragically. The concrete conclusion is indirectly stated in v.62: let us see to it that it never comes to such a pass in our family.

---

(161) Other passages in which this form of argumentation is applied include (not an exhaustive list): I,2,2, vv.152-209; I,2,25, vv.183-303; I,2,28, vv.139-168; I,2.29, vv.153-162; II,1,12, vv.457-461 and 724-726; II,2.1, vv.337-350; II,2,3, vv.105-126; ept.40, vv.1-3.
The passage from I,2,29 (*PG* 37,895-6) is one of the few fully elaborated argumentations, and follows Aristotle's guideline on number and place of the παραδείγματα: verse 153 starts with the formula πυνθάνομ᾽ ὡς, which introduces three illustrantia (Echo and Pan, Narcissus, Comaetho and Cydnus, vv.153-160). The common *Ernstbedeutung* of these three myths follows in v.161: οὕτω τυφλὸν ἔρως καὶ ἀνάρσιον. From this, the particular conclusion is drawn: οὐ μέγα θαῦμα, εἴ τινα καὶ σὺ (sc. the gaudy woman) νέων τῆλε νόοιο βάλοις,... (vv.161-162 in the Maurists edition. Knecht gives εἴ τινα καὶ πινυτῶν τῆλε νόοιο βάλοι [sc. Eros]. He thus keeps closer to the manuscripts, but has to admit a lacuna of one distich after v.162, in which a transition was made to the second person.)

(162) II,2,2, vv.1-5 (*PG* 37,1477-8). The exemplary characters are Elijah in v.1 (1 Kgs 18, 41-46), Noah in v.2 (Gen. 6-8), Moses in v.4 (Exod. 16,4-16). In v.3, more characters are possibly taken into account; Cosmas thinks of Naaman's being cured by Elisha (2Kgs 5) where the sick are concerned, and of e.g. Moses, Joshua, Gideon, Samson and David with regard to the wars.

50 Τίς τάδε θρηνήσειε γόων πολύϊδρις ἀοιδός;
Πῶς μῦθον προτέροισιν ἐδώκαμεν οἷς παθέεσσι;
(...)
Κεῖνο δ' ἄκουσα.
Ὡς μήτηρ φίλον υἷα κατέκτανε μαργοσύνῃσι·
Κτεῖνε μέν, ὥς τινα θῆρα, τὸ δέρκετο· ὡς δ' ἐνόησε,
Μύρατο οὐκέτι θῆρα, πάϊν δ' ὑπὸ χερσὶ δαμέντα.
Καὶ μήτηρ τεκέεσσιν ἑοῖς ἐνὶ φάσγανον ἧκεν.
Ἀμφιχολωσαμένη λεχέων καὶ πατρὸς ἔρωτος.
60 Καί τινα θηρητῆρα κατ' οὔρεος, ἀντ' ἐλάφοιο
Ὠκείης, ἐδάσαντο θοαὶ κύνες, ἃς φιλέεσκε.
Μή σε, πάτερ, τούτων τιν' ἀριθμήσειεν ἀοιδὸς
Μνωόμενος πατέρων κακίης καὶ πήματ' ἀείδων
Ἐνδήμου πολέμοιο, καὶ αἵματος ἀντιβίοιο.
What singer, experienced in lamentations, could bemoan our situation?
How have we provided a subject with our prior sufferings?
(...) I have heard the following.
A mother finished her beloved son off in a fit of insanity:
in her eyes she did kill an animal; yet when she came to her senses again,
she no longer mourned an animal, but her child, killed by her hand.
Another mother thrust a sword into her own children,
in a blind rage over her marriage and their father's adultery.
In the shape of a nimble hart, a hunter in the mountains
was lacerated by his swift dogs, whom he dearly loved.
Please avoid, father, a singer's reciting you in this list,
when he recalls wicked fathers and sings about the misery
of civil wars and of hostility between blood relations (163).

---

(163) II,2,3, vv.50–51 and 54–64 (*PG* 37.1483-4). If Gregory has a specific « ἀοιδός » in mind, it is likely to be Euripides: vv.55–57 (Agave and Pentheus) probably reach back to the *Bacchae*, vv.58–59 to the *Medea*. The history of Actaeon (vv.60–61) hardly fits in the context. Gregory seems to have been led by an associative line of thought here: Actaeon is indeed one of Pentheus' cousins, who has also been lacerated like an animal because of ὕβρις towards a deity, namely Artemis (this punishment of ὕβρις is the *Eigenbedeutung* of both myths). Furthermore, Actaeon's death is also recounted in the *Bacchae*, vv.337–341 (as an exemplum with a deterring model function held up by Cadmus to Pentheus: Ὁρᾷς τὸν Ἀκτέωνος ἄθλιον μόρον (...) Ὃ μὴ πάθῃς σύ...). In the discussion of the literary form, I shall come back to the sometimes apparently associative linking of exem-

(2) the inductive exemplum (ὡς μέρος πρὸς ὅλον)

In the use of pagan and biblical exempla, Gregory does not confine himself to the above mentioned form of argumentation, which is appropriate to arguing about particular situations or decisions, as in the autobiographical and most of the epistolary poems. The subject of the *moralia*, though, is more general, and in these Gregory appeals more to the inductive exemplum. This implies that an illustrans (by definition particular or concrete) is quoted as proof of a general or abstract case: the conclusion from this exemplum is a generalization. We saw that Aristotle recommended the use of the παράδειγμα as μαρτύριον of (the premise of) an enthymeme.

Some illustrations of this type of argumentation have already been mentioned above in the text: in the prologue of the moral sermon or.14 the exempla even appeared to be inserted nine times with the terms μάρτυς and μαρτυρέω, which are related to μαρτύριον (164). Μάρτυς as an announcement of an exemplum can also be found in the speech of Παρθενίη in I,2,1: to justify her own lifestyle, she posits that abstinence is a divine law; she refers to Adam, who was not married in the beginning, to the Mosaic law on the priestly purity, and ultimately to the virgin birth of Christ:

Αὐτὰρ ἐγώ, φίλα τέκνα Θεοῦ, πάντων βασιλῆος,
410 Τόνδε νόμον τίουσα, ὁμοφροσύνην ἐρατεινὴν
Πρὸς Θεὸν οἷον ἔμιξα, χοὸς δ' ἀπέλειπον ἔρωτα,
Ὃν παῖς ἀθανάτοιο Πατρὸς ἐστήσατ' ἄνωθεν.
(...)
Ἐξέτι τοῦ, ὅτε πρῶτον Ἀδὰμ θέτο ἐν παραδείσῳ
Ἄζυγα, καὶ μετέπειτα διδοὺς νόμον ἥγνισε λαόν,
Καὶ τοκετοὺς ἐκάθηρε νόμῳ, καὶ νηὸν ἔτισε
Σώμασιν ἁγνοτάτοισιν ἀμοιβαδίων ἱερήων.

---

pla in Gregory's work.
It is not certain whether any allusions are made to certain myths in the last two lines. If one looks further for it in the Euripidean tragedies, one might think of the *Alcestis* (in which Pheres - an evil father - refuses to die instead of his son Admetus, husband of Alcestis), and the *Phoenissae*, *Supplices*, *Antigone* (in which the content or the background of the drama is formed by the fratricide of Polynices and Eteocles).

(164) Cf. supra p.76. The premises (Καλὸν ἡ πίστις, καλὸν ἡ ταπεινοφροσύνη...) are all - in Aristotelian fashion - followed by the supporting examples. Other, already quoted texts that belong here: I,2,10, vv.198-218 (cf. p.78: premise « wise Greeks exist », examples introduced by δείγματος χάριν); or.4,120 (cf. p.79: premise « ἄριστον ὁμόνοια », but τίσι τοῦτο διδάξουσιν ὑποδείγμασιν;).

> Μάρτυς Ἰωάννοιο πατὴρ μέγας, οὔτι πάροιθε
> Σπερμήνας φίλον υἷα, τὸν ἔνδοθι δέξατο νηοῦ,
> Τὸν Χριστοῦ μεγάλοιο πρόαγγελον ἡμερίοισι,
> Πρίν γε Θεῷ τελέσαι μυστήρια ἤμασιν ἁγνοῖς (165).
> Τοῦ δὲ νόμοιο τέλος Χριστός, μερόπεσσι κερασθεὶς
> Παρθενικῆς ἀπὸ γαστρός, ὅπως γάμος ἐς χθόνα νεύσῃ.
> *But I, dear children of God, ruler of all,*
> *have decided to share the lovely harmony only with God,*
> *abandoning earthly love, out of respect for the law,*
> *which the son of the immortal Father has laid down from the beginning.*
> *(...)*
> *already when he initially placed Adam in Paradise,*
> *unmarried, and then purified the people with his legislation,*
> *cleansed childbirths by law, and respected the temple*
> *through the absolutely pure bodies of priests serving in rotation.*
> *Witness to this is the great father of John: he waited*
> *to beget his son, who was announced to him in the temple,*
> *- the harbinger of the great Christ for mortals, -*
> *until he had fulfilled his service dedicated to God in days of chastity.*
> *The fulfilment of this law is Christ himself, who came among human beings*
> *from the womb of a virgin, so that marriage might incline to earth* (166).

The argumentation of the Παρθενίη case (justification of her choice for celibacy) is an ἐνθύμημα, which can be analysed in the following way:

1. The law of God prescribes sexual abstinence.
2. Well then, I respect the law of God.
3. Thus: I choose for celibacy.

The first premise, which is not undisputed (in their preceding speech, the supporters of marriage alleged the contrary; hence, what we have here is a non-necessary ἐνθύμημα – ἐξ εἰκότων), is sustained by the interpretations of the « paradisiacal state » of Adam, the Mosaic law, and the birth of Christ (167). The general statements on the Jewish law are substantiated by the story of

---

(165) That Zechariah had no intercourse with Elisabeth as long as he had temple service is not mentioned in so many words in the N.T., but can be deduced from Luke 1,23-24: καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ (in which the birth of a son was announced to him by Gabriel), ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ. μετὰ δὲ ταύτας τὰς ἡμέρας συνέλαβεν Ἐλισάβετ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ.

(166) I,2,1, vv.409-423 (*PG* 37,553-4).

(167) I.e., the three most significant steps in the salvation history.

Zechariah (168) as μαρτύριον (one exemplum, following the enthymeme) (169).

Whereas in the previous passages, the illustrans functioned as proof of the premise of an enthymeme (and was thus no actual part of the matter under discussion), at other times it proves the case itself, of which it is a representative or illustrative exemplar. This is for instance the case in the discussion of the Greeks' attitude towards possession in I,2,10. After Gregory has considered some positive examples (some roses among the thorns, cf. fragment p.78), he puts their merits in perspective, by doubting the sincerity of their detached and propertyless life:

> Πλεῖον γὰρ ἦν ἔνδειξις ἢ καλοῦ πόθος·
> (...)
> ἔπειτα γαστρὸς ἡδοναῖς ἐφίεσαν,
> ὡς ἄν τινες φεύγοντες οὐ πλούτου κόρον,
> τὰς φροντίδας δὲ καὶ πόνους τῆς κτήσεως,
> τρυφῆς δ᾽ ἀφορμὴν τἀπορεῖν ποιούμενοι.
> Δηλοῦσι σησαμοῦσιν ἄρτοι κρίθινοι
> ὑπεξιόντες καὶ τραγῳδίας ἔπη,
> ὧν ἕν τι καὶ τόδ᾽ εὐστόχως εἰρημένον·

---

(168) It is not accidental that Zechariah is chosen as an example of the Jewish law: his son John the Baptist (the *Prodromos*) is traditionally (and also repeatedly in Gregory's œuvre) mentioned as the connection between the Old and the New Testament (e.g. in I,2,1, vv.323-324, quoted on p.93).

(169) Another elaborate passage in which a theological (more specifically soteriological) viewpoint is corroborated by exempla, is found in I,1,6, vv.53-69 (*PG* 37,434-5) (Focken pp.32-33 quotes these verses as an example of his second type of rhetorical induction, cf. supra n.154). The proposition is that before Christ, belief was still feeble, the law still shadowy, and the relation between merit and reward still unclear (vv.53-56 and 69). The argumentation appears in vv.57-68, and is announced by the sentence Τεκμήριον δὲ τοῦ λόγου. (Τεκμήριον is the technical term for a *σημεῖον ἀναγκαῖον* / *signum necessarium*, cf. Lausberg §361, and Aristotle *Rhet.* A2, 1357b; thus, Gregory seems to suggest that at this point he gives an ἐνθύμημα ἐκ τεκμηρίων, i.e. a necessary argumentation.) It consists of three general, gnomic statements (» some heavy crimes were forgiven «; » other light ones were punished «, « some acts of revenge of wise men were extravagant «, vv.58-61), followed by three names of biblical characters who should illustrate these general sayings (vv.62-63: Δαυῒδ σε ταῦτα πειθέτω, καὶ Μωϋσῆς, / Ἐλισσεός τε, οὗ τρέμω μεμνημένος: mind the formula σε πειθέτω - also signalled in or.14), afterwards summarily worked out in a vague description of the episodes in question (see inventory 1). The *Ernstbedeutung* (which is at the same time the probandum) is made explicit in v.69: Οὕτω σκιώδης τηνικαῦτ᾽ ἦν καὶ νόμος.

> « Ὦ ξένε, τυράννοις ἐκποδὼν μεθίστασο ».
> *After all, it was more show than a yearning for the good.*
> *(...)*
> *Further they lost themselves in the delights of the stomach,*
> *as if they did not actually renounce the satiety of affluence,*
> *but escaped from the worries and burdens of possession,*
> *and used their poverty as a pretext for a life of luxury.*
> *The barley loaves which had to give way to sesame cakes*
> *prove this, and so do the verses of tragedy*
> *of which this one is quoted aptly:*
> *« Stranger, get out of the way for a monarch »* (170).

(3) the Hermogenic argumentation

In Gregory's poems, I have found only one fully elaborated example of an argumentation with παράδειγμα according to Ps.-Hermogenes' Περὶ εὑρέσεως (171). It is the end of the speech of the supporters of marriage in I,2,1. I quote the whole (long) passage, because it is interesting for some other reasons as well (to which I shall refer later on). The different parts of the argumentation are indicated in the Greek text, where possible with the appropriate form or topos.

κεφάλαιον
Εἰ δ' ἀρετὴν ποθέων τις ἀτιμάζει φιλότητα,
λύσις (ἀπὸ τῆς ἐνστάσεως)
Οὐδ' ἀρετὴ φιλότητος ἀπόπροθεν.
ἐπιχείρημα 1 (ἀπὸ προσώπου καὶ χρόνου)
οὐχ ὅτι μοῦνον
Πάντεσσι τοπάροιθε γάμος φίλον εὐσεβέεσσιν (172).
ἐπιχείρημα 2 (ἀπὸ προσώπου καὶ αἰτίας)
Ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ φιλότητος ἐνηέος εἰσὶ γενέθλη
300 Καὶ Χριστοῦ παθέων ἐπιίστορες, ἠδ' ὑποφῆται,
Πάτραρχοι, ἱερῆες, ἀεθλοφόροι, βασιλῆες,

---

(170) I,2,10, vv.270 and 272-279 (*PG* 37,699-700). (Quotation from Euripides, *Phoenissae* 40). Same anecdote in or.4,72 (*PG* 35,596A), in which he calls the fastidious philosopher by name: τῆς Διογένους στωμυλίας, τοῦ τὸν πίθον οἰκοῦντος, ὑφ' ἧς τοὺς ξένους ὑπεξίστησι τοῖς τυράννοις ἐκ τῆς τραγῳδίας, τοὺς εὐτελεῖς ἄρτους τοῖς σησαμοῦσι.

(171) This fact corresponds with Norris' conclusion that the Hermogenic corpus has left its marks in Gregory's œuvre especially on the plane of the total structure.

(172) Sundermann, p.72 points to the fact that virginity and asceticism were indeed not in keeping with the Jewish body of thought. Hence, the supporters of marriage will especially appeal to characters from the O.T.: Παρθενίη on the other hand will keep to Adam and Zechariah, as was clear from the text quoted on p.88.

Παντοίαις ἀρετῇσι κεκασμένοι. Οὐ γὰρ ἀνέσχε
Χθὼν ἀγαθούς, ὥς φασι πελώρια φῦλα γιγάντων,
Ἀλλὰ γάμου τελέθουσι γόνος καὶ κῦδος ἅπαντες.

ἐργασία ἐκ παραδειγμάτων (as μαρτύρια)

Τίς Θεὸν ἀνθρώποισι μέγαν κρατέονθ' ὑπέδειξε,
Καίπερ τηλόθ' ἐοῦσι, νόον δ' ἔπλησεν ἔρωτος
Θειοτέρου, καὶ ἔνθεν ἀπήγαγεν ἐς βίον ἄλλον;
Τίς ψυχὰς ἐκάθηρεν ὅλοις μερόπεσσι φαεινοῖς;
Πίστις Ἐνὼχ μετέθηκεν (173). Ὁ δ' ἐξ ὑδάτων ἐσάωσε
310 Κόσμον ὅλον ψυχαῖς ὀλίγαις καὶ σπέρμασι πλωτοῖς
Νῶε μέγας. Ἀβραὰμ δὲ πατὴρ πτολίων τε καὶ ἐθνῶν,
Καὶ θυσίην Χριστῷ παραβώμιον υἷα πεδήσας (174).
Μωσῆς ἤγαγε λαὸν ἀπ' Αἰγύπτοιο βαρείης
Θαύμασι σὺν μεγάλοισι, νόμον δ' ὑπεδέξατο πλαξὶν
Ὑψόθε λαϊνέῃσι. Θεὸν δ' εἰσέδρακεν ἄντην (175).
Πιστὸς ἐνὶ προτέροισι θυηπόλος ἔσκεν Ἀαρών.
Μήνης δ' ἠελίου τε δρόμον σχέθεν ἧος Ἰησοῦς.

---

(173) Vv.305-309 deal with Enoch; they are based especially on an apocryphal tradition, namely on the Ethiopian book of Enoch (1 Henoch) - regularly quoted by the Church Fathers -, in which it is told how evil spreads all over the world and how Enoch interferes by travelling round the globe (in my view, then, Gregory's καίπερ τηλόθ' ἐοῦσι (v.306) can be interpreted as « fallen far from God », or as « living far apart »); in 1 Henoch, Enoch's assumption into heaven is also recorded. This assumption is already mentioned in Gen.5,24 (καὶ εὐηρέστησεν Ενωχ τῷ θεῷ καὶ οὐχ ηὑρίσκετο, ὅτι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ Θεός), and caused a legend to be formed, which found its reflection in the LXX, in Sir 44,16: Ενωχ εὐηρέστησεν κυρίῳ καὶ μετετέθη **ὑπόδειγμα** μετανοίας ταῖς γενεαῖς. For this whole series of exempla, Gregory is indebted to the passage from Siracides to which this verse belongs. This might be the reason why he uses the verb ὑποδείκνυμι in relation to Enoch. The intertextuality can be taken even further: the formulation of the assumption of Enoch - similar though it may seem to that in Gen. and Sir. - is inspired by the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is also influenced by 1 Henoch: Πίστει Ἐνὼχ μετετέθη (Heb.11,5).

(174) I do not understand why SUNDERMANN p.76 indicates in his comment to this passage that Isaac's sacrifice is « gern allegorisch gedeutet »: Gregory simply follows Gen. 22, 17-18: τὸ σπέρμα σου τὰς πόλεις τῶν ὑπεναντίων· καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς, ἀνθ' ὧν ὑπήκουσας τῆς ἐμῆς φωνῆς.

(175) In SUNDERMANN's view (p.77), Gregory is mistaken here: according to the Book of Exodus, Moses would only have seen God's back. This is indeed the case in Ex 33,23, to which Sundermann refers (καὶ τότε ὄψῃ τὰ ὀπίσω μου, τὸ δὲ πρόσωπόν μου οὐκ ὀφθήσεταί σοι), but in Ex 34,6, we read παρῆλθεν κύριος πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ; and in Nu 12,7-8, God says about Moses: στόμα κατὰ στόμα λαλήσω αὐτῷ, ἐν εἴδει καὶ οὐ δι' αἰνιγμάτων, καὶ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου εἶδεν. Moreover, here as well, Gregory is probably inspired directly by Sir 45,5 (ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κατὰ πρόσωπον ἐντολάς). Gregory repeatedly states that Moses saw God directly, cf. inventory 2 s.l. *Moses (saw God)*.

Μακρότερον δηίοισι φόνον καὶ κήδεα τεύχων.
Καὶ σὺ, μάκαρ, χριστοῖσι φέρων κέρας, ἁγνὲ Σαμουήλ.
320 Δαβὶδ ἐν βασιλεῦσιν ἀοίδιμος ἦεν ἅπασι.
Καὶ Σολομὼν σοφίης πρῶτον κλέος. Οὐδὲ προφητῶν
Λήσομαι. Ἠλίαν δὲ πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἥρπασεν ἅρμα.
Τίς δὲ νόμοιο μέσον καὶ πνεύματος οὐχὶ τέθηπε
Φωτὸς Ἰωάννην ἐριηγέα πρόδρομον ἄκρου;
Τίς δὲ δυωδεκάδα κλεινῶν μετέπειτα μαθητῶν;
Τίς Παύλοιο μένος μεγαλήτορος οὐρανοφοίτου (176).
Ἄλλους θ' οἳ γεγάασι, καὶ οἳ νῦν εἰσιν ἄριστοι,
Ἕρμα λόγου, κόσμου τε κλέος, λαοῦ τε θέμεθλα;

(***Ernstbedeutung***)

Τοὺς πάντας μερόπεσσι γάμος καὶ Χριστὸς ἔδωκεν.

(further παραδείγματα)

330 Οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδὲ γυναῖκες ἐπ' εὐσεβίῃ κομόωσαι,
Ὧν μέγας ἐν βίβλοισι θεοπνεύστοισιν ἀριθμός,
Νόσφι γάμου καὶ σαρκὸς ἐϋκλείης ἐπέβησαν.

ἐνθύμημα (ἀπὸ μείζονος)

Εἴπω μείζονα μῦθον ἐμὴν τίων φιλότητα.
Καὶ Χριστὸς καθαροῖς μὲν, ἀτὰρ σπλάγχνοισιν ἐμίχθη
Ἀνδρομέοις, μνηστῆς δὲ διωλίσθησε γυναικός,
Ἥμισυ συζυγίης μίξας βροτέης θεότητι.

ἐπενθύμημα (177)

Ἓν δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσι μέγιστον ἐμὸν κράτος, ἣν κρατέωσιν
Ἀζυγέες, καὶ οἳ γὰρ ἐμὸν γένος, ὥσπερ ἅπαντες·
Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐξ ἀγάμων γεγαμηκότες, ἐκ δὲ γάμοιο
340 Ἀζυγέες. Τεκέεσσιν ἀνώγομεν, ἴσχετ' ἀγῶνα.
Εἰ τοι μὴ πατέρες, πατέρων γε μὲν ἐξεγένεσθε.
Would one, out of a yearning for virtue, disapprove of love?
Yet virtue is not detached from love! And this not only because
in former days marriage used to be cherished by all pious people,
but also because from tender love are born
even witnesses of Christ's suffering, and interpreters,
Patriarchs, priests, victorious martyrs, kings,
excelling in all manner of virtues. For it is not the earth which has brought forth
the virtuous ones, as is told about the monstrous race of the giants,
but they are fruit and pride of marriage, all of them.
Who pointed out the way towards God, the great ruler, to the people
although they had strayed far off? Who filled their heart
with a more divine love, and led them from here to another life?
Who purified the souls of all radiant mortals?
Faith translated Enoch from this earth. Another saved the whole world

---

(176) With this somewhat grotesque epitheton, Gregory alludes to Paul's description of his own ecstasy ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ (2Cor 12,2).

(177) According to Hermogenes, the ἐνθύμημα should be characterised by δεινότης, and the ἐπενθύμημα by περιττοτέρα δεινότης (Rabe pp. 150 and 154).

from the Flood, with a few souls and all kinds of floating seed:
the great Noah. And Abraham (became) the father of cities and peoples,
after he had tied even his son to the altar as a sacrifice for Christ.
Moses led his people away from the oppression of Egypt
to the accompaniment of great miracles, and on the mountain he received the law
inscribed on stone Tablets, and he stood face to face with God.
A faithful priest among the people of earlier times was Aaron.
The good Joshua brought the course of moon and sun to a halt,
and in this way brought murder and mourning to the enemies for a longer period.
And you, blessed, pure Samuel, who anointed the kings from the horn pot!
David was renowned among all kings,
and Solomon the most famous for his wisdom. The Prophets
I will not forget either. Elijah was taken up to heaven on a chariot.
Who does not stand in amazement before the link between law and spirit,
John the Precursor, who loudly proclaimed the supreme light?
Who can fail to be amazed at the famous twelve disciples who came later?
Who is not impressed by the force of the great-hearted Paul, who entered the heavens,
and by the other excellent people from past and present,
foundation of doctrine, pride of the world, support of the people?
All of them have been given to mankind through marriage and Christ.
Again, even the women who acquired their good reputation from their piety,
and who are present in large numbers in the God-inspired books,
have not acquired their good fame without marriage and body.
Let me give an even stronger argument in honour of this love of mine.
Christ also has come among the people through a human womb, albeit a pure one,
and slipped into the world from an engaged woman,
thus uniting half of a human marriage with divinity.
I have still one strong point, which surpasses all others, if the unmarried ones might prevail:
they too belong, like everyone, to my kind,
since married ones do not come from unmarried ones, but rather the unmarried from marriage.
We urge our children: cease your efforts.
Even if you yourselves are no parents, then you are still born from parents (178).

---

(178) I.2.1, vv.296–341 (*PG* 37,544–8).

In v.335, Gregory describes the birth of Christ with a rather irreverent term, which was usually pejorative in the writings of the Church Fathers (cf. *PGL* s.v.): διολισθαίνω means « slip away, slide through » (Gregory himself uses the *simplex* ὀλισθαίνω three times more for being born, but in two cases it is in a complaint about life – nothing but trouble from birth on – while in the third he speaks about animals). One might wonder whether he did not consciously put this in the mouths of those who support the married state, whose arguments – also the one about the birth of Christ – he will later refute, cf. quotation p.89. In any case, he prepares Παρθενίη's answer, for example by mentioning Solomon's wisdom in v.321: Παρθενίη will refer to Solomon's affairs with women (179). Is it possible then, when we regard the fact that he uses the Hermogenic form of argumentation especially (and exceptionally) in this speech, intended as it is to be refuted, to draw conclusions on his appreciation of this form?

2) *Degrees of similarity*

(o) general survey

For all *exempla probationis* (and also of some ornamental exempla), I have attempted to specify to what degree of similarity the illustrantia relate to their respective illustranda, on the basis of the division into ἀφ' ὁμοίου (or ἀπ' ἴσου: the « normal » relation), ἀπ' ἐναντίου, ἀπὸ μείζονος and ἀπ' ἐλάττονος, discussed on p.42. In the treatment of the two *a fortiori* forms (the last two), I make a distinction according to the cause of the incomplete similarity (usually deed or person).

The following table provides a survey of Gregory's use of these four topoi, in correlation with function (only evidence and model) and matter (pagan and biblical; the few exempla from Christian history are not included). Not all exempla belong to one of the four sections: six cases are called « *non*-similar » (these are the cases of which Gregory denies the similarity; they will be treated in the paragraph on the λύσις), and a larger number did not fit into the classification, for example because the same history is used both ἀφ' ὁμοίου and ἀπ' ἐναντίου (180). At the bottom of the table, I mention the totals; in the « matter »–column, two figures are listed: the number of biblical and pagan *exempla probationis*, and the total number. The totals are somewhat higher than those of the general table, because here, the alternative or problematic exempla are not eliminated.

---

(179) Vv.496-497 (*PG* 37,559): Καὶ Σολομὼν τὰ πρῶτα σοφός, μετέπειτα κάκιστος...

(180) This goes, for example, for many parables in I,1,27.

	FUNCTION			MATTER	
	EVIDENCE	MODEL		BIBLICAL	PAGAN
ἀφ᾽ ὁμοίου	147	146		206	84
ἀπ᾽ ἐναντίου	1	56		41	18
ἀπὸ μείζονος	2	38		38	1
ἀπ᾽ ἐλάττονος	11	24		12	24
non-similar	4	2		6	0
TOTAL	167	289	evid/mod:	303	127
			total:	511	292

The figures are not at all evenly distributed. For many topoi there is a significant deviation from the average ratio, so that, even before a further analysis, we can conclude that there does indeed exist a correlation between degrees of similarity on the one hand and both function and matter on the other.

In the division according to function, it is remarkable that the majority of exempla with evidential function show the highest possible degree of similarity (ἀφ᾽ ὁμοίου) (181). Of course, this is not surprising in itself, and moreover it is related to the already discussed strong presence of inductive exempla in Gregory's poems: these are by definition ἀφ᾽ ὁμοίου, or more precisely ἀπ᾽ ἴσου (182). The other three topoi are concentrated in the exempla with model function, the deviation being strongest in the case of ἀπ᾽ ἐναντίου (183): this degree of similarity is found especially in exempla with dissuasive model function (directed at ἀποτροπῇ) (184).

---

(181) The number of non-similar exempla is too small to draw actual conclusions from, but it cannot be coincidental that – precisely at this inversion of the ἀφ᾽ ὁμοίου – the evidential function also scores higher than the model function.

(182) Strictly speaking, the inductive exempla do not belong to any degree of similarity, as in these exempla, the relation between illustrans and illustrandum is not based on analogy, but on inclusion.

(183) The one exemplum with evidential function (II.2.1, vv.345-352) is moreover a problematic case.

(184) Analogously, these are also relatively most numerous in the dissuasive *moralia*: this class of poems represents about 2.500 of the 17.000 verses, but contains 15 of the 57 exempla ἀπ᾽ ἐναντίου.

The distribution according to matter is somewhat more balanced: the first (and numerically most important) two topoi show an average relation. The strong - mutually opposite - variations in the two *a fortiori* forms are the more striking for it. This will be emphasized in the further discussion: I shall successively deal with pagan and biblical exempla.

(1) ἀπ' ἐναντίου (185)

In fact, this is a negative exemplum: it is quoted in contrast with the case, or - as usual in the case of a model - to prevent history from repeating itself. Hence, many παραδείγματα ἀπ' ἐναντίου are inserted by means of a negative sentence. That was for instance the case in the passage quoted on p.87, in which Peter and Phocas confronted their father with **mythological** histories: Μή σε, πάτερ, τούτων τιν' ἀριθμήσειεν ἀοιδός. As another illustration, I quote a passage with **biblical** exempla, from the « Admonitions to the celibates. » They are urged to live up to their promise:

Τίς δ' ἀΐων Σάπφειραν ἀτάσθαλον, Ἀνανίην τε,
Κέρδεος οἳ σφετέροιο κακὸν μόρον ἠλλάξαντο,
Οὐ τρομέει καὶ μικρὸν ὑποσχεσίης τι κολούειν;
Καὶ γλῶσσαν χρυσέην τις, ἐπεὶ νοσφίσατο λάθρῃ
Ἀνδράσιν ἐν προτέροισι, παρεκνόον ἡγεμονῆος,
Εἱμά τε, χρῆμά τε βαιόν, ὅλῳ δηλήσατο λαῷ.
Who can stand to hear the history of the reckless Sapphira and Ananias,
who paid for their pursuit of gain with a shameful death,
without fear of being only slightly remiss in his promise?
Another, a man from ancient times, secretly stole a gold bar, without the knowledge of the leader,
and a dress and some money: he caused damage to the whole people (186).

---

(185) I shall not further examine the « normal » degree of similarity (ἀφ' ὁμοίου / ἴσου).

(186) I.2.2. vv.432-437 (*PG* 37.612): the histories of Ananias and Saphira (Acts 5,1-11) and Achan (Jos 7) are placed next to each other in or.34,14 as well. Also in this passage, Achan is not called by name. In or.34 (*PG* 36.253C), they are quoted ἀπ' ἐλάττονος: if they are already punished so severely for the theft of cheap goods, then how much harsher should the heretic's punishment be αὐτὴν κλέπτων θεότητα, καὶ ψευδόμενος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ Θεόν;.

(2) *ἀπὸ μείζονος*

Gregory adopts this topos only in one **pagan** exemplum, and not even in his own name: it is quoted by Vitalianus' sons, who suspected that things were going too well in their family, which eventually caused their present troubles:

> Ὦ Σαμίων ποτ' ἄναξ, σὺ Πολύκρατες, οἷον ἐμήσω;
> Δείσας εὐτυχίης δρόμον ἄσχετον, ἔμβαλες ἅλμῃ
> Πόρκην, ὃν φιλέεσκες, ὅπως φθόνον ἐξαρέσαιο·
> Καὶ τὸν μὲν πάλιν εἶχες, ἀτὰρ μόρον οὐχ ὑπάλυξας.
> Ἡμῶν δ' οὐδὲν ἄποινον ἔχει φθόνος. Οὐ μέγα θαῦμα.
> Εἴ τι δόμοις καὶ βαιὸν ἐπήχλυσεν ἡμετέροισιν.
> *You, Polycrates, once king of the Samians, what kind of plan did you think up?*
> *Anxious about the permanently prosperous course of your life, you threw a ring,*
> *to which you were very attached, into the sea, to quiet down Envy.*
> *You recovered the ring, but you did not escape death.*
> *But we have not given Envy the slightest ransom. Hence, it is no wonder*
> *if a small misfortune has come to darken our house* (187).

The exemplum functions as evidence, and the reasoning is clearly ἀπὸ μείζονος πράξεως (even those who tried to quiet down envy did not escape the reversal of fate).

In this category, only one of the **biblical** exempla has *evidential* function (also ἀπὸ μείζονος πράξεως): the multiplication of the loaves, to which Gregory refers in his exhortation to live soberly and with trust in God:

> Σοὶ δὲ μέριμνα μία πρὸς Θεὸν ἀεὶ βλέπειν.
> Ἡ χρεία δ' ἔστω ὀλίγη μᾶζα, καὶ μικρὰ σκέπη.
> (...)
> Ἵνα σὺ μάθῃς, παρθένε, πρὸς Θεὸν μόνον βλέπειν,
> Ὃς ἐν ἐρήμῳ τρέφειν οἶδε καὶ μυριάδας.
> *For you, there may only be one concern: always to keep your eyes bent on God.*
> *Let your need be only a little bread, and a humble shelter,*
> *(...)*

---

(187) II.2.3, vv.42-46 (*PG* 37.1483). The legend of Polycrates is recounted even more elaborately in II.1.34, but without mention of the unfortunate outcome. The *Ernstbedeutung* is different in the two cases.

that you may learn, virgin, to keep your eyes fixed on God alone,
who was able to feed even thousands of people in the desert (188).

Of the exempla with *model* function some are ἀπὸ μείζονος πράξεως, others ἀπὸ μείζονος προσώπου. An example of the first type can be found at the end of the letter of Vitalianus' sons: they try to persuade their father to be conciliatory by referring to David's attitude towards Absalom, who had done his father a much greater injustice:

Δαυΐδ, ὃς βασιλεῦσι μετέπρεπεν Ἀβραμίδῃσι,
Πᾶσι μὲν ἤπιος ἦε, τόσον δέ τε παισὶν ἑοῖσιν,
320 Ὡς καὶ πατροφόνοισι χόλον καὶ κήδεα πέσσειν.
Τεκμαίρου βασιλῆϊ τὸν ἀντία θωρηχθέντα,
Ὄζῳ θ' ἡμιόνῳ τε, θανόνθ' ὑπὸ δάσκιον ὕλην,
Οὐχ οἷον θρήνοισιν ἐκλαύσατο, ὥς τιν' ἄριστον,
Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀγγείλαντι δίκην ἐπέθηκε φονῆος (189).
Τύνη δ', ὦ κακόβουλε, πόσον κακόν, ἢ τί πεπονθώς,
Ὧδε χόλον ἀδάμαστον ἐνὶ φρεσὶ σῇσιν ἀέξεις;
Οὔτε σε πατρῴης ἀπεμέρσαμεν, ὦ ἄνα, τιμῆς·
Οὐδὲ μὲν ἀσταχύεσσιν ἐπεγράψαμεν σέο χώρης,
Οὐδὲ βοῶν ἀγέλαις, οὐ πώεσιν, οὐδὲ μὲν ἵπποις·
330 Οὐδὲ λέχους ἐπέβημεν, ὃ μὴ φίλον ἀφραδέοντες,
Οὐδὲ δόλον φρασάμεσθα σὺν ἀνδράσι δυσμενέεσσι.
Ταῦτα γὰρ εἴ τι χόλοιο φέρει, πάτερ, οὐ νεμεσητόν.
David, pre-eminent among the kings of Abraham's lineage,
was kind-hearted towards everyone; towards his children even to the point
of suppressing his angry concern over parricides.
As evidence you have the son who took up arms against the king,
and who died on a mule, caught on a branch in a thick shady wood.
David bemoaned him not only with lamentations, as if he were an excellent son,
but moreover, he charged the messenger with the punishment for a murderer.
You, on the contrary, with your faulty judgement, what sort of evil have you been through,

---

(188) I,2,3, vv.79–80 and 88–89 (*PG* 37,639). In between, we also find a παράδειγμα ἀπ' ἐλαττόνων προσώπων from nature, plucked right out of the gospels: Οὐ χείρων εἶ πετεινῶν σχεδίως τρεφομένων (v.84; cf.Matt. 6.26 and Luke 12,24).

(189) Gregory makes a contamination: not the messenger who reported Absalom's death (the whole passage in 2Rg 18), but the messenger who reported Saul's death was executed by order of David (2Rg 1.15). He makes the same mistake in I.2.25, v.214. The Maurists do not seem to see through the cause of the wrong version.

that you cherish such an unrelenting grudge in your heart?
We have not withheld from you, my lord, the respect due to a father;
we have not assaulted the cornfields on your territory,
nor your herds of cattle, nor your sheep nor your horses.
We have not defiled your bed in mindless hostility,
and have not devised a scheme with ill-disposed men.
If such a thing provokes a feeling of rage, father, we cannot hold that against you (190).

The next example is ἀπὸ μείζονος προσώπου, and comes from the poem against anger. One of the methods recommended by Gregory to endure the other's anger is humility.

Σποδὸν δέ, καὶ γῆν, καὶ σκιὰν καλουμένους
Αὐτοὺς ὑφ' αὑτῶν οἶδα τοὺς Θεῷ φίλους,
Ὡς ἄν τι συστέλλωσι τῆς ἐπάρσεως.
Σὺ δ', ὡς ἄριστος, τὰς ὕβρεις ἀπαξιοῖς;
Ashes, and dust, and shadow, that is what I know
friends of God naturally call themselves,
to suppress even a hint of pride.
And you think you are too good to endure insults, as if you were the best of all? (191).

The same reasoning ἀπὸ μείζονος προσώπου goes for Christ's suffering to the highest degree. In the same poem, after other exempla, Christ is indeed presented as the climax of endurance (see p.81 for the broad context). The last verses clearly express the cause of the incomplete similarity:

Ταῦτ' οὐ προδήλως τῆς Θεοῦ τυπώσεως (192),
Καὶ τῶν ἐκείνου καὶ παθῶν καὶ δογμάτων,
Ὃς ὢν Θεός τε καὶ κεραυνῶν δεσπότης,

---

(190) II,2,3, vv.318-332 (*PG* 37,1503-4). Verses 327-331 still (or again) deal with Absalom: Gregory alludes to respectively 2Rg 15,3; 2Rg 14,30; 2Rg 16,21-22 and 2Rg 17. In the discussion of the literary form of the exempla, I shall elaborate on this kind of combination of explicit and allusive references to related episodes. Cosmas does not see through this technique, as he talks about Zeus and Cronus, Ruben and Jacob, and Joseph and his brothers in an attempt to seek a history behind each of these verses.

(191) I,2,25, vv.432-435 (*PG* 37,843). Ashes, dust and shadow: this is indeed what Abraham (Gn 18,27) and Job (Job 42,6) call themselves. Not only did Abraham and Job have much less reason, as God's friends, to endure humiliations, furthermore they did it themselves and out of their own free will: actually both person and deed are dissimilar.

(192) Ταῦτα refers to Stephen's martyrdom.

240 Ὡς ἀμνὸς ἤγετ' εἰς σφαγὴν ἀφωνίᾳ;
(...)
Τοιαῦτα καὶ τοσαῦτα τοῦ σοῦ Δεσπότου.
250 Οἷς, ἄν τι πάσχοις, ἀντισηκώσεις τὰ σά.
Κἂν πάνθ' ὑποστῇς, τὸ πλέον λελείψεται·
Εἴπερ τὸ πάσχειν κρίνεται πρὸς ἀξίαν.
Does that (sc. Stephen's martyrdom) *not clearly conform with the pattern of God,*
in both his suffering and his teaching?
Even though God and ruler of lightning,
he was led like a lamb to the slaughter, without a word.
(...)
So awful and so numerous were your Lord's sufferings.
If you suffer of something, then weigh it up against that:
even if you have to endure everything, most of it will be missing,
since suffering is judged by worth (193).

(3) ἀπ' ἐλάττονος (194)

As was clear from the table on p.96, this topos is the only one of which there are mostly **pagan** examples in Gregory's poems. Only in three cases, these pagan exempla have evidential function. All three of them are fables (thus ἀπ' ἐλαττόνων προσώπων), of which the most elaborated – that of the owl – will be discussed further on in the text (195).

The 21 others function as model; most of these (15) are derived from I.2.10, in which they are repeatedly labelled as παραδείγματα ἀπ' ἐλαττόνων προσώπων: we already noted this in the fragment quoted on p.78 (ῥόδ' ἐξ ἀκανθῶν, ὡς λέγουσι, συλλέγων, / ἐκ τῶν ἀπίστων μανθάνων τὰ κρείσσονα). The conclusion of a series of Greek exempla of σωφροσύνη is equally rich in imagery:

Ταῦτ' ἐστὶ τῶν ἐμῶν μὲν οὐδὲν πλησίον,

---

(193) I,2,25, vv.237-240 and 249-252 (*PG* 37,830-1).

(194) Gregory readily adopts this topos in nature exempla (see also n.188), e.g. expressly in I,2,2, vv.534-559 (*PG* 37.620-2), in which Gregory refers to chaste animals to argue the feasibility of celibacy for man: Ὦ φύσι παμμήτειρα, σὰ δ', οὐκ ἐμὰ θαύματα λέξω, / Ὅσσα καὶ ἐν χέρσοισι καὶ ἐν πελάγεσσιν ἔθηκας. (...) Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀφραδέεσσι σαοφροσύνης τι μέμηλε, / Πλάσμα Θεοῦ, σὺ δὲ σαρκὸς ὅλον νόμον οὔτι πεδήσεις, / Ἣν ἐθέλῃς; Εἰκτὸς δὲ λόγῳ βροτός, ὡς πυρὶ χαλκός (vv.534-535 and 557-559). Related to this is the mention of the Alpheus (I,2,2, vv.596-599), which does belong to the listed exempla because of its mythological background.

(195) Cf. p.106, see especially the concluding verses. The two other fables are that of the fat and the lean cow (I,1,6, vv.88-96) and that of Aphrodite and Momus (I,2,2, vv.246-247).

> ὅμως δ' ἐπαινῶ· καὶ πόθεν; λευκὴν ἰδεῖν
> μορφὴν ἐν Αἰθίοψιν, ἡλίκη χάρις
> ἢ καὶ θαλάσσης ἐν μέσῳ νᾶμα γλυκύ.
> ὡς δ' ἐν πονηροῖς καὶ κακοῖς διδάγμασιν
> ἔχειν τι σῶφρον, ἡ μεγίστου θαύματος.
> *All these examples do not even come close to those from our tradition;*
> *and yet I cite them with praise. And why? To see a white*
> *shape among the Ethiopians: how delightful!*
> *Or a freshwater flow in the middle of the sea!*
> *Thus too to find among shameful and bad instructions*
> *an example of self-control: a fabulous miracle* (196).

Yet the most striking formulation of this attitude towards the Greeks as exemplary characters is found in the poem against anger, in the transition between the biblical and the pagan exempla (cf. p.81):

> Ἀρκεῖ τάδ' ἡμῖν εὐγενῆ παιδεύματα,
> Πλακῶν νόμοι τε καὶ τρόποι τῶν ἐξ ὄρους.
> Ἢ δεῖ τι τούτοις προστεθῆναι καὶ νόθον;
> Καὶ χεῖρον οὐδέν· ὡς τι κἀν τοῖς χείροσι
> Τῶν κρεισσόνων τε καὶ φίλων δρεψώμεθα.
> Ὧν γὰρ κρατεῖν καὶ σφόδρα, οὐ σφόδρ' αἰνετόν,
> Τούτων κρατεῖσθαι καὶ λίαν, πόσον κακόν!
> Μεμνήσομαι δὲ καί τινων, καὶ συντόμως.
> *Where we are concerned these noble lessons suffice,*
> *the laws and the morals of the Tablets of the Mount;*
> *or should we add something of spurious origin to this?*
> *And it is not at all inferior: let us pick even from the inferior ones*
> *what is best and valued by us.*
> *Since surpassing them, even to a great extent, is not very meritorious,*
> *while to be surpassed by them, and greatly at that, is a disgrace.*
> *Hence, I will call some to mind, and this concisely* (197).

Here as well we clearly deal with παραδείγματα ἀπ' ἐλαττόνων προσώπων: of the 24 pagan exempla ἀπ' ἐλάττονος, there are 23 in which the *a fortiori* reasoning depends on the intrinsic inferiority of the quoted characters (198): in 3 cases fables are involved, in all others, Greeks. Conversely, we noted that only one pagan exemplum was quoted ἀπὸ μείζονος, and in that case ἀπὸ μείζονος πράξεως was concerned. Hence, Gregory's method rather resembles the practice of Tertullian, who inserted positive pagan exempla *ex minore ad maius*, than that of Jerome, who hardly made use of *exempla ex minore ad maius* (and *exempla contraria*).

---

(196) I,2,10, vv.823-828 (*PG* 37,739). Notice the allusion to the Alpheus myth (v.826), here as embellishment.

(197) I,2,25, vv.253-259 (*PG* 37,831). Hereupon follow (variations on) anecdotes - known also from other authors - about Aristotle, Alexander, Pericles, Euclides (? anonymous), and a unique anecdote about Constantius, who is thus aligned with the historical characters from pagan antiquity.

The **biblical** exempla ἀπ' ἐλάττονος are less numerous, and in some cases less clear. Five of the twelve are ἀπ' ἐλάττονος πράξεως, and are found in one and the same passage; the addressed character is not valued more highly than the exemplary characters. In his indictment against the degeneration of the episcopacy (II,1, 13), Gregory refers to biblical exempla of profanation and their punishment. First, he tells how, at Moses' ascent, the Sinai was inaccessible to man and beast, under penalty of annihilation; then he tells of the death of Aaron's sons Nadab and Abihu; then of the death of Eli's sons (vv.116–133). *Ernstbedeutung* and conclusion follow before the last two illustrantia:

> Εἰ δὲ τόσῃ τοίῃσιν ἁμαρτάσι μῆνις ἔπεστιν,
> Ὁσσατίης δέος ἐστὶν ἐπὶ πλεόνεσσι κακοῖσι!
> Καὶ σέ, κιβωτὸν ἄνασσαν, ὃς ἤδρασε χειρὶ βεβήλῳ
> Κλινομένην, θάνεν αἶψα. Θεοῦ δέ τε νηὸν ἔθηκεν
> Ἄψαυστον παλάμῃσιν, ἐρείσματα τἄκτοθι τοίχων.
> *If violations of this kind evoke such wrath,*
> *how much greater a punishment should we fear at more numerous offences!*
> *Also he who with a profane hand supported you, royal Ark,*
> *when you were about to fall, immediately died. And God's temple was*
> *guarded against the touch of hands, by the outer retaining walls* (199).

These exempla have an analogically evidential function, like three of the biblical ἀπ' ἐλαττόνων προσώπων. Two of these have already been quoted: Eve and Seth as an argument for the ὁμοουσία of Son and Spirit (p.85); the third is open to different interpretations:

---

(198) The only case in which the deed causes the incomplete similarity (ἀπ' ἐλάττονος πράξεως), is II,1,12, vv.595–597 (*PG* 37,1209), but there, the illustrans (Crates who threw his possessions overboard) is incorporated into an anonymous allusion, and has an embellishing function: οὗτος πένης νῦν, ἦν δ' ὅτε ζάπλουτος ἦν· / ἀλλ' ἐκβολὴν ἔστερξε καὶ κοῦφος πλέει / ῥίψας πένησιν, οὐ βυθῷ, τὸ φορτίον.

(199) II,1,13, vv.134-138 (*PG* 37,1238). Uzza was not even of ill will (in contrast with Aaron's and Eli's sons) when he supported the toppling Ark of the Covenant (2Rg 6,6-7).

> Ἄρτοις τρέφονται πέντε μύριος λεώς·
> Πόσον σὺ μᾶλλον, ἡ Θεοῦ παραστάτις;
> *With loaves of bread a crowd of five thousand people was fed;*
> *how much more then you who are close to God?* (200).

Finally, I quote a peculiar example of a paradigmatic prayer (thus with model function), in which Gregory seems to place himself in all humility above some New Testament characters:

> Τί μ' ἄλγεσι τόσσον ἐλαύνεις;
> Οὔτ' ἀγαθοῖσι μόνοισι θάνες, Θεὸς εὖτ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν
> Ἤλυθες (ὢ μέγα θαῦμα, Θεὸς βροτὸς αἵματι ῥαίνων
> Ψυχὰς ἡμετέρας καὶ σώματα), οὔτε κάκιστος
> Μοῦνος ἐγώ. Πολλοῖσι χερείοσι κῦδος ὄπασσας.
> Τρεῖς βίβλοισι τεῇσι μεγακλέες εἰσὶ τελῶναι,
> Ματθαῖός τε μέγας, νηῷ τ' ἔνι δάκρυα λείψας,
> Ζακχαῖός τ' ἐπὶ τοῖσιν· ὁ τέτρατος αὐτὸς ἔοιμι.
> *Why do you try me so sorely with torments?*
> *After all you did not only die for the good ones, when you came to earth*
> *as God (what a great miracle, a God-man who sprinkles*
> *our souls and bodies with his blood); and not I alone am bad*
> *through and through. To far worse people have you granted glory.*
> *There are three renowned tax collectors in your books:*
> *the great Matthew, and he who shed tears in the temple,*
> *and finally Zacchaeus; grant me to be the fourth* (201).

---

(200) I.2.6. vv.51-52 (*PG* 37,647). If my interpretation (*a fortiori* based on the greater merit of the παρθένος, not on the greater difficulty to feed 5000 people) is correct, the exemplum of the multiplication of the loaves has another *Ernstbedeutung* here than in the passage quoted above from I,2,3 (cf. p.98), to which this text bears resemblance (e.g. in the direct context of both passages, allusions are made to Elijah's stay with the widow of Zarephat, where the oil jug could not be emptied). My interpretation is founded - along with the most obvious reading of the text itself - also on the parallel (probably conscious) from Luke 12,28, in which Jesus concludes after referring to flowers and birds (quoted in I,2,3 ἀπ' ἐλάττονος, cf. n.188): πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὑμᾶς, ὀλιγόπιστοι.

(201) II,1,19, vv.86-93 (*PG* 37,1278). The plea continues analogously with the cure of three lame persons and the raising of three dead ones. Reasonably, one can expect at the most that Gregory finds himself less corrupt than the three publicans. But even this is unsure: if χερείοσι from v.90 has no comparative value, these three παραδείγματα should not be considered as ἀπ' ἐλαττόνων προσώπων.
The last and only irrefutable example in which a contemporary person is placed above a biblical character, is II,1,11, vv.1838-1842 (*PG* 37,1158): in

3) Λύσις παραδείγματος

As pointed out, the ancient rhetoricians gave two further unspecified methods to refute an argumentation with exempla: giving counter examples (as in Aristotle: the argument of the opponent is thus revealed as unnecessary), and pointing out that the quoted examples are not appropriate or similar. Gregory most frequently uses the second method, which I shall treat first.

(1) contestation of the validity of the quoted examples

This method can be subdivided into two main types: either the interpretation of the quoted illustrantia itself is contested (the correctness of the *Eigenbedeutung*), or their validity for the particular case is challenged (the appropriateness of the *Ernstbedeutung*). These two types can be summarized as respectively *« no »* and *« yes, but »*.

Of the first type, I have found only one example in Gregory's poems: in the dogmatic poem Περὶ Προνοίας (I,1,5), which mainly consists of a refutation of astrology (vv.15-33 and 45-64). He anticipates a remark about the star of Bethlehem: those who see its function of messenger as an example of an astrological phenomenon misinterpret this history, since precisely this episode meant the fall of astrologers and their art:

> Σιγάσθω Χριστοῖο μέγα κλέος ἄγγελος ἀστὴρ
> Ἀντολίηθε Μάγοισιν ἐπὶ πτόλιν ἡγεμονεύσας.
> (...)
> Τῆμος ὅτ᾽ ἀστρολόγοισιν ὁμοῦ πέσε μήδεα τέχνης,
> Ἀστρολόγων τὸν ἄνακτα σὺν οὐρανίοισι σεβόντων.
> *Let us have no talk of that great glory of Christ, the star in the east*
> *giving its message to the Magi, leading them to the town (...).*
> *It was at this very time that the cleverness of the astrologers' craft came crashing down,*
> *when astrologers joined heavenly beings in worshipping the king* (202).

---

his valediction in Constantinople Gregory compares himself to Jonah, who was also thrown overboard during a storm; but in contrast with Jonah, Gregory is not to blame for the storm: καίπερ κλύδωνος τυγχάνων ἀναίτιος (v.1840). Gero apparently misinterprets this passage, when he judges v.1840 as « a disclaimer which, of course, runs counter to the biblical story ». Gregory does *not* suggest that Jonah was innocent.

(202) I,1,5, vv.53-54 and 63-64 (*PG* 37,428-9, translation Sykes, *translation*). In between these verses, Gregory explains his thesis: the star had never previously appeared, and the Chaldaeans knew of its coming and meaning because it was announced in the Jewish books.

The second type of contestation (*yes, but*) is found much more frequently. It is adopted for example in the two passages in which Gregory uses the term παράδειγμα for the examples of a fictitious opponent that are to be refuted. In the poem against avarice (I,2,28), Gregory laments the fact that greedy persons do not realize that they suffer from a disease (which is hard to cure); moreover, these patients look for excuses, among other things by referring to certain examples (not specified by Gregory). He considers the quoting of παραδείγματα in one's defence as τοῦ τρόπου φυγή (v.218) and σοφίσματα (v.234). It is amusing that he himself appeals to a vivid exemplary beast fable (probably of his own invention) for his refutation, which is presented to the opponent ἀπ' ἐλάττονος.

> Πρὸς τὰ παραδείγματ' εὐθέως ἀνατρέχει.
> Τί τοῦτο, Χριστέ; πῶς δέδωκας τοῖς κακοῖς
> Τὰ τῶν ἀρίστων ἔστιν ὧν προσκρούσματα,
> Ὡς ἄν τιν' εὑρίσκωσι **τοῦ τρόπου φυγήν;**
> Καλὸν μὲν οὐδείς, καὶ πλέον, λογίζεται,
> 220 Κακὸν δέ, καὶ μικρόν τι, γίνεται πίναξ
> Τοῖς ἀφρονεστέροις τε καὶ κακωτέροις.
> Καλοῖς σίδηρος, κηρὸς ἐν τοῖς χείροσιν
> Εἰσί, τὸ χεῖρον ῥαδίως τυπούμενοι (203).
> «Οὐ σωφρονῶ· τί δ'; ἄλλος οὐχ εὑρίσκεται
> Τοιοῦτος;» Οἴμοι! καὶ σοφῶν λέξει τινά (204).
> «Κτείνω· τί δ'; οὐχὶ κἀνθάδ' εὑρεθήσεται
> Τῶν τις παλαιῶν, ἢ νέων; Πλουτῶ κακῶς·
> Ἔθνη δέ τ' ἄλλος καὶ πόλεις ἐκτήσατο» (205).
> (...)
> 232 Πρὸς ταῦτα καί τι μυθολογῆσαί σοι θέλω,
> Εἰ δεῖ τι παίζειν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν συμφορῶν,
> Μῦθον πρέποντα τοῖσδε τοῖς **σοφίσμασι**.
> Τὴν γλαῦκ' ἐπέσκωπτέ τις· ἣδ' ἐφύγγανεν
> Τῶν σκωμμάτων ἕκαστον εὐστόχῳ λόγῳ·
> «Ὅσον κάρηνον! – Τοῦ Διὸς δὲ πηλίκον! (206) –

---

(203) Reference has already been made to the affinity between παράδειγμα and τύπος (n.37); also the synonymity of παράδειγμα (in model meaning) and πίναξ (see v.220) has already been mentioned (p.60).

(204) Gregory himself frequently refers to the less admirable adventures of David (with Bathsheba) and especially of his son Solomon: cf. inventory 2.

(205) Compare with I,2,1, v.311 about Abraham (quoted on p.92).

(206) Allusion to the birth of Athena from Zeus' head.

Ἡ γλαυκότης δέ! – Τοῦτο τῆς Γλαυκώπιδος. –
Φθέγγῃ δύστηχον. – Ἡ δὲ κίττα καὶ πλέον. –
240 Τὸ λεπτόπουν πῶς; – Ψὴρ δέ σοι τί φαίνεται; »
Ἐπεὶ δὲ πάντα διέδρασε ῥαδίως,
Ἑνὶ κρατεῖται, καὶ σοφή περ οὖσ' ὅμως.
« Ἀλλ', ὦ σοφή, σκόπησον, ὡς τούτων μὲν ἓν
Ἑνὶ πρόσεστι, σοὶ δ' ἅπαντα καὶ λίαν·
Γλαυκή, δύστηχος, λεπτόπους, βαρύκρανος. »
Τούτοις ἀπῆλθεν ἐντραπεῖσ' ἡ φιλτάτη.
Σὺ δ' οὐδὲ τοῦτο. ἀλλὰ κἂν μύθῳ πολὺ
Ἔστιν τις ὄρνις σῆς φρενὸς σοφώτερος.
Ἑνὸς τὰ πάντα· τοῦτό σου τὸ δυσχερές.
He immediately resorts to the examples.
What is it, Christ? Why did you give bad people
the offensive behaviour of some of the best,
so that they find a pretext for their behaviour?
The good nobody takes into account, even if it is predominant,
but the bad, on however small a scale, is the example
for the more foolish and depraved people.
With regard to the good, these are of iron, of wax with regard to the bad,
easily made to conform to the bad.
« I not chaste? What of it? Can no one else be found
like me? » Unfortunately, he will name one of the wise men.
« I commit a murder. What of it? Are there no comparable people
in ancient or modern times? » « I use my wealth badly?
Others have got their hands on whole peoples and cities. »
(…)
In response I want to tell you a fable,
- if I may jest for a while in the middle of these unfortunate circumstances -,
a fable which fits in with your sophisms.
The owl was ridiculed by someone; but he was able to escape
every gibe with a clever word:
« What an enormous head! » « And Zeus' head then, how big is that! »
« And those gleaming eyes! » « Like the goddess with gleaming eyes. »
« Your singing is horrific. » « But the jay's is even worse. »
« How thin those claws! » « What do you think of the starling's? »
Yet, when he had without difficulty escaped all the taunts,
he was checkmated with one remark, for all his mental dexterity.
« But, smart Alec, think of how one finds all of these defects
separately in one or another, but you have them all in full measure:
gleaming eyes, a false voice, twiggy claws, a fat head. »
Thereupon our dear owl slunk off in shame.
But you do not even do this. On the contrary, even the bird from the fable

> *has much more wisdom in it than your brainpan.*
> *Within yourself you combine all flaws: there lies your problem* (207).

The reasoning is clear: *yes*, there are examples, *but* you combine all weaknesses.

In the second passage with the term παράδειγμα we find a different argumentation. From the fact that Jesus was baptised and started a public life only at thirty, Gregory draws a lesson « for reckless youngsters who think they are already entitled to lecture older people »: they should be modest, not pretentious. He then anticipates a reference to Daniel and other young judges:

> Εἶτα ὁ Δανιὴλ ἐνταῦθα καὶ ὁ δεῖνα καὶ ὁ δεῖνα, νέοι κριταί, καὶ τὰ παραδείγματα ἐπὶ γλώσσης. Πᾶς γὰρ ἀδικῶν εἰς ἀπολογίαν ἕτοιμος. Ἀλλ᾽ οὐ νόμος Ἐκκλησίας τὸ σπάνιον, εἴπερ μηδὲ μία χελιδὼν ἔαρ ποιεῖ μηδὲ γραμμὴ μία τὸν γεωμέτρην ἢ πλοῦς εἷς τὸν θαλάττιον. *But here it may be said, Daniel, and this or that other, were judges in their youth, and examples are on your tongues; for every wrongdoer is prepared to defend himself. But I reply that that which is rare is not the law of the Church. For one swallow does not make a summer, nor one line a geometrician, nor one voyage a sailor* (208).

Here as well, then, we find a distinctly negative judgment on the abuse of exempla as a pretext (compare with the first verse of the preceding fragment), but with a different refutation: *yes*, there are examples, *but* the exceptions prove the rule.

A third type of counterargument follows the scheme *yes*, there are examples of people who acted or were alike, *but* otherwise you are not like the people from these examples. This type is used in a fragment from the poem against gaudy women:

---

(207) I,2,28, vv.215-249 (*PG* 37,872-4). According to STERNBACH, *Dilucidationes* p.24, this fable comes « ex fonte nobis ignoto »; WYSS, *Dichter* p.195, shares this opinion. MASSON-VINCOURT p.182 posits that « lorsqu'il ne dispose pas de mythe païen susceptible de rendre compte de sa pensée, il invente une fable appropriée, à laquelle il juge nécessaire de donner le ton des fables grecques en y introduisant des divinités. » From this statement, one might erroneously deduce that this was Gregory's habit: with the exception of one (ep.114.2-5), all other beast epics, whether or not with mythological bias, are found in the category of Aesopean and related fables (see partly Wyss *ibidem* n.48, and more complete in inventory 2). Still, I,2,29 contains a fable that is most probably invented by Gregory himself (vv.187-206, a kind of aetiological myth about the blush of shame, which recalls Aristophanes' myth in Plato's Symposium). Also I,2,26, vv.1-6 is a fable-like tale which should probably be ascribed to Gregory.

(208) Or.39.14 (*PG* 36,352A-B, translation BROWNE-SWALLOW p.357).

> « Ἐσθὴρ εἶδος ἔτευξεν ἐράσμιον. » ἀλλὰ τί κείνης
> ἔργον ἀριπρεπέης; ἔθνος ἔμεινεν ὅλον.
> γράψε ποτ᾽ ὄμματα πόρνα Ἰεζάβελ ἀγριόθυμος·
> λοῦσέ γε μὴν πόρνας αἵματι πορνιδίῳ (209).
> σοὶ δ᾽ οὔτ᾽ ἔργον ἄνακτος ἑλεῖν χόλον οὔτ᾽ ἐνὶ πόρναις
> μοῖραν ἔχεις· τῷ μοι φείδεο σωφροσύνης.
> *« Esther worked on her appearance to make herself desirable. » But what was the point of this striking appearance? A whole people remained intact.*
> *Also the wild Jezebel once made up her eyes like a whore*
> *but then she also washed the whores with her whore's blood.*
> *But it is not your task to calm down the anger of a king, and nor is your place among the whores: hence have a proper concern for your chastity* (210).

Most refutations of the type « yes, but » appear to come from the dissuasive *moralia* (characterized by their diatribe style): I referred to passages from I,2,24, 25, 28 and 29. In all cases they were directed against people who appeal to biblical examples (with model function) as an excuse or justification for their own behaviour.

(2) counter examples

In the above passage, Gregory does not confine himself to refuting a possible apologetical reference to Esther, but he also gives a sort of counter example, by putting Jezebel next to it (whom no one would ever mention as an excuse).

A real refutation by means of counter examples can be found in the speech of Παρθενίη in I,2,1. Her answer to the final words of the supporters of marriage (discussed from p.91 on) runs as follows:

> Εἰ δὲ σοφοῖσι γέγηθας, ἐπεὶ σέθεν ἐξεγένοντο,

---

(209) Gregory confuses 3Rg 22,38 (in the LXX-version: καὶ αἱ πόρναι ἐλούσαντο ἐν τῷ αἵματι, after the story of Ahab's bloody death) and 4Rg 9,30-37 (about Jezebel who wants to seduce Jehu - καὶ ἐστιμίσατο τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῆς - and her equally bloody death); KNECHT p.25 was the first to ascertain this.

(210) I,2,29, vv.291-296 (*PG* 37,905-6). Other examples of a similar refutation: I,2,24, vv.225-232 (« Paul did swear, - yes, but you are no Paul »); I,2,25, vv.371-407 (about « God's wrath » in the Scripture, and the fury of pious men).

Δέξαι καὶ ἀλιτρῶν κακίην, ὧν ῥίζα τέτυξαι.
Ῥίζα Κάϊν, Σοδόμων τε, καὶ οὓς ἐκέδασ᾽ ἐπὶ πύργῳ
Χριστὸς ἀτασθαλέοντας, ὕβριν θ᾽ ὧν ἔσβεσεν ὄμβρος
450 Οὐρανόθεν χθόνα πᾶσαν ὁμοῦ πνείουσι καθήρας.
Τίς Φαραὼ κακόμητιν, Ἀχὰβ θράσος, Ἀσσυρίων τε
Πικροτάτους βασιλῆας ἐθρέψατο; τίς δὲ δίκαιον
Αἷμα πότῳ μάχλοις τε κινήμασι δόντα θυγατρὸς
Οὔλιον Ἡρώδην, παιδοκτόνον (211), ἠδὲ φονῆας
Χριστοῦ παμβασιλῆος, ὅσοι τ᾽ ἐγένοντο διῶκται
Πρόσθεν καὶ μετέπειτα, καὶ ὑστατίοισι χρόνοισι (212).
Ὧν πύματον πρῶτόν τε, κακὸν Βελίαο βέρεθρον,
458 Δεινὸν Ἰουλιανοῖο κράτος, ψυχῶν ὀλετῆρος,
(...)
Τίς κεν ἀριθμήσειεν; ἐπεὶ τόδε πᾶσι πέφανται,
Ὡς πλείων χρυσοῖο κόνις, πλείους δὲ κάκιστοι
Τῶν ἀγαθῶν· καὶ γάρ τε τρίβους περόωσιν ἀνίσους.
Τοῖς μὲν γὰρ χθαμαλὴ καὶ ἐπίτροχός ἐστι κακοῖσιν.
Οἱ δ᾽ ἀγαθοὶ τέμνουσι προσάντεα. Τοὔνεκεν ἐσθλῶν
Πλεῖστον ὅσον κακίους προφερέστεροί εἰσιν ἀριθμῷ.
470 Εἰ μὲν δὴ λήξειας ἀγαλλομένη τεκέεσσι,
Καὶ πηρὸν καλέουσα βίον θεότητος ἑταῖρον (213),
Στήσομεν ἐνθάδε μῦθον.

If you are so delighted with these wise people, because they are your descendants,
then also accept the wickedness of the sinners, who spring from you.
You are the root of Cain, of Sodom, of the miscreants on their tower,
whom Christ divided, of the people whose recklessness was quenched
by a torrent from heaven which purified the whole earth, living beings included.
Who bred Pharaoh with his sly plans, Ahab with his brutality, Assyria's
vindictive kings? Who the man who gave the blood of a righteous person
for a drinking-bout and the lecherous movements of his daughter,
the murderous Herod, the child-murderer; and who the murderers
of Christ the supreme king, and all persecutors that have ever been,
in early, later and recent times,

---

(211) Gregory confuses Herodes Antipas, commissioner of the beheading of John the Baptist (Matt. 14,3-12) with his father Herodes the Great, commissioner of the child-murder (Matt. 2,16). Cosmas, who had failed to notice the aforementioned contamination concerning Jezebel (n. 209) and who merely paraphrased Gregory's version, does mention the mingling in this case.

(212) There is no rift here between the biblical and the « historical » ecclesiastical history.

(213) As the supporters of marriage did in vv.288-295 (just before their praise of their children).

> *among whom the last and worst, the evil abyss of Belial,*
> *the terrible ruler Julian, corruptor of the souls?*
> *(...)*
> *Who could count them? Since it is obvious to everyone*
> *that there is more dust than gold, and more criminals*
> *than virtuous ones, since they also take different courses:*
> *some a flat and comfortable one: the bad ones,*
> *while the good ones take an uphill one. That is why*
> *the bad ones so far outnumber the good ones.*
> *If you cease now to take pride in your children,*
> *and to call deficient the life lived in friendship with God,*
> *we shall stop our oration here* (214).

Despite Aristotle's assertion that ἕν τι οὐχ οὕτω sufficed for the refutation, we find a whole list of counter examples here. Παρθενίη's argument is based in particular on the fact that the counter examples are in the majority. Moreover, this fits in better with her own denial of the assumption that Lucifer and Judas (the exceptions) would cast a slur on respectively angels and apostles (cf. p.83), - a reasoning frequently repeated by Gregory himself. The refutation by one counter example, founded on Aristotelian logic (215), is not applied in Gregory's poems.

2.1.1.2 Ornament (the ornamental exemplum)

The smaller half of the total number of exempla functions neither as evidence, nor as model, but has in first instance a « literary » function. The ancient rhetoricians did not give any specific directions for the use of the ornamental exemplum; nor does Gregory indicate explicitly that he inserts them: nowhere do the terms παράδειγμα and ὑπόδειγμα have this meaning. Hence, this micro-analysis will be rather brief.

As already pointed out, the difference with the *exemplum probationis* is sometimes quite vague (216). Exempla with evidential or model function on the one hand can sometimes have an embellishing function as well (217). On the other hand, the use of a specific history as ornament can be significant: behind the apparently superficial comparison, a deeper intention (the *Ernstbedeutung*) is hidden, which gives the text an additional dimension (218); furthermore, there are also some ornamental exempla which make use of the degrees of similarity (219).

---

(214) I,2,1, vv.446-472 (*PG* 37,556-8).

(215) Cf. supra n.57: λέλυται, ὅτι οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον.

(216) See e.g. n.150, for exemplary characters who have functioned as model in the past: within the text they no longer actually function as model, but rather as comparison.

(217) See e.g. the announcement of the fable of the owl in I,2,28, v.233: Εἰ δεῖ τι παίζειν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν συμφορῶν (cf. p.106).

---

(218) The examples are legion; I restrict myself to one pagan and one biblical.
In II.1,12, vv.136-175 (*PG* 37,1176-9), Gregory scolds the farmers, soldiers, grocers, and slaves, who become bishops from one day to the next. He compares their fast career with the attempt of dung beetles to fly to heaven: ἄνω τρέχουσι κάνθαροι πρὸς οὐρανὸν / πῶλον στρέφοντες, οὐ τὸν ἐκ κόπρων ἔτι, / οὐδ' ἐξόπισθεν, ὡς τὸ πρίν, νενευκότες,... (vv.170-172). In the fable of the dung beetle and the eagle (PERRY Appendix 650), the dung beetle finally collapses in exhaustion.
In II.2,3, vv.137-176 (*PG* 37,1490-92), Peter and Phocas complain about the contrast between Vitalianus' gentle contact with others and his stubborn rejection of his own sons: he does not even grant them the least scrap of bread: Ἀλλὰ τραπέζαις / Ἥμεθ' ἐπὶ σχεδίῃσι δυσάμμοροι, οὐδ' ὀλίγας περ, / Λάζαρος ὥς τις ἐκεῖνος, ὑπερφιάλοιο τραπέζης / Ψῖχας ἀφαρπάζοντες, ὁμὴν κυσὶ δαῖτα φέροντες (vv.148-151). The reference to the parable of poor Lazarus and the wicked rich man is an implicit warning: after his death, the latter was heavily punished. The boundary between ornament and dissuasive model is extremely vague here.
Next to the many significant ornamental exempla, there are also purely decorative ones, which are sometimes far-fetched or even misplaced. The fact that Gregory describes for example the changing attitude of Peter of Alexandria with an allusion to the rescue of Iphigenia (II.1,11, v.863, *PG* 37,1089: νῦν δ' ἧκεν ἡμῖν νεβρὸς ἀντὶ παρθένου) adds nothing to the meaning of the text. Biblical histories are also used in the same empty manner, e.g. in II.1,17, vv.51-56 (*PG* 37,1265-6), where he calls out to the Φθόνος at leaving Constantinople that he retreats to Nazianzus, and compares this to Jonah's stay in the whale: Κεῖμ'· ἐπίβαιν', ἐπίβαινε, κακὲ Φθόνε. Ἦ τάχα δή σε / Σχήσω, καὶ πυμάτοις πείρασι κευθόμενος, / Καὶ θηρὸς ζοφεροῖσιν ἐνὶ σπλάγχνοισιν ἐερχθείς, / Κήτεος εἰναλίου, ὥς ποτ' Ἰωνᾶς ἔδυ. / Σῶμα μὲν ἐν σπλάγχνοισι· νόος δ' ἀδέτοισιν ἐρωαῖς / Βήσεται, οἷ κ' ἐθέλει, καί περ ἐεργόμενος. The last verses are in flagrant contradiction with Jonah's situation (who actually did *not* want to speak); furthermore Gregory actually compares the Φθόνος (whom he flees from) with God (whom Jonah fled from).

(219) See e.g. already n.198 for Crates as παράδειγμα ἀπ' ἐλάττονος πράξεως. In II.1,19, vv.31-36 (*PG* 37,1273-4) Gregory compares himself to Job because of his ordeals, but adds immediately that it is an *exemplum dissimile* (the incomplete similarity is due to the different cause in this case, one might speak of ἀπὸ μείζονος αἰτίας): Ἄλλος Ἰὼβ νέος εἰμί· τὸ δ' αἴτιον οὐκέθ' ὅμοιον. / Οὐ γὰρ ἀεθλεύοντά μ' ἄγεις, μάκαρ, ὥς τιν' ἄριστον / Ἀντίον ἀθλητῆρος ἀπηνέος, ἀλλὰ πεποιθώς, / Ὥς κεν ἀριστεύσαντι γέρας καὶ κῦδος ὀπάσσῃς. / Οὔπω τόσσος ἔγωγ', οὐδ' ἄλγεσι κῦδος ἔπεστι. / Ποινὴν δ' ἀμπλακίης τίνω τάδε.

2.1.2 Macro-analysis

1) Frequency of the different functions

Of the 772 exempla in Gregory's poems, there are 160 with evidential function (21%), 281 with model function (36%), and 331 with ornamental function (43%). When comparing this to the evolution recorded by Le Goff from ancient to medieval (Latin) exemplum (cf. p.55), Gregory's intense use of the exemplum with ornamental function seems to be in keeping with the ancient practice, whereas the predominance of model over evidential function is rather typical of the medieval exemplum.

2) Correlation with rhetorical categories and literary genres

The parallel between the three functions of the exemplum and the three rhetorical categories brought me to postulate - in the introduction to this analysis - the hypothesis that exempla as evidence occur preferably in a judicial situation, as model in a deliberative, and as ornament in an epideictic. As emerges from the following figures, the practice is somewhat more differentiated (the first number gives the percentage of the total number of exempla, the second the number of exempla per thousand verses):

	(average)	JUDICIAL		DELIBERATIVE		EPIDEICTIC	
EVIDENCE	21%	25%	6	27%	15	9%	5
MODEL	36%	22%	5	36%	20	42%	22
ORNAMENT	43%	53%	12.5	37%	20	49%	26

There is a general predominance of the **ornamental** function: within each of the three γένη, this occurs most frequently, in the judicial poems even in more than half of the exempla. In the literary genres, the predominance is largest in the epigrams (85%), followed by the four groups of autobiographical poems (programmatic 67%; apologetic 65%, polemic and elegiac each 60%; the first three belong to the judicial γένος); the exempla with ornamental function are the smallest group in the (judicial) *dogmatica* (18%) and the *biblica* (0%).

From this angle, there seems to be no correlation between ornamental function and epideictic γένος. Yet, when the relative frequency (number of items per 1000 verses) is taken into account, this correlation is apparent: without the *biblica*, the average for the epideictic poems would even be 28 to 1000. According to genre, three epideictic groups are peaks: the epigrams (44), the hymns and prayers (28) and the elegies (26).

Only in the judicial γένος, exempla with **evidential** function do not occupy the last place (25% versus 22% for model function), but this 25% is less than the 27% in the deliberative. Furthermore, the frequency in the judicial poems is much lower than in the deliberative (6 per 1000 verses versus 15), and hardly any higher than in the epideictic (5). Hence, the expected correlation is rather poor: within the exempla in the judicial poems, the evidential ones take a relatively important place, but they are not at all concentrated in this group of poems.

When subdividing according to genre, we get a different picture: 4 of the 5 judicial genres take the highest places *qua* percentage (220) and almost the highest *qua* frequency (*dogmatica*, 59%, 10 per 1000 verses; II,2,7 44%, 24; polemical 40%, 13; and programmatic 33%, 10). The fact that the hypothesis for the whole judicial γένος is not confirmed is due to one group, which is, in numerical terms, most important: the apologetic poems (5%, 1 per 1000).

Finally, the expected correlation of **model** function with deliberative γένος is not quite manifest either: in this group of poems the share of model-exempla comes closest to that of the ornamental exempla, but the relative share as well as the frequency are smaller than in the category of epideictic poems. Still, when leaving I,1,27 out of consideration in this last group (cf. supra p.74 for the exceptional position of this poem), the numbers fall back to respectively 35% and 17 model-exempla per 1000 verses, and the deliberative γένος occupies the first place for this function twice. The division according to genre shows two (epideictic) peaks: the *biblica* with 100% and 60 per 1000 (except for 1 exemplum, to be ascribed completely to I,1,27), and the hymns and prayers with 76% and also 60 per 1000 (largely due to the paradigmatic prayers).

In conclusion, we can say that, in contrast with the postulated hypothesis, there is no notable correlation between the rhetorical species of the poems and the function of the quoted exempla, even though, on closer investigation, the figures repeatedly point in that direction.

As for the literary genres, some deviate strongly from the average in terms of distribution and/or frequency: in the *dogma-*

---

(220) The deliberative gnomologies excepted: 3 exempla with evidential function (8 per 1000 verses) are sufficient for 50% there.

tica, the evidential function prevails; in the *biblica* (sc. in I,1,27) and the (paradigmatic) prayers, the model function; and in the epigrams, the ornamental function (221).

In addition, some striking *negative* correlations can be registered, both in relation to genre and to rhetorical γένος. Exempla with evidential function are strongly underrepresented in the epideictic poems (9%, 5 per 1000 verses; none at all in the *biblica*, the hymns and prayers, and the elegiac-autobiographical). Exempla as models do not occur in the programmatic and polemical poems. The share of the ornamental exempla is considerably smaller in the deliberative than in the other γένη. A final remarkable point is Gregory's limited use of both types of *exempla probationis* in his judicial poems, in proportion to both the total number of exempla and the volume of those poems.

2.1.3 Conclusion

This last remark might point to the fact that Gregory ascribes little persuasive power to the παράδειγμα / ὑπόδειγμα (terms which he uses only for *exempla probationis*) in circumstances in which he wants to be in the right (characteristic of the judicial situation). Generally, the number of exempla with evidential function is actually relatively restricted, and a large part appeals to the inductive method, whereby the quoted example does not find itself outside of the probandum. He does use the analogical method (ὡς μέρος πρὸς μέρος) – which is in keeping with his acquaintanceship with Aristotle's logic and rhetoric noted by Focken and Norris –, but less often, and seldom with pagan exempla (which cannot appeal to the authority of the Bible). I found only one elaborate example of the Hermogenic argumentation, and in that case, the context suggested that Gregory put it in the mouth of a character so as to be able to refute it afterwards. The discussion of the λύσις παραδείγματος further indicates that Gregory designates other people's use of exempla as σοφίσματα and τοῦ τρόπου φυγή. For the refutation itself he appeals more to challenging the appropriateness or similarity of the quoted example than to counter examples. Whereas one counter example was sufficient to Aristotle, « ὅτι οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον », this does not seem to be the case in Gregory's argumentation (222): the themes with which he deals, including the theological ones, are probability matters and hence in any case never ἀναγκαῖον.

---

(221) Longer individual poems which transcend the others *qua* frequency of a specific function are: evidence in II,1,14 (90 per 1000 verses; and I,2,1b (71); model in II,1,46 (160), I,2,3 (90), II,1,19 (87) and I,2,6 (77); ornament in II,1,41 (92), the epitaphs for Nonna (92) and for Gregory sr. (77).

Exempla functioning as models are much more numerous in Gregory's poetry; besides, their effectiveness is explicitly quite highly esteemed.

Three of the four criteria upon which Le Goff based his comparison of the ancient with the medieval exemplum have been dealt with in this part. On two points, Gregory fits in more closely with the latter (predominance of inductive over analogical method, and predominance of model over evidential function); a third characteristic follows ancient practice (the use of ornamental exempla – but there are no indications that Gregory considered these as παραδείγματα himself; moreover there are no rhetorical prescriptions on this point by which to test his use, as is possible in the case of *exempla probationis*).

As expected, Gregory seems to be familiar with these prescriptions regarding the *exempla probationis*, and he applies them to a variable extent. This goes both for the logical method and the refutation as for the topical degrees of similarity. Whereas no systematic correlation could be found between the functions of the exempla and rhetorical γένος or literary genre, this correlation is undoubtedly apparent between the topical degrees of similarity and both functions and matter of the exempla (223). The results are especially striking in the case of the pagan exempla, which are used remarkably often ἀπ' ἐλάττονος προσώπου. This conclusion will be resumed in the next part, which deals with the subject matter of Gregory's exempla.

2.2. SUBJECT MATTER

In contrast with the function of an exemplum, which is sometimes hard to distinguish, the definition of its subject matter is usually evident, that is, except for some legendary characters wavering between myth and history. The problem was rather a matter of quantity: how extensive should the description of the material be? The determination of this can be found in the introduction of this study, and in the general remarks that come with the inventories. In inventory 1, the matter of each selected item is indicated, and inventory 2 is divided according to the subject matter. The theoretical motivation for the restriction to the *historical exemplum* (in the broad sense: ἱστορίαι used as exempla) is given in the chapter on the rhetorical παράδειγμα: most later rhetoricians identified it with what Aristotle called τὸ λέγειν πράγματα προγεγενημένα.

---

(222) This is apparent not only from the use of a whole series instead of one counter example: he also explicitly employs the principle « the exception proves the rule. »

(223) The possible correlation between functions and matter and literary form, respectively, is discussed in the later parts of this study.

In this part I first return to the observation that Gregory's use of the term παράδειγμα is not limited to the historical exempla; afterwards I resume with the divisions which the ancient rhetoricians have been shown to make, and verify if and how Gregory adopts these divisions explicitly.

The divisions function as parameters in the macro-analysis: there, possible connections and correlations are examined between on the one hand the different sorts of material and on the other the function of the exempla and the genre, the rhetorical species and the audience of the poems.

2.2.1 Rhetorical theory and Gregory's practice

A. Terminology

As appeared from passages quoted above, Gregory repeatedly uses παράδειγμα and ὑπόδειγμα for (quoting) histories from biblical or pagan tradition, in the sense attached to *exemplum* in this study. Still these terms - as indications for literary phenomena - do not seem to be restricted to the historical exemplum in Gregory's writings, as they were for most rhetoricians from the imperial age: six times they point to the other εἶδος of the Aristotelian παράδειγμα: the παραβολή.

In one case, the use of the term παράδειγμα is in accordance with the definitions of the later rhetoricians: a comparison with people is made (224), and there is a narrative aspect to the comparison:

---

(224) Compare with the definitions of Ps.-Aelius Herodianus and Apsines, supra n.65: a comparison to people or deeds is a παράδειγμα, a comparison to inanimate creatures a παραβολή.

> Μιμούμεθα τοὺς ζωγράφους, οἳ ταῖς σκιαῖς τὰ σώματα προχαράσσοντες δευτέρᾳ καὶ τρίτῃ χειρὶ ταύτας ἀπακριβοῦσι καὶ τελειοῦσι τοῖς χρώμασι. Πρὸς τί βλέπει μοι τὸ **παράδειγμα**:
> *I am taking a leaf from the painters' book. They get the general configuration first into a sketch, and then go over it again a second or a third time with their colours to secure perfect accuracy. What do I mean by this example?* (225).

Yet, elsewhere ὑπόδειγμα and παράδειγμα indicate a pure παραβολή: a comparison to things, inanimate creatures or natural phenomena. In the conclusion of the fifth theological speech, the term ὑπόδειγμα is mentioned three times in this sense. In completion of the whole cycle, Gregory attempts to evoke the mystery of the Trinity with a number of resemblances, but all of these can give rise to misunderstanding. Already in the introduction to this passage, the terms εἰκών, παραβάλλω, ὁμοίωσις and ὑπόδειγμα (of which we noted that the mutual affinity rather varies in the different rhetoricians' writings) are used with the same meaning:

> Ὡς ἔγωγε πολλὰ διασκεψάμενος πρὸς ἐμαυτὸν τῇ φιλοπραγμοσύνῃ τοῦ νοῦ, καὶ πανταχόθεν τὸν λόγον εὐθύνας, καὶ ζητῶν **εἰκόνα** τινὰ τοῦ τοσούτου πράγματος, οὐκ ἔσχον ᾧτινι χρὴ τῶν κάτω τὴν θείαν φύσιν **παραβαλεῖν**. Κἂν γὰρ μικρά τις **ὁμαίωσις** εὑρεθῇ, φεύγει τὸ πλεῖον, ἀφέν με κάτω μετὰ τοῦ **ὑποδείγματος**.
> *For my part, though I have examined the question in private so busily and so often, searching from all points of view for an illustration of this profound matter, I have failed to find anything in this world with which I might compare the divine nature. If a faint resemblance comes my way, the more significant aspect escapes me, leaving me and my illustration here in this world.*

Thereupon, Gregory does give some images for the Trinity (e.g. ὀφθαλμός, πηγή, ποταμός and ἥλιος, ἀκτίς, φῶς), but cautions against misinterpretation. For instance, with the second comparison, there is the danger

> μὴ τὸν Πατέρα μὲν οὐσιώσωμεν, τἄλλα δὲ μὴ ὑποστήσωμεν, ἀλλὰ δυνάμεις Θεοῦ ποιήσωμεν ἐνυπαρχούσας, οὐχ ὑφεστώσας – οὔτε γὰρ ἀκτίς, οὔτε φῶς, ἄλλος ἥλιος, ἀλλ' ἡλιακαί τινες ἀπόρροιαι, καὶ ποιότητες οὐσιώδεις –, καὶ ἅμα τὸ εἶναι καὶ τὸ μὴ εἶναι τῷ Θεῷ δῶμεν ἐν τούτοις, ὅσον ἐκ τοῦ **ὑποδείγματος**, ὃ καὶ τῶν εἰρημένων ἀτοπώτερον.
> *of making the Father a substance but the others potentialities inherent in him, attributes of God, not individual beings. Beam and light are not*

---

(225) Ep.230,1-2. Translation partly from RUETHER p.101.

> extra Suns, but emanations from the Sun, qualities of its substance. To think thus is thereby to attribute to God, to the extent that the illustration suggests the idea, both being and nonbeing - and that is a greater absurdity than the previous suggestions.

Finally, he dismisses the idea of a Trinitarian metaphor:

> Καὶ ὅλως οὐδέν ἐστιν ὅ μοι τὴν διάνοιαν ἵστησιν ἐπὶ τῶν **ὑποδειγμάτων** θεωροῦντι τὸ φανταζόμενον, πλὴν εἴ τις ἕν τι λαβὼν τῆς **εἰκόνος**, ὑπ᾽ εὐγνωμοσύνης, τὰ λοιπὰ ῥίψειεν. Τέλος οὖν ἔδοξέ μοι κράτιστον εἶναι τὰς μὲν **εἰκόνας** χαίρειν ἐᾶσαι καὶ τὰς **σκιάς**, ὡς ἀπατηλὰς καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας πλεῖστον ἀποδεούσας....
> *In a word, there is nothing to satisfy my mind when I try to illustrate the mental picture I have, except taking part of the image and wisely discarding the rest. So, in the end, I resolved that it was best to have done with images and shadows, deceptive and utterly inadequate as they are to express the reality* (226).

Gregory's terminology confirms the traditionally close connection between παράδειγμα and παραβολή. This link is revealed by his literary practice as well: within the same argumentation, he regularly combines historical exempla and nature exempla or comparisons from daily life (227).

B. Categories of the historical exemplum

1) *Old and new*

> Τούτους μιμώμεθα, καὶ ἱερεῖς, καὶ μητέρες, καὶ παῖδες· (...). Ποθῶ γὰρ (...) βοηθεῖσθαι μὲν **τοῖς παλαιοῖς διηγήμασι**, βοηθεῖσθαι δὲ καὶ **τοῖς νέοις**, καὶ πανταχόθεν, ὥσπερ αἱ μέλισσαι, συλλέγειν τὰ χρησιμώτατα (...), ἵνα **καὶ διὰ Παλαιᾶς καὶ Νέας** εὐδοκιμῇ Θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν.
> *Let us follow them* (sc. the Maccabees), *priests, and mothers, and children: (...). For I long (...) to find help in the old tales, but also to find help in the new ones, and to select the most useful from every-*

---

(226) Or.31,31-33 (*PG* 36,169A-172A, translation Wickham-Williams in Norris, *Faith* pp.297-8). The two other cases where the term has this meaning are or.43,52 (*PG* 36,564A: οὐδὲν παράδειγμα, *nothing comparable*) and or.29,14 (*PG* 36,92D: οἱ τοῦ ὑποδείγματος κύνες, *the dogs from your comparison*).

(227) For an example of the latter, cf. supra n.155; examples of nature exempla can be found quite frequently, cf. e.g. n.194; II,1,16, vv.67-74 successively provides biblical and nature exempla.

> where, like the bees (...), so that God is revered among us through Old and New (*Testament*) (228).

Gregory often deals explicitly with old (παλαιά) and new (νέα) exempla or histories, whether or not opposed to each other. Yet these terms do not always amount to the same thing: they are adopted in three areas.

(1) Old and New Testament

In Gregory's writings, « Old » and « New » mostly – as in the quoted fragment – stand for Old Testament or Jewish, and New Testament or Christian (229). Analogously, in the next passage he speaks – in the Pauline terminology – of the old and the new Adam. In his Pentecostal homily, he urges the Christians to celebrate the fiftieth day πνευματικῶς, not κατὰ τὸ γράμμα like the Jews (or κατὰ τὸ σῶμα like the Greeks). Thereupon, he enlarges on the value of the number seven in the Bible:

> Εἰ δὲ δεῖ καὶ **τὰς παλαιὰς ἱστορίας** σκοπεῖν, ἐννοῶ μὲν τὸν ἕβδομον ἐν προγόνοις Ἐνὼχ τῇ μεταθέσει τετιμημένον. Ἐννοῶ δὲ καὶ τὸν εἰκοστὸν πρῶτον Ἀβραὰμ τῇ πατριαρχίᾳ δεδοξασμένον, μυστηρίου προσθήκῃ μείζονος. Τρισσουμένη γὰρ ἡ ἑβδομὰς τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦτον ἐργάζεται. Τολμήσειε δ' ἄν τις τῶν πάντα νεανικῶν καὶ ἐπὶ **τὸν νέον Ἀδὰμ** ἐλθεῖν, τὸν Θεόν μου καὶ Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, ἀπὸ **τοῦ παλαιοῦ** καὶ τοῦ ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν **Ἀδάμ**, ἑβδομηκοστὸν ἕβδομον ἀριθμούμενον κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Λουκᾶ γενεαλογίαν ἀναποδίζουσαν. (...)
> Τί μοι **τὰ πόρρω** λέγειν; Ἰησοῦς αὐτός, ἡ καθαρὰ τελειότης, οἶδε μὲν τρέφειν ἐν ἐρημίᾳ καὶ πέντε ἄρτοις πεντακισχιλίους, οἶδε δὲ καὶ ἑπτὰ πάλιν τετρακισχιλίους.
> *And if we must also look at ancient history, I perceive that Enoch, the seventh among our ancestors, was honoured by translation. I perceive also that the twenty-first, Abraham, was given the glory of the Patriarchate, by the addition of a greater mystery. For the Hebdomad thrice repeated brings out this number. And one who is very bold might venture even to come to the New Adam, my God and Lord Jesus Christ, Who is counted the Seventy-seventh from the old Adam who fell under sin, in the backward genealogy according to Luke.*

---

(228) Or.15,12 (*PG* 35,932C-933A).

(229) See also in already quoted passages: τινα τῶν παλαιῶν ἱστοριῶν about the exemplum of Jonah (or.2,104, cf. p.80); βίους σκόπει μοι τῶν πάλαι καὶ τῶν νέων about respectively Old and New Testament exempla (I,2,25, v.184, cf. p.81); τῶν τις παλαιῶν, ἢ νέων, given the implied authority, probably about biblical exempla (I,2,28, v.227, cf. p.106).

(... some more Old Testament examples are mentioned ...)

> *But why do I speak of the distant past? Jesus Himself who is pure perfection, could in the desert and with five loaves feed five thousand, and again with seven loaves four thousand* (230).

(2) Earlier and contemporary

Where in the above text, the use of *Old* (Testament) exempla seemed less evident (Εἰ δὲ δεῖ καὶ...), it is - the exceptional time that Gregory inserts a contemporary exemplum - this *new* one which needs to be justified:

> Κωνστάντιον δὲ (καὶ γὰρ εἰπεῖν ἄξιον,
> Ὡς μὴ **τὰ πρόσθεν** τυγχάνῃ λόγου μόνα,
> Περιφρονῆτέ θ' **ὧνπερ αὐτοὶ μάρτυρες**),
> Φασί ποτ' εἰπεῖν ἄξιον μνήμης λόγον.
> *And Constantius (for this is also worth telling:*
> *thus, not only events from a remote past are mentioned,*
> *and you do not neglect those of which you yourselves are witnesses),*
> *has, as is said, once made a memorable statement* (231).

(3) Greek and Roman

This division is less expected. Gregory labels the Greeks as ancient, as opposed to the Romans. Apparently, he was already so pervaded by the notion of Ῥωμανία, that, to him also, pagan Romans did not belong to closed history (232). As pointed out, in I,2,10, he discusses some pagan examples of material detachment and integrity. After a whole list of Greeks, he also mentions one Roman, Fabricius (233):

> Οὐκ ἂν παρέλθοιμ' οὐδὲ τὰ Ῥωμαίων καλά,
> ὡς μὴ **παλαιοῖς** ἰσχυριζοίμην μόνοις.
> *Let me not pass by the good among the Romans,*

---

(230) Or.41,4 (*PG* 36,433A-C, translation BROWNE-SWALLOW p.380).

(231) I,2,25, vv.290-293 (*PG* 37,833-4). The apophthegm of Constantius follows, as stated in n.197, some anecdotes about ancient Greeks.

(232) In any case, in Gregory's poems, we find some of the oldest attestations of the notion of νέα Ῥώμη. The oldest official document in which this Greek term appears is canon 3 of the Constantinople Council (381): the bishop of Constantinople is ranked first after the bishop of Rome « διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὴν νέαν Ῥώμην » (quoted in FENSTER p.55). In two of Gregory's poems written shortly afterwards, we read similar phrasings: ὁπλοτέρη Ῥώμη in II,1,10, v.5 (*PG* 37,1027); and Ῥώμη νεουργής in II,1,11, v.15 (*PG* 37,1031). For a discussion of the role of Constantinople in Gregory's œuvre, see FENSTER pp.57-61.

(233) The anecdote about Pyrrhus and Fabricius actually comes from the Greek biography of the former, by Plutarch (*Pyrrh* 20,1-3).

> *to avoid relying only on old examples* (234).

From the explicit justification of both Roman and contemporary exempla, and from the fact that Gregory himself uses these only rarely, we can deduce that rhetoricians and listeners usually preferred the older histories encrusted with tradition and associations.

Conversely, when comparing biblical exempla, Gregory seems to attach higher value to the « accomplished » New Testament exempla than to the Old Testament ones. The macro-analysis will examine whether this is revealed in the frequency and the quality as well.

2) *Classification according to historicity* (235)

The selected exempla from Gregory's work can also be subdivided into
- the historical exemplum: characters or episodes from pagan, biblical or Christian history
- the *exemplum verisimile*: characters or episodes from Greek literature, and New Testament parables
- the poetic exemplum: mythology and fable.

The distinction between the first and the two other types – between historical reality and fiction – is most significant. According to Quintilian, the first type involves the greatest degree of credibility (236); and also the Greek rhetoricians seemed to recommend the use of myths as ornament rather than as argument (cf. n.69). Hence, in the macro-analysis I shall investigate a possible correlation between historicity and function of the exempla.

The remote credibility of the mythological exempla is clearly expressed by Gregory himself in I,2,29, where he places Pandora and Eve next to each other as dissuasive examples. After having told the myth of Pandora, he puts it into perspective and announces the true story of Eve:

> **Οὐ** μὲν δὴ **μύθοις ἐπιπείθομαι**· εἰ δὲ κελεύεις,
> μὴ σύ γε Πανδώρη γίνεο δαιδαλέη.
> (...)
> **ἄλλος δ' οὐκέτι μῦθος.** ἐμῶν δ' ἐπέων ἐπάκουσον,
> οὓς σοι θειοτάτων φθέγξομαι ἐκ λογίων.
> *Of course I do not attach credence to myths; but if still you insist:*
> *see to it that you do not become an exquisite Pandora.* (...)

---

(234) I,2,10, vv.350-351 (*PG* 37,705).

(235) Cf. supra p.45.

(236) Cf. LAUSBERG §413.

> *Another story is no longer a myth; listen to my words,*
> *which I will tell you from the most divine texts* (237).

3) *οἰκεῖα and ἀλλότρια*

This originally national classification is transposed to the ideological sphere in Gregory's writings: in accordance with the common Christian usage of referring to non-Christians as οἱ ἔξω, he makes a distinction between « foreign » and « our » exempla. In I,2,10, we find some clear expressions of this at the transition from pagan to biblical exempla; thus for example after a series of quotations from Greek literature on εὐτέλεια:

> Τί μοι **ξένων** μύθων τε καὶ διδαγμάτων;
> Αὐτοὺς σκόπει μοι **τοὺς ἐμοὺς** ἤδη νόμους.
> *Why do I need those foreign words and lessons?*
> *Look at the following instructions of my own* (238).

From the theoretical treatment of the παράδειγμα it appeared that the rhetoricians considered the use of *exempla externa* appropriate for an argumentation *ex minore ad maius*. In the discussion of the degrees of similarity in Gregory's poems, we indeed saw that he uses notably many pagan exempla for an insertion ἀπ' ἐλάττονος. In the further macro-analysis, most attention wil be paid to the subdivision into pagan and biblical exempla.

2.2.2 Macro-analysis

A. Old and New

I deal only with the opposites Old - New Testament here (239): as pointed out, the other « new » exempla (contemporary and

---

(237) I,2,29, vv.123-128 (*PG* 37,893). Compare also or.4.94 (*PG* 35.625D-628A), in which he quotes the hydra, the chimaera, Scylla and Charybdis as exempla, εἴ τι τῷ μύθῳ πειστέον.

(238) I,2,10, vv.412-413 (*PG* 37,710). Also in the announcement of pagan exempla of σωφροσύνη he speaks about ξένοι: Δεῦρο σκόπει μοι καὶ τὰ τῆς αἰνουμένης / **ἡμῖν** μάλιστα σωφροσύνης· ἔχει δὲ πῶς; / Εἰσὶν μέν, εἰσὶ καὶ παρ' Ἕλλησίν τινες / ταύτης ἐρασταὶ καὶ **πάλαι καὶ νῦν** ἔτι (the most recent is Dio Chrysostomus' wife). / Οὐ γὰρ ἀπιστήσω γε τοῖς θρυλουμένοις· / φθόνος γὰρ οὐδεὶς σωφρονεῖν καὶ **τοὺς ξένους** (vv.772-777, *PG* 37.736). Also at the beginning of the discussion of the ἐγκράτεια, he opposes the ancient Greeks and barbarians to « us »: Τῆς δ' ἐγκρατείας μικρὰ μὲν τὰ **τῶν πάλαι** / σοφῶν παρ' Ἕλλησίν τε καὶ τῶν βαρβάρων / – καὶ βαρβάροις γὰρ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἦν τις λόγος – / τί χρὴ δ' **ἀφ' ἡμῶν** οἷα καὶ ὅσα γράφειν; Πᾶσιν γάρ ἐστι περιφανῆ καὶ γνώριμα (vv.580-584, *PG* 37,722).
Above, we saw the pagan exempla described as τι νόθον (p.102).

(239) I do not treat the histories that go back to the Apocrypha separately: they are counted in with the canonical histories. What is involved is

Roman) are too scarce to qualify for a quantitative approach. Some of Gregory's explicit enunciations give the impression that he thinks most highly of the New Testament exempla (cf. supra).

1) Frequency and distribution according to genre and rhetorical γένος

The following table gives the number of exempla from O.T. and N.T. in the different genres and rhetorical categories. Next to the absolute figures, the relation O.T. per 100 N.T. is listed. The classification is made according to this relation, in decreasing order (hence, from relatively most to least Old Testament exempla) (240)

	O.T.	N.T.	O.T./100 N.T.
Dogmatica	12	2	600
Prayers	34	7	486
Autobiographical	80	38	211
Epigrams	17	10	170
Moralia	115	79	146
Θρῆνοι	20	18	111
Epistolary poems	18	23	78
Gnomologies	1	5	20
Biblica	1	26	4
Total	298	208	143

	O.T.	N.T.	O.T./100 N.T.
Judicial	59	17	347
Deliberative	135	104	130
Epideictic	104	87	120

In Gregory's poems, I counted 421 Old and 324 New Testament histories, including respectively 298 and 208 exempla.

---

one history from the Old Testament Apocrypha (the martyrdom of Isaiah in II,1,14, v.61) and 12 from the New Testament. Beside this, there are some histories in which Gregory apparently intermingles the canonical and apocryphal tradition (thus e.g. the above quoted history of Enoch, n.173).

(240) For the sake of comparison, I give the same numbers for the material selected in the prose

(Auto-)biographical orations			
ψόγοι	59	17	347
ἐγκώμ. / ἐπιτ.	114	35	326
Apologetic	125	48	260
Occasional speeches	64	38	168
Pastoral orations			
ἐγκώμια	57	20	285
Theological	79	49	161
Panegyrics	137	106	129
Exegetical	6	9	67
Moral	21	34	62
Total orations	662	356	186
Letters	28	16	175

Judicial	269	123	219
Epideictic	323	170	190
Deliberative	71	63	113

When comparing the size and the amount of narrative matter of both corpora, the share of the New Testament histories is noticeably large (241). The most utilized book of the N.T., Matthew, provides 122 exempla, much more than that of the O.T., Genesis, which is nonetheless longer: 76 exempla.

In the poems there occur one and a half times as many Old as New Testament exempla (298 / 208 = 143 O.T. per 100 N.T.). This proportion is not constant in the different genres: the smaller the total number of biblical exempla, the greater the deviation (statistically a normal phenomenon). It is not accidental that the prayers show an exceptionally large proportion of Old Testament exempla (486 / 100, to be ascribed especially to the paradigmatic prayers, about which more follows) and the *biblica* a notably small proportion (4 / 100, completely due to - again - I,1,27). Subdivided according to rhetorical γένος, the extremely high proportion in the judicial poems is striking (347 / 100), whereas the other two score an average: deliberative 130, and epideictic 120 (without I,1,27: 170).

In the prose (average proportion 186 / 100), the differences per genre are much less clear-cut; according to the rhetorical γένος, the same proportion can be detected: judicial scores highest (219 / 100), deliberative shows the lowest score (113 / 100). Hence, the conclusion for the entire œuvre is that Gregory quotes notably more Old than New Testament histories in texts which are directed (especially) at having the reader / listener judge, whereas both sources have more or less the same share in texts which intend to influence the behaviour of the reader / listener. Since the Old Testament offers much more potential material, the latter conclusion is the noteworthy one.

2) Correlation with the function

In line with the previous observation, it is not surprising that Gregory uses the Old Testament exempla relatively rarely with model function:

---

(241) I have no frame of reference for the judgment of this relation (nor of the other figures in the macro-analysis) for the early Christian or Byzantine authors. About Tertullian, Pétré does mention that the New Testament exempla are less numerous (cf. p.53), but she gives no precise figures.

FUNCTION	O.T.	N.T.	O.T./100 N.T.	DEGREES OF SIMILARITY	O.T.	N.T.	O/N
Evidence	55	36	153	ἀφ' ὁμοίου	118	88	134
Model	122	112	109	ἀπ' ἐναντίου	23	18	128
Ornament	121	60	202	ἀπὸ μείζονος	17	21	81
				ἀπ' ἐλάττονος	8	4	200

When interpreting these figures, it is clear that also in practice Gregory attaches more value and credibility to the New than to the Old Testament exempla: relatively, they are used more as *exempla probationis* (especially as model), and even in absolute figures they are quoted more ἀπὸ μείζονος, whereas the Old Testament ones are quoted twice as much ἀπ' ἐλάττονος.

B. Historical and fictitious

1) Frequency and distribution according to rhetorical γένος

Gregory's poems contain over twice as many historical as fictitious exempla (527 versus 245). They are divided over the different classes as follows; I also list the total number of narrative items, in poetry and prose:

		EXEMPLA	ITEMS POETRY	ITEMS PROSE
- Historical:	biblical	428	652	971
	pagan	94	154	133
	Christian	5	5	7
- *Verisimile*:	parables	63	108	47
	Greek lit.	2	2	1
- Poetical:	mythology	167	350	201
	fable	13	13	4

It is striking that only half of the mythological items are used in an exemplary way: the other classes score much higher on this point. Also remarkable is the much greater predominance of the historical items in Gregory's prose: 1111 versus 253 (= 444/100, against 215/100 in his verse).

Divided among the different rhetorical γένη, this gives the following proportions for the exempla:

	HISTORICAL	FICTITIOUS	HIST./100 FICT.
Judicial	78	31	251
Deliberative	281	118	238
Epideictic	168	95	176
Total	527	245	215

In the epideictic poems, fictive exempla apparently occur much more frequently. Yet one should take into account that the numbers are distorted by I.1,27: without this poem containing 26 parables the proportion of historical to fictitious for the epideictic poems is 242 / 100, and the three rhetorical γένη show quite an even distribution (242).

2) *Correlation with the function*

There *is* a significant correlation between historicity and function of the exempla, as was adopted as hypothesis in the discussion of the classification according to historicity:

FUNCTION	hist.	fict.	hist. / 100 fict.
Evidence	113	50	226
Model	213	68	313
Ornament	201	130	155

DEGREES OF SIMILARITY	hist.	fict.	h / f
ἀφ' ὁμοίου	210	84	250
ἀπ' ἐναντίου	33	26	127
ἀπὸ μείζονος	40	–	–
ἀπ' ἐλάττονος	29	7	414

Thus, fictitious histories are used noticeably more as ornament than as *exempla probationis*, and *if* they are quoted as argument, it is relatively often ἀπ' ἐναντίου, and hardly ever in an *a fortiori* reasoning (not at all ἀπὸ μείζονος). The mythological exempla, of which Gregory stressed the low credibility, represent 45 of the 50 fictitious exempla with evidential function, yet nearly exclusively in an inductive form of argumentation, in which the power of persuasion is less under discussion (243). Yet, of the 68 fictitious exempla with model function, only 21 are mythological (versus 45 parables, ... including 26 in I,1,27); besides, 10 of these 21 are quoted ἀπ' ἐναντίου. It is not amazing of course that the Greek myths form no rich source of positive models to a Church Father: on the contrary, it is precisely the few mythological exempla with positive model function which are interesting. They are dealt with in the semantic analysis, in the second part of this study.

---

(242) In the case of the orations, something similar occurs: the proportion of historical to fictitious there is 308 / 100 for the judicial *orationes*, versus 678 for the deliberative and 639 for the epideictic. This deviation can be explained by the high concentration of fictitious - in this case mythological - material, namely in the invectives against Julian.

(243) The three places where Zeus' metamorphoses are summed up as inductive evidence of the lechery of the Greek gods are already worth 25 exempla (in 14 lines in all: I,2,2, v.500; I,2,10, vv.833-842; II,2,7, vv.94-96).

C. Pagan and biblical

1) *Frequency and distribution according to genre and rhetorical γένος*

The biblical exempla are in the majority in Gregory's poems, but the pagan ones have a remarkably large share: 281 out of 772, or 36%; of the total number of (also non-exemplary) items, the pagan ones even make up 39%; in the prose, their share is smaller: 25% (346 out of 1364). From the discussion of the dispersion of the material among the individual poems and orations (supra p.73) it appeared that the pagan subject matter - in contrast with the biblical material - was concentrated especially in a limited number of texts. The following table of the **poems** shows this concentration to be reflected in the dispersion according to genre and rhetorical γένος. The first column lists the share of the pagan exempla in the total number of exempla, the second that of the pagan items in the total number of items, the third the number of pagan items per 1000 verses, and the fourth the same for the biblical items. Genres and rhetorical categories are classified according to the decreasing share of the pagan exempla.

	PAG.EXEMPLA	PAG.ITEMS	PAG. / 1000 VV.	BIB. / 1000 VV.
Epigrams	60%	77%	72	21
Epistolary poems	51%	70%	56	24
Moralia	44%	46%	34	40
Θρῆνοι	33%	37%	27	46
Autobiographical	19%	28%	11	28
Dogmatica	18%	5%	3	63
Gnomologies	17%	9%	3	30
Prayers	0%	8%	8	92
Biblica	0%	0%	0	278
Deliberative	43%	45%	31	38
Judicial	33%	42%	22	31
Epideictic	27%	31%	28	63
Total	36%	39%	28	43

The third column particularly reveals that the presence of pagan material depends much more upon the content or the literary genre of the poems (between 0 and 72 items per 1000 lines) than upon their rhetorical species. Epigrams, epistolary poems and the *moralia* show the strongest pagan bias. In the case of the epigrams and of the *moralia* with their strong affinity with the cynic-stoic diatribe, literary convention certainly plays a part; the high score of the class of epistolary poems is largely due to II,2,7, the προτρεπτικός to Nemesius. The fluctuation is less significant in the case of the biblical material (between 21 and 46), when leaving the poems with specifically Christian subjects outside consideration. It is also these last - namely the prayers and the *biblica* - which cause the high frequency of biblical material in the epideictic γένος.

In the **orations**, the distribution according to genre shows more or less the same irregularity for the pagan material (between 0 and 45 items per 25 columns, respectively in exegetic and apologetic orations, and in ψόγοι). As regards the biblical material, the dispersion is more irregular here than in the case of the poems (between 20 and 58, respectively in ψόγοι and panegyrics). Furthermore, there seems to be a significant difference here according to the rhetorical γένος: in the symboleutic category, there are twenty times as many biblical as pagan histories, in the epideictic four times as many, and in the judicial not even twice as many. Yet, the difference is to be ascribed to the content of the speeches rather than to their rhetorical species: thus, both the apologetic orations (with 1% of pagan material) and the ψόγοι (with 69%) belong to the judicial group. Also the extremely divergent percentages per rhetorical γένος between prose and poetry show that in Gregory's œuvre, the rhetorical species of the text is not determinant for the relation between pagan and biblical material.

Finally, the **letters** are the only group which contain more pagan than biblical material, which is due especially to the limited number of biblical histories (244).

2) *Correlation with audience or addressed character*

The interpretation of the above tables shows that the choice between pagan and biblical material is linked not with the rheto-

---

(244) The figures for the prose (share of pagan material, number of pagan items per 25 columns, number of biblical items per 25 columns):

Autobiographical orations				Pastoral orations			
ψόγοι	69%	45	20	Theological	24%	8	25
ἐγκώμ. / ἐπιτ.	30%	13	29	ἐγκώμια	14%	7	42
Occasional	8%	3	34	Panegyrics	12%	8	58
Apologetic	1%	0	36	Moral	4%	2	53
				Exegetic	0%	0	29
Judicial	35%	15	27				
Epideictic	19%	10	42				
Deliberative	4%	2	40				
Orations	25%	11	34				
Letters	63%	11	7				

rical species of the text, but with the genre (which is determined especially by the content). The addressee or the audience is another (external) criterion by which the text as a whole may be defined. The notably divergent proportions of pagan and biblical material in orations (25% pagan), poems (39%) and letters (63%) point to the significance of this factor. The conclusion seems to be that the more limited the audience is, the more likely it is that pagan elements are included.

As the starting point of a further inquiry into the connection between audience and subject matter of the exempla, I refer to the ancient rhetoricians' rule, which says that the exempla should be well-known and clear (245). We can assume that Gregory followed this rule; in any case, I have already quoted some passages in which he explicitly departs from the supposition that his readers are familiar with the cited examples (246). I even considered these passages as – additional – indications for the audience intended with the poems in question (247).

The question arises, then, whether Gregory solely or especially takes into account this condition of recognizability in his selection of pagan or biblical material (with the audience's cultural level as criterion), or whether he is also or particularly guided by religious belief. To answer this, I depend on explicit statements by Gregory himself, as well as on statistics. Of course, one should be careful with the latter: the discussion of the poems' audience taught us that little is known for certain in this area, and that the majority of the poems seems to be written for quite a homogeneous audience (Christian and with a literary education (248)).

---

(245) Cf. supra n.70: χρὴ δὲ τὰ παραδείγματα γνώριμα εἶναι καὶ σαφῆ (Apsines).

(246) Cf. supra p.65: ἴστε.... or ἐστι περιφανῆ καὶ γνώριμα (the term used by Apsines).

(247) Of course, this implies a somewhat more differentiated opinion concerning Gregory's readers and listeners than that of Costanza, who apparently assumes that everyone was able to place everything: COSTANZA, *risonanze classiche* p.204, about the « periodo arcaico, in cui era universale la capacità di recepire ... ». Crimi, on the other hand, does actually establish a difference according to the addressee, in his study on the quotations from Greek drama in Gregory's letters: « le più interessanti citazioni tragiche (...) si trovino proprio in epistole indirizzate a *pepaideumenoi*, che possedovano un livello culturale di base che consentisse loro di « decodificare » correttamente la citazione. Gregorio adatta i propri mezzi espressivi al grado di cultura dell' interlocutore ed ai suoi gusti » (CRIMI, *Allusioni* p.80).

(248) The *biblica*, with their probably catechetical purposes, seemed to

Hence, the poetry can merely be divided according to hypothetical criteria (the audience of most autobiographical poems seemed wider, and with an average of a lower literary education than the audience of, say, the *moralia*) or in hardly representative classes (the few texts with pagan addressees versus the vast majority addressed to Christians). In the case of the letters, the number of pagan addressees is relatively larger, but here, the limited amount of exempla causes uncertainty about the significance of the results. Finally, where the orations are concerned, there is the problem of the selective and partly revised publication of the actually delivered speeches. I shall compare the orations given in Constantinople with those from his Cappadocia period: he himself frequently opposes the (over)cultivated capital to the « peasant » province town Nazianzus (249).

(1) Explicit statements

Certain pagan exempla which Gregory quotes in his letters are accompanied by some significant additions: he considers these appropriate for addressing an *ἀνὴρ λόγιος* or *πεπαιδευμένος* (250):

> *Μέγας ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὁ Ἡρακλῆς, ὡς ὁ λόγος (ἵνα σε* **λόγιον** *ὄντα καί τινος ἀναμνήσω* **τῶν σῶν**)·
> *Great among the people is Heracles, as is said (to remind you, a well read man, also of one of your characters);* (251).

---

be an exception. The fact that this group of poems contains no pagan material at all can be due to different factors: the subject (paraphrase or enumeration of biblical histories), the audience (catechists? monks?), the purpose (to impress scriptural knowledge through the mnemotechnical use of verses).

(249) Yet, here as well one should take care, « car les belles figures de style et les harmonieuses cadences qu'il a léguées à la postérité supposent un public muni d'une toute autre culture que celle que pouvait posséder le petit peuple de Nazianze ou même de Constantinople » (BERNARDI, *Prédication* p.259).

(250) Even though *λόγιος* and *πεπαιδευμένος* are often used as near synonyms, in Gregory's work these terms each represent a different aspect: the former always refers to a mastery in the (secular) *λόγοι*, and is hence also used pejoratively or ironically sometimes (e.g. in or.4.4, *PG* 35,536A – *ὁ πάντων λογιώτατος* about Julian –, or.4,101, or.5,32, or.21.21). In his letters, Gregory also uses the polite phrase *ἡ σὴ λογιότης* eight times, mostly addressed to Hellenes.
The latter term refers to the received *παίδευσις*, which can be either Christian or secular, and it has always a positive connotation. He uses this term once at the most in connection with a Hellene (ep.165.4; the religious persuasion of the addressee, Stagirius, is not certain).

(251) Ep.156,1.

> Καὶ ἵνα τι **τῶν ὑμετέρων** εἴπω, τὸν μυθικὸν τέττιγα μιμησάμενος καὶ ἀντὶ τῆς ῥαγείσης νευρᾶς Εὐνόμω τῶ σῶ γενόμενος, ἀναπλήρωσον τὴν ᾠδήν. Οὕτω μοι δοκεῖς ἐνευδοκιμήσειν τῶ νέω καὶ ἡμῖν χαριεῖσθαι τὰ μέγιστα, οἳ μὴ πολλά σου καὶ **τῆς σῆς λογιότητος** ἔμπροσθεν ἄγομεν.
> *To mention one of your histories: imitate the cricket from the myth, take the place of the snapped string for your Eunomus, and complete the melody. Thus, I think, you will earn a reputation through the boy and you will do us an enormous favour; there is little we think more highly of than you and your literary skill* (252).
>
> Καί, ὡς οἷόν τ' ἦν, εἷλκον τὴν ἐξήγησιν πρὸς τὸ πάθος, ἐκ **τῶν ἡμετέρων**, ἐκ **τῶν ἔξωθεν** ταῦτα φιλοσοφῶν, ὡς **ἀνδρὶ πεπαιδευμένω** καὶ τοσούτω διαλεγόμενος....
> *And, as far as possible, I applied the explanation* (sc. of Psalm 72) *to your suffering. I philosophized about it from our books, and from the profane ones, since I conversed with a cultured man, such as you are*... (253).

The last ἀνὴρ πεπαιδευμένος is Philagrius, fellow student of Caesarius and friend of Gregory. As appears from the juxtaposition of « our » and « the secular » books, this Philagrius is a Christian. But the addressee of the first fragment, Asterius, is also a Christian (254), and still, Gregory quotes exclusively (four) mythological exempla in the whole letter, because he is λόγιος. The same probably goes for Eudoxius as well, addressee of the second fragment (255). In the seven letters addressed to him, we find five pagan exempla and (at least) five quotations from classical authors, versus two quotations from the Bible (256). It is remarkable that in the first two quotations, pagan exempla are indicated with respectively τὰ σὰ and τὰ ὑμέτερα, which do *not* refer to a contrast with « our » (Christian) message. Apparently, the choice of the subject matter is less determined by the Christian faith of these addressees than by their παίδευσις.

---

(252) Ep.175.2. The myth of the singer Eunomus is told by Clement of Alexandria as well (*Protr.* I,1,2). cf. Gallay, *Lettres 2* p.159. The young man (the Eunomus) in question is Nicobulus; the letter is addressed to his teacher of rhetoric Eudoxius. (In this letter, the use of ἡ σὴ λογιότης does not seem to be reduced to a trivial, formulaic description of the second person, as is done in all other cases in which the expression is used. Hence my translation « your literary skill ».)

(253) Ep.34.3.

(254) Hauser-Meury p.35.

(255) We cannot say anything about Eudoxius' religious beliefs with certainty, but from Gregory's attempts to persuade him to live a « philosophic life » (as a monk, that is) (epp.177-180), we can probably deduce that he was a Christian.

(256) A biblical and a pagan quotation reinforce each other e.g. in ep.178,4: Τὸ δὲ μὴ βιάζεσθαι ῥοῦν ποταμοῦ, καὶ ἡ παροιμία κελεύει (Sir.4.26) καὶ ἱπποσύνην δεδαῶτα μὴ ἅδειν ἐθέλει ἡ ποίησις (AG 9.537).

In another letter to Philagrius, Gregory expresses this criterion for selection as follows, after which he puts it into practice:

> Πάντ᾽ ἐπῆλθες δηλαδὴ τῇ διανοία, **ὅσ᾽ ἡμέτερα, ὅσ᾽ ἀλλότρια**, ὡς ἀνὴρ **πεπαιδευμένος ἐν ἀμφοτέροις** καὶ παιδευτὴς ἄλλων, καὶ ἐκ πάντων σεαυτῷ συνελέξω τὸ τῆς ἀνθρωπίας φάρμακον. Ἵνα δέ σοι κἀγὼ συμφιλοσοφήσω μικρόν, εἰ τοῦτο κελεύεις, οὐκ ἐπαινῶ τοῦ Ἀριστοτέλους τὸ μικρολόγον....
> *Now as a man like yourself whose trained mind has traversed all knowledge, our own and pagan lore as well, who is learned in both fields and a trainer of others, has no doubt compounded from it all some palliative for human vicissitudes, may I, with your permission, enter the field of philosophy in your company? Aristotle, it seems to me is pusillanimous when he...* (257).

After the refutation of Aristotle, he agrees with an (unnamed) Stoic, and gives four exempla of endurance: three Greek ones and one biblical.

These programmatic statements are given concrete expression in Gregory's letters to addressees whom he explicitly calls λόγιος or πεπαιδευμένος: in these sixteen letters addressed to twelve different persons (among whom there are certainly six Christians and three Hellenes), one biblical and fifteen pagan exempla occur (258).

(2) Statistics

The poems and the orations do not give any clear indications about **the educational level** of the readers / listeners. Still, the poem περὶ ἀρετῆς (I,2,10) is addressed to a young Christian about whom Gregory explicitly says that he was given a secular education. This one poem contains 65 pagan exempla (23% of the total in the poems) and 21 biblical (4%): these figures seem to confirm the explicit statements in the above letters.

A comparison of the genres which seem directed at this same audience (*moralia*, *dogmatica*, and gnomologies = A), with the genres aimed certainly at a wider audience (apologetic and polemic = B), apparently gives a similar result:

---

(257) Ep.32.4-5 (translation RUETHER p.173).

(258) The letters in question are 31,32 and 34 (to Philagrius), 38 (Themistius), 51 (Nicobulus), 148 and 156 (Asterius), 164 (Timotheus), 165 (Stagirius), 167 (Helladius), 175 (Eudoxius), 195 (the ἄρχων Gregory), 198 and 199 (Nemesius), 202 (Nectarius) and 234 (Olympianus).
For my use of the term 'Hellene', cf. n.18.

	A	B
number of verses (proportion of the total)	7436 (42%)	2959 (17%)
number of biblical exempla (items)	204 (316)	54 (59)
number of pagan exempla (items)	154 (201)	18 (39)
biblical exempla per 1000 verses	28	18
pagan exempla per 1000 verses	21	3
proportion of the total number of biblical exempla	42%	11%
proportion of the total number of pagan exempla	55%	6%

The first class shows significantly more pagan exempla, both *qua* frequency and in comparison with the number of biblical exempla and with the total amount. Yet the question arises whether this has anything to do with the type of audience. The high score is entirely due to the *moralia*; in the two other genres of class A, even fewer pagan exempla occur than in the genres of class B. Thus, Gregory either wrote the *dogmatica* and the gnomologies for a different audience from the *moralia*, or there were more important factors than the audience in his choice of the exemplary subject matter.

The subdivision of the orations according to the place where (and thus the audience for which) they were delivered results in the following figures. In the first column we find the figures for Cappadocia (between brackets the figures without the funeral oration for Basil), in the second those for Nazianzus only, in the third those for Constantinople, and in the fourth those for the orations which were never delivered:

	Cappadocia	Nazianzus	C pel	fictitious
number of biblical items	410 (317)	207	429	146
number of pagan items	65 (29)	6	98	172
pagan per 100 biblical items	16 (9)	3	23	118

The reverse proportion (more pagan than biblical) for the orations which were not delivered, is due to the invectives. Still, the purpose of this table was especially to show the difference between Cappadocia – more specifically Nazianzus – and Constantinople. The difference is too considerable to be ascribed to coincidence. And, as the treated subjects or genres do not differ radically in both places, these cannot explain the dissimilarity either. Therefore, we can conclude that Gregory was much more sparing with pagan elements for his modest audience at home than for the inhabitants of the capital.

The other parameter for research is the **religious persuasion** of the addressee. For this purpose, we can in fact only take the letters into account (259).

addressee	number of pagan items	number of biblical items
christian	43	47
pagan	12	1
uncertain	19	-

As expected, the biblical items occur nearly solely in the letters to Christians; yet, on the other hand, these letters contain approximately the same amount of pagan items. In proportion to the number of letters, there are more pagan items in letters to Hellenes (and to persons whose religious persuasion is uncertain), but this is (also) related to the fact that Gregory's pagan correspondents are chiefly sophists and authorities (λόγιοι, thus), whereas among his Christian addressees there are many more ordinary people.

From explicit statements and statistics concerning the correlation between subject matter of the exempla and audience, we can draw the following conclusion: when Gregory addresses Hellenes, he does not include biblical elements; when he addresses Christians, he especially takes their cultural background into account: the higher the (average) level, and the smaller the (originally intended) number of readers, the larger the share of the pagan material (least in orations, most in letters).

This general tendency can be tested concretely both in different types of texts (orations, letters and poems) addressed to or dealing with the same person (260), and in similar texts (e.g. funeral epigrams or funeral orations) to or about different persons. Consolino approached the cycles of funeral epigrams (series about the same person) from this double angle. He established an influence both of the *dedicatori* (the deceased person is determinant for the pagan or Christian character of the epigrams) and of the literary genre and thus of the audience (261). I expressed Consolino's observations in figures of pagan and biblical material, and extended these to other texts and characters: acquaintances about whom Gregory has written a whole series of funeral epigrams, or to whom he has addressed poems as well as letters and/or orations. Next to the names of these people, one finds the references to the texts in question and the numbers of pagan/biblical items. The closest family is mentioned first, then the (other) Christians - all four with an elaborate rhetorical education -, and finally, the Hellenes Nemesius and Martinianus are listed.

---

(259) An investigation of the few poems (II.2.7 and some fifteen epigrams) addressed to pagans would be entirely influenced by the first poem, the προτρεπτικός to Nemesius, which is teeming with pagan elements, due to its subject (particularly refutation of paganism). This would have the same effect on the statistics as the invectives had on the figures of the orations that were not delivered in the preceding table.

(260) I do not distinguish here between addressee and addressed character, insofar as the latter is one specific (and known) person.

	POEMS		LETTERS		ORATIONS	
Caesarius	(ept.6-21)	7/0	(7,20)	0/0	(7)	17/4
Gorgonia	(ept.22-24)	0/0	-		(8)	0/9
Gregory sr.	(ept.55-65)	0/5	-		(18)	2/34
Nonna	(ept.66-100)	5/14	-		-	
Basil	(ept.119a-l)	0/1	(some 20)	12/9	(43)	36/93
Philagrius	(epg.4-6)	2/0	(some 10)	5/2	-	
Euphemius (262)	(ept.28-36)	18/0	-		-	
Julian	(II,2,2)	0/6	(67-69)	0/0	(17,19)	0/22
Nemesius	(II.2,7)	58/5	(198-201)	1/0	-	
Martinianus (263)	(ept.40-53)	11/0	-		-	

In the case of **the same person**, the differences between the genres are usually restricted. The funeral epigrams for Caesarius breathe a traditional secular character (with the emphasis on the *immatura mors*), and also in his funeral oration, the pagan histories prevail, even though here, Caesarius is presented as a Christian hero (versus the Emperor Julian) and biblical elements are included as well in this oration (264). In the funeral epigrams and the funeral oration for the model Christian Gorgonia, the pagan element is completely omitted. The same goes for the bishop Gregory. It is remarkable that - even though meant to form a contrast - five Greeks are mentioned in the epitaphs for Nonna, despite her aversion to the heathen, which Gregory emphasizes in his funeral oration for her husband (265).

---

(261) Consolino; his intermediate titles correspond with the examined correlations: « Influenza dei dedicatori: carmi profani e carmi cristiani » and « Gregorio e il suo pubblico: differenze fra generi letterari. » Concerning the latter: the comparison of epigrams and funeral orations about the elder Gregory, Basil and Caesarius draws attention to a marked difference especially in the case of Caesarius: the epigrams are obviously directed at a cultivated audience, while the funeral oration betrays Gregory's pastoral concern.

(262) Brother of Amphilochius of Iconium and hence Gregory's cousin, pupil of Libanius. He died at twenty (ept.30, v.1) (cf. Hauser-Meury p.71). Salvatore's attempt to revalue Gregory's epigrams is based almost exclusively on the epitaphs for Euphemius (discussion on pp.13-40).

(263) Cappadocian who held high positions in the West (probably, among other things, *praefectus urbis Romae* and *consularis Siciliae*, cf. Hauser-Meury pp.117-118).

The basic attitude towards pagan elements in the texts to or about the four Christian friends is not one of depreciation. The epitaphs for Euphemius are - like those for Caesarius - almost purely profane (here as well we see the traditional theme of the *immatura mors*). In the epigrams directed at Philagrius, the same thoughts and the same exempla occur as in letters 30 to 36, also addressed to him (266). On the other hand, though, the rhetorical education of the addressee does not automatically lead to the use of pagan exempla: in epistolary poem, orations and letters addressed to the peraequator Julian or enunciated in his presence, Gregory uses exclusively biblical material. Possibly, the subject (request for exemption from taxation for monks) and circumstances (the orations are delivered in Nazianzus), are not without significance in this case. But in the twelve funeral epigrams for Basil, the pagan element is entirely absent as well, in contrast to the funeral oration, and also particularly to the sophisticated letters written to him by Gregory.

The data concerning both pagan addressees come up to the expectations. The fact that Gregory still quotes five biblical exempla in the epistolary poem to Nemesius is due to the subject: in this letter, the refutation of paganism is accompanied by an apology for Christianity (267).

---

(264) Thus, Gregory adapts himself in the texts about his deceased brother to Caesarius' secular career; this was not always the case during his life: in ep.7, he tries to persuade his brother to leave his office at Julian's court, because this caused disgrace in Nazianzus.

(265) Or.18,9-10. She would have refused to kiss non-Christians, shake their hand, or even accept them as table-companions (while at the same time, she was married to a Hypsistarian, i.e. a half-heathen). DÖLGER, *Nonna* gives a whole series of pagan and Christian parallels for these and other peculiar habits of this woman.

(266) Epictetus and Anaxarchus are quoted favourably in epg.4 and in the already discussed ep.32 (here, next to Socrates); in epg.6, vv.3-4 (*PG* 38,85), Gregory considers Philagrius' double education (cf. already p.133, in the same letter 32) as his major virtue: Πάσης μὲν σοφίης σε δαήμονα οἶδα, φέριστε, / Τούτου δ' οὐδὲν ἔχω φέρτερον ἄλλο λέγειν.

(267) The epitaphs for Martinianus emphasize the luxurious grave and

Within **the same type of texts**, the differences are notably more considerable. Even though the funeral orations are delivered for at least partly the same audience, Gregory clearly reckons with the « addressee » in his choice of the subject matter; the same goes for the funeral epigrams. In the case of letters and epistolary poems, the themes are mutually too divergent to make any significant comparisons.

3) Correlation with the speaking character

In the discussion of the audience of Gregory's poetry, attention was drawn to some poems - including six long ones - in which Gregory himself is not the speaking character. In three of these (three *moralia*), we are concerned with a fictitious dialogue or ἀγών between personifications, in which Gregory's own voice is clearly resounding; in the others (three epistolary poems), the fictitious authors are existing persons, and Gregory is apparently absent. This basis is somewhat small to derive any affirmative propositions from. Still, it is remarkable that in the second group, more pagan than biblical exempla are used (26 versus 16), and that these pagan exempla usually have no negative connotation. Also, in proportion to the length, the presence of pagan material is stronger than on average (268). In epistolary poems 4 and 5, this can be related to the subject (Nicobulus' rhetorical-literary studies), in 3, not directly so. Perhaps then, there actually is a correlation between the choice of the exemplary subject matter and the speaking character, yet in any case, it cannot be said that Gregory *needed* the mask of a Peter or a Nicobulus to appeal freely to the pagan tradition.

4) Correlation with the function

Where there actually seems to be a connection between the choice of the - biblical or pagan - matter and the nature of the

---

are directed particularly against possible desecrators. The strong presence of pagan elements (especially in relation to the underworld, as a threat) is connected with the conventional genre: the same goes for the whole series of general epigrams against desecrators of graves (32 pagan elements versus one biblical).

(268) The figures: per poem, the number of verses, the number of biblical exempla (items) and the number of pagan exempla (items), each time per thousand verses:

II.2,3 (352 vv.)	37 (37)	31 (45)	I.2.1b (518 vv.)	85 (93)	12 (14)
II.2,4 (208 vv.)	5 (5)	34 (34)	I.2.8 (255 vv.)	0 (0)	4 (4)
II.2,5 (282 vv.)	7 (7)	28 (32)	I.2.24 (328 vv.)	6 (6)	3 (3)
Whole corpus	29 (43)	17 (28)			

text in its entirety, the link is even clearer between this matter and the function of the exemplum. For the sake of uniformity with the figures of Old / New and historical / fictitious, I repeat the figures for the degrees of similarity as well (cf. p.96).

FUNCTION	biblical	pagan	bib / 100 pag
Evidence	91	66	138
Model	228	51	447
Ornament	172	159	108

DEGREES OF SIMILARITY	bib	pag	b / p
ἀφ' ὁμοίου	206	84	245
ἀπ' ἐναντίου	41	18	228
ἀπὸ μείζονος	38	1	3800
ἀπ' ἐλάττονος	12	24	50

The figures are self-evident: pagan exempla are used especially as ornament, and – certainly in comparison with the biblical ones – least as model. Moreover, of the 51 pagan exempla with model function, 20 are ἀπ' ἐλάττονος and 17 ἀπ' ἐναντίου: clearly, Gregory seldom quotes Greeks or mythological characters as positive or full-fledged examples.

2.2.3 Conclusion

Gregory adopts the traditional subdivisions of the πράγματα προγεγενημένα into old and new, historical and fictitious, native and foreign; but he largely transposes these into Christian categories (Old versus New Testament, biblical / Christian versus pagan). In his explicit statements, he repeatedly attributes greater credibility or higher value to one of both poles in all three subdivisions, namely respectively New Testament, historical and biblical. The macro-analysis confirms this hierarchy within the exempla, both with regard to frequency (in poetry and prose) and function.

The **New Testament** exempla are relatively more numerous than the **Old Testament** ones, and are used notably more as *exempla probationis*, especially with model function. There is a correlation with the *a fortiori* degrees of similarity: ἀπ' ἐλάττονος is used particularly with O.T., N.T. with ἀπὸ μείζονος. The division of Old and New according to genre and rhetorical γένος of the whole text is irregular. Old strongly prevails in the judicial texts (but in the poems – with the greatest deviation – it concerns a very small total). New is relatively most numerous in the deliberative (yet in the orations – with the greatest deviation – it concerns a very small total).

The **historical** exempla are much more numerous than the **fictitious** ones, especially in prose, and are used notably more as *exempla probationis*, particularly with model function. There is a correlation with most degrees of similarity: the fictitious exempla are used twice as often ἀπ' ἐναντίου, whereas the *a fortiori* argumentation is as good as restricted to the historical exempla. This rather negative appreciation for the non-historical exempla is even more clear where the subgroup of mythological exempla is concerned. The distribution of historical and non-historical exempla according to genre and rhetorical species is almost perfectly normal, certainly when I,1,27 is left outside consideration.

The **biblical** exempla are more numerous than the **pagan** ones (but the prevalence is less explicit than that of the historical over the fictitious); and they are used markedly more as *exempla probationis*, especially with model function. The correlation with the degrees of similarity is comparable to that of Old and New: pagan is used particularly ἀπ' ἐλάττονος, virtually only biblical ἀπὸ μείζονος. Due to the high concentration of pagan material in a limited number of poems and orations, the distribution among the different genres is extremely irregular. Consequently, the division according to rhetorical species becomes irrelevant. Only in this subdivision of the subject matter, a possible correlation with the audience and / or addressed character was examined. From the explicit enunciations and the statistics it appears that Gregory reserves the biblical exempla for Christians, but does not reserve the pagan ones for Hellenes: these correspond with the degree of παίδευσις of the reader(s) / listeners, and are (thus) relatively more frequent in letters and poems than in orations, as well as in orations from Constantinople than in those from Nazianzus. Also when he speaks *about* acquaintances (e.g. in funeral epigrams and funeral orations), he takes their λογιότης into account, although not systematically.

Hence, frequency and choice of the exemplary subject matter are indeed connected with content and / or purpose of the whole text, and with the function of the exempla. This goes to a varying extent for all three examined subdivisions of the matter. Finally, to find out which dichotomy shows the most considerable deviations, and which parameter (rhetorical species, function, degrees of similarity) prevails in that, I give the respective proportions related to the normal proportions (those for the total of the poems, = 100), and between brackets the relative deviations from this normal proportion (0 = normal, 1 = double or half as much, ... with a maximum of 5).

	OLD / NEW	HIST. / FICT.	BIBLICAL / PAGAN
RHETORICAL SPECIES	*298 / 208 = 100*	*527 / 245 = 100*	*491 / 281 = 100*
judicial	238 (1,38)	116 (0,16)	116 (0,16)
deliberative	92 (0.09)	112 (0,12)	76 (0,32)
epideictic	82 (0,22)	80 (0,26)	151 (0,51)
mean rel. deviation	**0,56**	**0,18**	**0,33**
FUNCTION	*298 / 208 = 100*	*527 / 245 = 100*	*491 / 281 = 100*
evidence	105 (0,05)	102 (0,02)	78 (0,28)
model	75 (0,34)	146 (0,46)	253 (1,53)
ornament	144 (0,44)	75 (0,33)	63 (0,59)
mean rel. deviation	**0,28**	**0,27**	**0,8**
DEGREES OF SIMILARITY	*166 / 131 = 100*	*312 / 117 = 100*	*297 / 127 = 100*
ἀφ' ὁμοίου	106 (0,06)	94 (0,07)	105 (0,05)
ἀπ' ἐναντίου	101 (0,01)	48 (1,10)	97 (0,03)
ἀπὸ μείζονος	64 (0,56)	(5)	1625 (5)
ἀπ' ἐλάττονος	158 (0,58)	155 (0,55)	21 (3,68)
mean rel. deviation	**0,3**	**1,68**	**2,19**

It is clear that on average, the subdivision into pagan and biblical has the strongest impact on distribution and function of the exempla. For two of the three subdivisions, the deviation is sharpest according to the degrees of similarity (especially the *a fortiori* forms), and next according to the function (chiefly model).

2.3. LITERARY FORM

As pointed out before, the ancient rhetoricians give virtually no indications about the literary form of the exempla. Accordingly, the exempla take divergent shapes, both *qua* **elaboration** of the exemplary history (narration, name-mentioning, allusion), and *qua* **insertion** in the context (whether or not with explicit *Ernstbedeutung* and / or insertion formula) (269). A third part examines the exempla in **series**, with the paradigmatic prayer as special form.

Due to the absence of actual rhetoricians' theories, the treatment of the literary form of the exempla will be slightly different from that of function and matter, as no comparison can be made to an established παράδειγμα-theory. Still, in the macro-analysis, the method used above will be adopted.

---

(269) Inventory 1 lists the elaboration and insertion of all exempla: the elaboration is also mentioned for the non-exemplary items.

2.3.1 Elaboration

A. Types

The exempla in Gregory's poems frequently occur in the forms practised in the rhetorical προγυμνάσματα (270). In most cases, this means that the exemplum is made up of the most extensive elaboration: the narration. Only the σύγκρισις does not imply that the exemplary history is narrated: here, a name-mentioning or even an allusion may suffice (271).

After the discussion of the three major types (narration, name-mentioning, allusion), I deal with some special cases.

1) Narration

As « narration », I consider the exempla which are sufficiently elaborated to be clear for listeners/readers who are not familiar with the history. This may vary from a detailed paraphrase of the source to a brief account of the essential facts; usually, an exemplum of this form runs to a few verses, in some cases more than ten. It is this exemplum narration which is regarded as the regular form in the treatment of the medieval exemplum (272). In Gregory's work, this is the least frequent form: 184 exempla and 209 items, or respectively 23% and 17% of the total.

As mentioned, the narrations sometimes take progymnasmatic shapes. Gregory himself frequently calls the exemplary histories (the usable material) διηγήματα (273); sometimes he also uses this term to indicate his own account of them. Thus, in a letter to the rhetorician Eudoxius, he tells of the manner in which the Athenians determined the choice of profession of their children, and after that he gives the *Ernstbedeutung* of this narration. The transition is in the form of a question: Τί μοι βούλεται τὸ διήγημα; (*What do I mean by this story?*) (274). An elaborated διήγημα in the poems has already been quoted: the fable of the owl (p.106, 12 verses). Other long-drawn-out narrations are, for example, the parables of the good Samaritan and of the Pharisee and the publican in II,1,1, respectively vv.367-377 and 393-410, and the fable of the cat dressed up as a bride in II,1,12, vv.701-708.

---

(270) When I write about « exemplum » in the discussion of the elaboration, I actually mean the history quoted in an exemplary way (the illustrans), which is in fact only a part of the total exemplum.

(271) The longest laudatory σύγκρισις in Gregory's œuvre can be found in or.43,70-76, in which Basil is compared successively to heroes from the Old (70-74) and the New Testament (75-76. Ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν Νέαν μέτειμι Διαθήκην..., *PG* 36,596D). All (almost 30) heroes are mentioned by name, but with some, the Bible story is told, and with others, a brief characterization suffices to evoke the background history.

(272) Cf. Le Goff's definition, supra p.54.

(273) E.g. about Old and New Testament stories or.15.12 (already quoted p.119): Πειθῶ γὰρ (...) βοηθεῖσθαι μὲν τοῖς παλαιοῖς **διηγήμασι**, βοηθεῖσθαι δὲ καὶ τοῖς νέοις...; compare or.34,5 (*PG* 36,245B): καὶ παλαιῶν καὶ νέων **διηγημάτων**.

A second form from the προγυμνάσματα frequently used by Gregory is the χρεία or anecdote (nowhere in his writings do we find the term itself in this technical meaning). We saw that Aphthonius subdivided this into λογική, πρακτική and μικτή. Carmen I,2,10 is teeming with the three sorts of anecdotes concerning Greeks (275). Also in the poem against anger, many anecdotes occur, including the following, announced explicitly as λογική:

Κωνστάντιον δὲ (...cfr. p.121)
Φασί ποτ' εἰπεῖν **ἄξιον μνήμης λόγον.**
Τίς δ' ἦν; ἐκεῖνον τῶν τις ἐν τέλει ποτὲ,
Παρώξυν' ἡμῖν, οὐ φέρων τιμωμένους
Τιμαῖς τοσαύταις (276) (καὶ γὰρ εὐσεβέστατος,
Εἴ πέρ τις ἄλλος βασιλέων, ὧν ἴσμεν, ἦν)·
Πολλοῖς δ' ἐπειπὼν καί τινα τοιοῦτον λόγον·
« Τί τῆς μελίσσης ἐστὶν ἡμερώτερον;
Ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἐκείνη τῶν τρυγώντων φείδεται· »
Ἤκουσε· « Πῶς οὐκ οἶδας, ὦ βέλτιστε σύ,
Ὡς οὐδ' ἐκείνῃ κέντρον ἐστὶν ἀσφαλές;
Παίει μέν, αὐτὴ δ' εὐθέως ἀπόλλυται. »
And also Constantius (...)
has, as is said, once made a memorable statement.
Which one then? One of his highly placed officials once tried
to set him against us, because he could not bear the very great favours
that were conferred upon us (for he was indeed
the most pious king of whom we have knowledge);
after many other arguments this man also added something like this:
« What is more gentle than the honeybee?
But even she does not spare him who comes to harvest the honey ».

---

(274) Ep.178,3.

(275) See e.g. for a χρεία μικτή about Diogenes p.70.

(276) As pointed out (n.197), the anecdote is known only from this passage. It is not clear what exactly provoked envy: advantages for the Christians in general, or solely for the clergy?

> *He was told: « But don't you know, my dear sir,*
> *that also for herself the sting is not safe?*
> *She does sting, but she immediately dies herself »* (277).

Other progymnasmatic forms, which Gregory sporadically chooses for his exempla, are the ἔκφρασις and the ἠθοποιΐα. The first occurs in a passage which describes the condition of his orthodox community in Constantinople with agricultural imagery, which is clearly inspired by the parable of the sower (278). An elaborate example of ἠθοποιΐα can be found in the oration about the Maccabees (which is actually one long ὑπόδειγμα): Gregory puts an ἐπιτάφιος λόγος into the mouth of the Maccabees' mother, intending to hold her up as a paragon. The conclusion of the fictitious speech is abundantly clear:

> Χαίρετε, ὦ μητέρες, χαίρετε, ὦ παῖδες. Οὕτως ἐκτρέφετε τοὺς ἐξ ὑμῶν προελθόντας· οὕτως ἐκτρέφεσθε. Καλὸν **ὑπόδειγμα δεδώκαμεν** ὑμῖν· ἀγωνίζεσθε.
> *Farewell, mothers, farewell, children. Raise your descendants in this manner; be yourselves raised in this manner. We have given you a good example: make a real effort* (279).

2) Name-mentioning

The most frequent form (375 exempla, 713 items, or respectively 47% and 58%) in which Gregory presents an exemplum is the mentioning of the name of the (major) character in question, possibly with a short addition which helps to situate the episode concerned. In this case, the exemplum usually amounts to not even - or at most - one verse. To understand the message completely, knowledge of the history referred to is required. As the majority of the already quoted exempla illustrates this type of elaboration, it is unnecessary to quote any examples here.

---

(277) I,2,25, vv.290-303 (*PG* 37,833-4). Compare for the explicit announcement of a λογικὴ χρεία, the fable-like introduction of I,2,26 (Εἰς εὐγενῆ δύστροπον), vv.1-6 (*PG* 37,851): Αἵματος ἐξ ἀγαθοῦ τις, ἅπαν κακόν, ἀνδρὶ γένος μὲν / Οὐ τῶν εὐπατέρων, τἄλλα δὲ θαυμασίων, / Προὔφερε τοὺς προγόνους. Καὶ ὃς μάλα ἡδὺ γελάσσας, / Εἶπε **λόγον μνήμης ἄξιον**, ὡς « Τὸ γένος / Ἔστιν ὄνειδος ἔμοιγε, γένει δὲ σύ. » Τοῦτο φύλασσε / Ὡς μὴ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἄλλο τι πρόσθεν ἄγοις.

(278) II,1,11, vv.1258-1272.

(279) Or.15,9 (*PG* 35,929).

3) Allusion

The least elaborate (but not necessarily the shortest (280)) form in which an exemplum may occur is the allusion. The exemplary character is not named: to recognize and identify the exemplum as such, the reader has to be well acquainted with the history alluded to: an appeal is made to his erudition. Of course, the identification of an allusion is often not required to follow the general course of the text: those who read past the allusion have merely missed the double layer. The number of allusions in Gregory's poetry is in between that of the two other forms: 244 exempla and 318 items (respectively 30% and 26%).

An allusion can be communicated by a **proverb** (as distillate of a fable) or a **κρίσις** (enunciation of an authoritative character). An example of the former can be found in the above fragment: the enunciations of Constantius and his courtier go back to an Aesopian fable (172 HAUSRATH). From the same poem, a κρίσις has been quoted on p.100: friends of God (Abraham and Job) call themselves dust and ashes. A proverb frequently recurring in Gregory's work (Χωρὶς τὰ Μυσῶν καὶ Φρυγῶν ὁρίσματα) is ascribed to (a tragedy verse in the mouth of?) Telephus by the *Scholia Clarkiana* (281).

Other types of allusions easily escape notice, or are questionable: **lexical allusions**, and **unannounced quotations** which give the original author or speaker an exemplary function. I give an example of both. In the following passage from the poem against gaudy women, Cosmas probably correctly perceives an allusion to the Διὸς ἀπάτη, in which Hera used Aphrodite's κεστὸς ἱμάς:

> Πῶς δὲ σὺ τόσσον ἔρωτος ἐπ' ἀνδράσι κεστὸν ἔχουσα
> λυσιγάμοιο, γύναι, τῆλε μενεῖς κακίης;

---

(280) I,2,28, vv.70-84 e.g. is interspersed with allusions to the parable against πλεονεξία, about the rich fool.

(281) The proverb is found in II,1,11, v.1240; II,1,12, v.662 and II,1,39, v.102, and in a variant in I,2,10, v.293. In this form, one finds the proverb also as trag. adesp. 560 NAUCK (cf. JUNGCK pp.203-204). The scholion, accompanying the verse from II,1,12, is in GAISFORD p.37. It is uncertain whether Gregory was aware of the original context of this proverb. A preceding verse (II,1,12, v.658, *PG* 37,1214) might point in that direction: Πῶς μή τι ῥήξω ῥῆμα τῶν ἐμοὶ ξένων;. The Telephus proverb is the next recognizable ῥῆμα τῶν ἐμοὶ ξένων.

How can you, who expose men to such erotic charms,
madam, keep clear of pernicious adultery? (282).

And, by quoting Paul anonymously in a statement in the first person in his autobiographical poem, Gregory holds up the apostle as an exemplum for himself:

– καὶ γὰρ εἰμ' ἀνώμοτος,
ἵν' ἐν θεῷ κἀγώ τι κομπάσω μικρόν,
ἐξ οὗ λέλουμαι πνεύματος χαρίσματι –,...
- *I am not a swearing man,*
if I, too, may boast a little in God,
by whom I have been cleansed in the grace of the Spirit (283).

Similar assimilated quotations can be found, for example, in the same poem, vv.848-850 (paraphrase of Job 32,18-19, signalled by Jungck *ad locum*), and in I,2,2, v.288 (adopted from 1Rg 14,43). The identification of the allusions to, respectively, Paul, Elihu and Jonathan adds an extra dimension to these three texts, but they are perfectly comprehensible without this identification as well.

This does not apply to a last type of allusions often used by Gregory: the **antonomasia**. Here, a proper name is replaced or circumscribed: hence, it is (usually) clear *that* an exemplary character is alluded to. Identification is thus mostly desirable, and sometimes necessary to understand the message. The examples are legion: I quote some by way of illustration. In the first two cases, the identification is less evident than in the next two.

In the oration of Παρθενίη, she points to the criminals brought forth by marriage: among these also the φονῆας Χριστοῦ παμβασιλῆος, probably an allusion to Annas and Caiaphas, perhaps also Judas (284). In I,2,10, Gregory mentions some typical owners of earthly wealth. Between Gyges and Cyrus, he briefly alludes to a rich Lydian: κἂν φρονῇς τὰ Λυδίου, by which Croesus is probably meant (285). At other places, the antonomasia is unambiguous: in one verse, Adam and his transgression are evoked: Ποῦ μοι πρωτογόνοιο μέγα κλέος; ὤλεσ' ἐδωδή (286). And the ἀνήρ in the following passage can only be Moses, who conquered the Amalekites:

---

(282) I,2,29, vv.185-186 (*PG* 37,898). KNECHT p.100 calls Aphrodite's κεστὸς ἱμάς (or simply κεστός) « ein Requisit der erotischen Literatur », with references. See also W. SPEYER, *RLAC* p.1241-1242 (s.v. « Gürtel »). In or.4,116, Gregory uses the same word when he explicitly deals with the Διὸς ἀπάτη. He does not use these Homeric terms by coincidence, which is also revealed in e.g. v.105 of the same poem, where he speaks of συφεός in relation to Circe's pigsty, the same term as in *Od*.10,238.

(283) II,1,11, vv.1102-1104 (*PG* 37,1105, translation MEEHAN, *three poems* p.107: I would rather translate « ever since » for ἐξ οὗ). Compare with 2Cor 11,16: ἵνα κἀγὼ μικρόν τι καυχήσωμαι.

(284) I,2,1, vv.454-455 (*PG* 37,556). Cosmas explains as follows:

> Καὶ παλάμῃσι τρόπαιον ἀνὴρ ἔστησε ταθείσαις
> Σταυρὸν ὑποσκιάων, πίστις δ' ἐπέδησεν ἀκωκάς.
> *And a man established a sign of victory by extending his hands,*
> *through which he foreshadowed the cross; faith constrained the swords* (287).

Hybrid forms

An antonomasia usually coincides with a short allusion. In this last case quoted above, the allusion is already somewhat more elaborate. Still, one cannot speak of an **anonymous narration** here, because - even apart from the identification of the ἀνήρ - one has to be acquainted with the history to interpret these two lines (the mention of Moses would hardly make the passage clearer for non-Bible-experts). In other passages, this differs sometimes: a history may be recounted more or less elaborately without any mentioning of the major character's name. Possibly, this name is handed over in an unambiguous antonomasia: this is the case in the already quoted passages about Zechariah, who was described as Ἰωάννοιο πατήρ (I,2,1, vv.418-421, cf. p.89), and about

---

Ἄννας καὶ Καϊάφας, Ἡρώδης τε καὶ Πιλάτος, καὶ τῶν παρανόμων Ἰουδαίων ὁ δῆμος (MAI p.380). In vv.485-486 of the same poem, Gregory himself names Annas and Caiaphas as χριστοκτόνοι, followed immediately by Judas.

(285) I,2,10, v.33 (*PG* 37,683). The identification is open to question, as in II,1,88, vv.7-8 (*PG* 37,1425), « τὰ Γυγέω τοῦ Λυδίου » is mentioned. But already in vv.31-33 of I,2,10, « τὰ Γύγου τοῦ πολυχρύσου » is spoken of (= Archilochus frg.22 DIEHL, for COSTANZA, *risonanze classiche* pp.204-212 a reason to look upon this passage as a reminiscence, but Gregory probably takes the quotation from Plutarch, *De tranq. an.*470bc, or from Aristotle *Rhet.* Γ17 1418B28). The Lydian is thus probably someone else here, namely Croesus (cf. vv.294-305, in which the anecdote - from Herodotus 6.125 - is told about Alcmaeon, who is ridiculed for his greed by the rich Lydian king Croesus).

(286) I,2,15, v.105 (*PG* 37,773).

(287) I,2,2, vv.170-171 (*PG* 37,592). Allusion to Ex.17,11 (I return to the traditional typological interpretation of this history (σταυρὸν ὑποσκιάων in part two).

Diogenes, « τὸν Σινωπέα κύνα » (I,2,10, vv.218-227, cf. p.78). At other points, no specific information is given on the exemplary character, and one should deduce his / her name from the history itself: see, for instance, the passages about Achan (I,2,2, vv.435-437, cf. p.97: τις ἐν προτέροισιν) or Agave and Pentheus (II,2,3, vv.54-57, cf. p.87: μήτηρ and φίλον υἷα). In these and similar cases, which I have classified with the narrations, identification is not necessary: the history itself is more important than its character. As was pointed out, Le Goff considers this as a typical characteristic for the medieval exemplum, in which persuasiveness and credibility depend more upon the history gone through by the hero than upon this hero's prestige. In the macroanalysis, this observation will be resumed, though somewhat generalized: of the three types of elaboration, the name-mentioning and the narration accompanied by name-mentioning, fit in closest with the ancient exemplum, the allusion and the anonymous narration with the medieval exemplum.

Another technique frequently used by Gregory is a combination or a **transition from allusion to name-mentioning / narration**, or conversely (288). An illustrating example has already been signalled (p.99 and n.190): the exemplary history of David and Absalom is first quoted explicitly, and after a few verses about the case itself (the conflict between Vitalianus and his sons), it is taken up again in the form of allusions. In the same poem, we find a similar example, where the interruption is much longer. Peter reminds his father of the parable of the prodigal son:

Οὐκ ἀΐεις υἷα νεώτερον, ὡς ἀπὸ πατρὸς
Πλάγχθη, μαχλοσύνῃσι πατρώϊα πάντα λαφύξας.
Καί μιν λιμὸς ἔτειρεν ἀλήμονα; Ὡς δ' ἐπὶ δῶμα
Πατρὸς ἑοῦ παλίνορσος ἔβη, καὶ γούνασι κάμφθη,
Αἶψα πατὴρ ἐλέηρε κακὸν πάϊν, αὐχένι χεῖρας
Πλέξατο, δάκρυα χεῦε, καὶ εἰλαπίνῃσι γέρηρε.
You must have heard about the youngest son, who wandered away from his father,
roaming around, and squandered his whole inheritance in pursuit of lechery?

---

(288) Coulie, *Chaînes*, gives some examples from the invectives against Julian, in which quotations with the mention of a name and anonymous allusions from the same source alternate with each other. He correctly concludes that attention to this technique may help to identify obscure allusions, and to trace the guiding principle or unity of a (part of a) text.

> *He was consumed with hunger in his vagrant life. But when he stood in his father's house, back home again, and went down on his knees, the father immediately felt pity for his bad son, embraced him, shed tears, and regaled him with a banquet* (289).

This passage is followed by the parable of the lost sheep, and by some historical biblical exempla in which sinners are granted forgiveness. Subsequently, Peter enters upon another theme, and emphasizes the contrast between Vitalianus' mild contact with others, and the severe treatment of his sons. In this, a late echo of the parable resounds: just as the youngest son compares himself in this parable to his father's servants, who are even better off, Peter also complains that his father's slaves are granted more than he and his brothers: Καὶ μάλα περ ποθέοντες, ὃ καὶ δμώεσσιν ὀπάζεις / Πολλάκι... (i.e. seeing their father's face) (290).

The reverse phenomenon can be found, for example, in the epistolary poem to the younger Nicobulus: the mention of Odysseus in the sixth verse of the following passage is prepared from the beginning (the context: the praise of the μῦθος, here *eloquence*):

> Καὶ μῶλον στονόεντα, καὶ ἄγριον οἶδμα θαλάσσης
> Πολλάκις ἐκπροφυγών τις, ἐπὴν Θεὸς ἵλαος εἴη,
> Τόνδε συνεξεσάωσε, φίλον κτέαρ, οἶον ἀπ' ἄλλων,
> Ὧι πλέον, ἢ πλεόνεσσιν ἀγάλλεται ἄλλος ἐπ' ἐσθλοῖς.
> Μῦθος γάρ τε βροτοῖς αἰδοῖον ἄνδρα τίθησι.
> Τεκμαίρου δ' Ὀδυσῆϊ, τὸν ἐκ πόντοιο φυγόντα,
> Γυμνὸν, καὶ μελέεσσι τετρυμμένον, αἰπὺν ἀλήτην,
> 210 Μύθοισιν πυκινοῖσιν ἱκέσσιον ἀντιάσαντα.
> Παρθενική περ ἐοῦσ', ᾐδέσσατο, καὶ βασίλεια,
> Φαιήκεσσί τ' ἔδειξε, καὶ Ἀλκινόῳ βασιλῆϊ,
> Ξεῖνον, ναυηγὸν, πάντων γεραρώτερον ἄλλων.
> *Also one who has often emerged unharmed from the wretched turmoil of battle and the wild storm at sea*
> *(because God was favourably disposed towards him)*
> *has saved eloquence, cherished possession, and nothing but eloquence,*
> *wherein he finds more delight than someone else in many goods.*
> *For eloquence makes a man respectable among mortals.*
> *Take as evidence the example of Odysseus. Escaped from sea,*
> *naked, and with exhausted limbs, an out and out wanderer,*
> *he addressed himself with shrewd words as a supplicant*
> *to a girl. And she, a king's daughter, was filled with respect for him.*

---

(289) II,2,3, vv.105-110 (*PG* 37,1487).
(290) II,2,3, vv.147-148 (*PG* 37,1490). Compare with Luke 15,17.

> *She introduced him to the Phaeacians, and to king Alcinous,*
> *a stranger, a castaway, above all others in dignity* (291).

When a name-mentioning / narration and an allusion follow each other immediately, as in the last passage, I have considered the exemplum as one whole; in the other case, as in that of the prodigal son, the exemplum was given a double entry in the inventories.

A last type within the category of the hybrid forms are the **lexical contaminations**. In this form, there is no mixing of different elaborations of the same exemplum, but two exempla are assimilated into one: one on the foreground, in a name-mentioning or narration, and one on the background, in a lexical allusion. Hence, two histories are implicitly aligned. An example shows how Gregory pleads for a sober life by referring to poor Lazarus; the terms he uses hold reminiscences of the Odyssey: the suitors, who mock Odysseus who is disguised as beggar, call him ἄχθος ἀρούρης (*Od.*20,379) and are often called ὑπερφίαλοι. Thus in the following verses, Lazarus is implicitly put on a par with Odysseus, the rich with the suitors, and Gregory clearly takes sides:

> Ἢ τινα πὰρ πυλεῶνα βεβλημένος, ἄχθος ἀρούρης,
> Ἀνδρὸς ὑπερφιάλοιο, πένης, καὶ Λάζαρος ἄλλος,
> Ἕλκοιμι ζωήν τε λυγρὴν καὶ σῶμα πονηρόν.
> *Or let me, burden upon the earth, lying at some gate*
> *of an arrogant fellow, a poor figure, another Lazarus,*
> *lead a mournful life and drag along a painful body* (292).

---

(291) II,2,5, vv.203-213 (*PG* 37,1536-7).

(292) I,2,2, vv.138-140 (*PG* 37,589). In the same poem, Gregory also tells the story of Elijah's stay with the widow of Zarephath, in terms which are strongly reminiscent of Callimachus' Hecale (vv.172-176, cf. among others Wyss, *RLAC* p.850): both old women indeed gave evidence of an exemplary hospitality. Widow, hospitality and Odyssey are linked in still another instance of a lexical contamination: in his first dogmatic poem, Gregory clearly alludes to the Gospel story of the widow's offering, which he calls δῶρον ... ἀπὸ χειρὸς ... φιλίης ὀλίγης τε (I,1,1, vv.6-7, *PG* 37,399); compare with Eumaeus' description of his own hospitality towards Odysseus: δόσις δ' ὀλίγη τε φίλη τε (*Od.* 14,58, cf. Nardi p.161).
Related to these lexical contaminations is the use of epithets such as ἐπιτάρροθος, μεδέων, μητίετα and ὑψιμέδων, which are reserved for Zeus and

B. Macro-analysis

1) Frequency of the different types of elaboration

In the discussion of the three types, it has been indicated how numerous each of these are in Gregory's poems. For convenience of comparison, I compile the results in the following table: absolute figures and percentages, for exempla and (between brackets) for all selected items:

NARRATION	184 (209)	23% (17%)
NAME-MENTIONING	375 (713)	47% (58%)
ALLUSION	244 (318)	30% (26%)

The proportions rather vary depending on whether we take all items into account, or only the exemplary ones: of the non-exemplary items, 77% turn out to be a name-mentioning. This is especially due to pagan, more specifically mythological items (think, for example, of entries such as « Hades » and « Phthonos »). Because the criteria for the selection of the non-exemplary material were different for pagan and biblical material (see the foreword to inventory 1), it is best to work with the figures for the exempla alone in the investigation of the correlation with function and matter.

The predominance of the exempla by mere name-mentioning is striking, but due to the absence of numerical data for comparison, we cannot draw any conclusions concerning a possible evolution from ancient exemplum, in which persuasiveness is linked with the character, thus preferably with name-mentioning, to medieval exemplum, in which persuasiveness is related to the history, so that name-mentioning is not necessary. In the investigation of the correlations, attention will be devoted to possible notable deviations from the average proportion.

---

the other gods by Homer and Hesiod, but are transposed by Gregory onto Christ or God, cf. Demoen, *Attitude* p.240. Compare also the contamination with Zeus Xenios in epg.65, v.1 (*PG* 38,116): Πρός τε Θεοῦ Ξενίου σε λιτάζομαι...

The phenomenon of the lexical contaminations, with one (biblical, Christian) character on the foreground, and another (mythological) discreetly on the background – clearly only for insiders – is comparable to the ambivalent images in Christian art of the first centuries. Yet, there, the relation worked conversely: in Orpheus e.g., the insiders recognized Christ.

2) Correlation with the function

It can be expected beforehand that the *exempla probationis* will be elaborated more extensively than the exempla with ornamental function. This seems to be the case indeed, and even more pronounced in the case of the exempla with model function than for those functioning as evidence:

	(average)	EVIDENCE		MODEL		ORNAMENT	
NARRATION	23%	40	24%	109	38%	35	10%
NAME-MENTIONING	47%	83	50%	117	41%	175	50%
ALLUSION	30%	44	26%	62	22%	138	40%

The sharpest deviations are found in the case of exempla with model function, which are used remarkably often as narration, and in the case of ornamental exempla, which appear hardly ever as narration and relatively often as allusion.

3) Correlation with the subject matter

A link between elaboration and matter is less predictable and therefore also more interesting. I give the absolute figures and percentages for biblical and pagan exempla; for the most important subgroups only the percentages:

	(average)	BIBLICAL		hist.	par.	PAGAN		hist.	myth.
NARRATION	23%	118	23%	21%	38%	64	22%	39%	9%
NAME-MENT.	47%	265	53%	55%	40%	107	37%	43%	36%
ALLUSION	30%	123	24%	24%	22%	121	41%	18%	55%

The differences according to matter thus appear to be greater than those according to function. The division into subgroups is not superfluous here: the share of the narrations in the total of the biblical and pagan exempla seems more or less equal to the average, but the subdivision shows that behind this average, great mutual differences are hidden. Especially within the pagan group, the difference between historical and mythological exempla is considerable: of *all* types of matter, the Greeks are quoted most (39%) as narration, whereas the mythological are quoted least by far (9%). This is exactly the other way around in the case of allusions: there is seldom an allusion to historical Greeks, whereas a remarkable number of allusions are made to mythological characters. Furthermore, it is striking that biblical characters, especially the historical ones, are mentioned notably more by name than pagan characters.

What conclusion do these significant differences lead to, then? The exceptional position of the elaboration of the mythological exempla on the one hand points to a certain restraint in naming and certainly in elaborately recounting episodes from Greek mythology, but on the other, it proves once more that Gregory's poems were written for an audience with a sufficient measure of profane education to grasp mythological allusions. The fact that more than half of the biblical exempla occur in the shape of a name-mentioning, shows that, here, the persuasiveness - as usual in the ancient exemplum - is derived more from the biblical characters' authority, whereas the force of the pagan exempla - as in the medieval exempla - lies in the history itself. This also seems a possible explanation for the large number of narrations (including many anonymous ones) about Greeks.

4) Correlation with rhetorical categories and literary genre

	(average)	JUDICIAL		DELIBERATIVE		EPIDEICTIC	
NARRATION	23%	16	14%	131	31%	37	14%
NAME-MENT.	47%	43	37%	178	43%	154	57%
ALLUSION	30%	57	49%	108	26%	79	29%

The above figures are included here only for the sake of completeness, as the deviations from the average should be ascribed to the content and form of quantitatively important subgroups or individual poems, rather than to the actual rhetorical categories of the poems. The relatively large number of allusions in the *judicial* poems is due on the one hand to the autobiographical poems, in which pagan and biblical elements usually form no part of the treated matter, and thus occur in the first place in the shape of allusions, and on the other hand to the epistolary poem to Nemesius, where most items are indeed mentioned by name, but not in exempla (2 out of 35 name-mentionings are used as exempla, versus 16 out of 19 allusions). The predominance of the name-mentionings over the narrations in the *epideictic* poems is occasioned by the epigrams (respectively 7%, 58%, 35%), which, due to their brevity, leave no space for elaborated exempla. Only in the case of the *deliberative* poems, one might observe a causal connection between rhetorical γένος and elaboration of the exempla, judging by the argument that a long-drawn-out example has most opportunity to influence the reader. Anyway, this connection is certainly in line with the established correlation between narration and model function.

2.3.2 Insertion

The manner in which a relation is established between the exemplary history - no matter how it is elaborated - and the case is determined by the possible combinations of (a) illustrans, (b) illustrandum, (c) *Ernstbedeutung* of the illustrans or conclusion derived from it, and (d) linking term or formula (cf. pp.48-49). Of the three types of exemplum which I have defined in this way (full, minimal and metaphorical), the first two clearly distinguish (to a greater or lesser extent) between illustrans and illustrandum, by means of one insertion formula or another (d). In a first part, I describe some of these formulas; after that I deal with the different types of exempla according to insertion; and finally, in the macro-analysis I examine a possible connection between insertion and the already treated aspects of the exemplum.

A. Linking terms and formulas

1) Explicit announcement: formulas about the insertion itself

The announcement of exempla by means of the terms δεῖγμα, παράδειγμα or ὑπόδειγμα has already been commented upon (cf. pp.75-81). In this discussion, it was pointed out that explicit insertions can also be established with other formulas. Examples from Gregory's poems include:

> **Μεμνήσομαι** δὲ καί τινων, καὶ συντόμως.
> *I will call some to mind, and this in a concise manner* (293).
>
> Εἰ δ' ἄγε σοὶ καὶ μῦθον ἐοικότα **μυθολογήσω**
> αἴσχεσιν ὑμετέροις· ἡ πολιὴ δὲ λάλον.
> *Come on, I will tell you a fable which perfectly fits*
> *your disgraceful behaviour. A grey head likes to chat* (294).
>
> **Ἀρκεῖ τοσαῦτα** καὶ τάδε μετρίου πέρα...
> *So many (examples) suffice, they are more than numerous*
> *enough...* (295).

---

(293) I,2,25, v.260 (*PG* 37,832). Compare with the already quoted Μεμνήσομαι δέ, δείγματος χάριν, τινῶν (p.78: I,2,10, v.214, *PG* 37,695).

(294) I,2,29, vv.187-188 (*PG* 37,898). Compare with I,2,28, vv.232-234 (*PG* 37,873): Πρὸς ταῦτα καί τι μυθολογῆσαί σοι θέλω, (...) μῦθον πρέποντα ... (quoted in its entirety supra p.106). In both cases, Gregory has probably invented the fable himself.

(295) I,2,10, v.365 (*PG* 37,706). Compare with I,2,25, v.253 (*PG* 37,831, quoted on p.81): Ἀρκεῖ τάδ' ἡμῖν εὐγενῆ παιδεύματα. An example of an explicit insertion in Gregory's prose: Βούλει δε καὶ ἄλλην σοι παραστήσω τάξιν, καὶ ταύτην ἐπαινετήν, καὶ ταύτην ἀξίαν τῆς εἰς τὸ παρὸν μνήμης, καὶ νουθεσίας; Ὁρᾷς τῶν Χριστοῦ μαθητῶν.... (or.32,18, *PG* 36,193C).

2) Formulas containing information about the function of the exempla

Some linking terms or formulas immediately reveal which function the inserted exempla have; sometimes they also serve as the transition to the *Ernstbedeutung* or the conclusion.

As pointed out (p.76), the first paragraphs of the oration on the φιλοπτωχία (or.14) are an enumeration of παραδείγματα with *evidential function*, in which three terms or formulas are used repeatedly for insertion: forms of μαρτυρέω / μάρτυς, and the formulas πειθέτω σε and διδάσκει με. The first two also occur in Gregory's poems: μάρτυς once (cf. p.89), σε πειθέτω eight times (296). In addition, we also find δηλοῦσι (cf. p.90), τεκμήριον τοῦ λόγου, τεκμαίρου (twice, including the passage on p.149).

The formulas used to announce the *model function* of the exempla can be subdivided according to whether they are directed at προτροπή or ἀποτροπή. Already quoted examples of announcement and conclusion of exempla as προτροπή are ὡς ἂν μάθῃς κἀνθένδε τὴν ἀρετήν, and τούτους μιμώμεθα (297). A comparable expression is: ζητῶ σε πλήσιον θεῖναι / εἶναι. Less explicit is the more frequent type of insertion through verbs expressing admiration: αἰνῶ, τίς δ'οὐκ ἐπαινεῖ, θαυμάζω (six times in all). Exempla as ἀποτροπή, then, are inserted with verbs suggesting fear, as in the already quoted τοῦτο φοβούμενος τὸ ὑπόδειγμα καὶ αὐτός (298). Formulas in the poems include: ὡς ὑποτρομέῃς, σε δινείτω φόβος, τίς ἀΐων οὐ τρομέει, τοῦτο φύλασσε, μηδ' ὡς, δείδια (three times).

3) Standard formulas

Most linking terms and formulas are not connected with a specific function of the exemplum. On the whole, from Gregory's poems, four types of formulas can be deduced according to the way in which a distinction is made between illustrans and illustrandum. Of each of these four, prototypes can be found in the examples quoted by the rhetoricians in their treatment of the παράδειγμα (cf. n.75). I deal with them in decreasing order of emphasis.

---

(296) The frequencies denote the number of times that a specific formula occurs, not the number of illustrantia which are inserted in that manner. This latter figure is much higher, since frequently, several illustrantia are introduced or concluded with one and the same formula.

(297) Respectively I,2,10, v.215 (p.78) and or.15,12 (p.119). Apart from that, forms of μιμέομαι as προτροπή are only found in prose, e.g. in or.40,38 (*PG* 36,413B): Καθαρθῶμεν ἁφήν, (...) καὶ Θωμᾶν κατὰ τοῦτο μιμούμενοι. The one time that the verb is used for the insertion of an exemplum in Gregory's poems, it is with » retrospective « model function (of the type εἶχον ἐν λόγῳ, cf. n.150): in the past, someone (i.e. Nonna) has – whether or not consciously – followed a model: Παῖδα ποθεῦσ' ἱερῆς Ἄννης ἐμιμήσατο φωνήν (II,1,1, v.426, *PG* 37,1001).

(298) Ep.206,3 (cf.p.80). The participle serves at the same time as transition to the conclusion drawn from the *Ernstbedeutung* of the ὑπόδειγμα.

(1) Verba declarandi and verba sentiendi

The distance between illustrans and illustrandum is brought about here by the intervention usually of the first or second person, who remembers a history, thinks it over, examines it, is informed of it ..., or is asked to do or be so. In the rhetoricians' examples, it concerns the formulas **μέμνημαι** τόδε ἔργον ἐγὼ πάλαι, ἢ οὐκ **ἀΐεις**, **ὁρᾷς**. In Gregory's poems, these three verbs can be found back in the same form, as announcements of exempla, respectively 1, 3 and 3 times (299). Furthermore, he uses expressions with forms of μνάομαι (μνωόμενος, 2), σκοπέω (ἀλλά μοι σκόπει, 2), ὁράω (ποτ᾽ εἶδες), ἀθρέω (ἄθρει μοι / δή, 3), πυνθάνομαι (5), βλέπω, σκέπτομαι, ἀκούω (4), οἶδα (4), ὑπομιμνήσκω (2), ἐννοέω, λέγω.

There are some parallel expressions with which Gregory sometimes vaguely refers to a source (in his poems, he practically never mentions the name of a classical author or of a book of the Bible from which he derives a specific exemplum): πυνθάνομ᾽ ὡς, (ὅταν) ἀκούω, (ὡς) ἐνέπουσιν, (ὡς) λέγονται, ὥς φασι, ὡς πιστεύεται .... These apparently relativizing additions are used, for instance – but not exclusively –, when Gregory wants to distance himself from pagan histories (300).

(2) Explicit reference to the past

The rhetoricians use καὶ γὰρ **πρότερον** and μέμνημαι τόδε ἔργον ἐγὼ **πάλαι** as linking formulas to place the quoted history in the past. In both cases, the adverb of time is not the only transitional term. Gregory also often links the reference to the past with other indications about the relation between illustrans and illustrandum: in at least twenty cases, πρόσθεν, πάρος, τοπάροιθε, ποτε, πάλαι, πρῶτον, πρίν, ἦν δ' ὅτε, ἤδη τις... are preceded by ὡς, ὅπως, οἷα, καὶ γάρ (301). However, some fifteen times they form the only connection with the exemplary history. Sometimes, adverbs or conjunctions such as καὶ νῦν and μετὰ τὸν δεῖνα also serve this same purpose.

---

(299) An example with οὐκ ἀΐεις is already quoted on p.148: the parable of the prodigal son; the same formula in I,2,29, v.129 (*PG* 37,893): οὐκ ἀΐεις, καὶ πρόσθε τεὸν πατέρ᾽ ὡς ἀπάτησεν...; an example with ὁρᾷς (from prose) in n.295, in combination with an explicit insertion.

(300) (Ὣς) ἐνέπουσιν e.g. serves as the linking formula for the myth of Pandora (inspired by Hesiod's *Theog.* 570–589 and *Erga* 55–56), from which Gregory explicitly distances himself afterwards (I,2,29, v.115, cf. supra p.122). In II,1,1, v.368, though, the same formula is used for the Bible story about the destruction of Jericho.

(3) Adverbs or conjunctions with causal or adversative meaning or nuance

Prototypes in the rhetoricians' writings are here **οὐδὲ γὰρ** οὐδέ and the combination **καὶ γὰρ** πρότερον. As the exemplum's only introduction, we come across this type about 25 times in Gregory, in the forms ἀλλὰ καί, καὶ γάρ, τοὔνεκα καί, μηδέ, καί. Especially in the epigrams, even briefer terms are used to distinguish history and case: (μέν...) δέ, ἀλλά (σύ), αὐτὰρ ἐγώ. These last formulas are typical for the priamel, frequently used by Gregory (302).

(4) Terms of comparison

In the rhetoricians' writings we find παραδείγματα, accompanied by the insertion terms **ὡς** and **τῷ ἴκελον**. A few times, Gregory uses paraphrases similar to this last form: τῷ προσφερές, παλαιοτάτοισιν ὅμοιος, οὐδὲν διοίσει ταῦτα. Much more frequently, the linking term is simply ὡς or ὥσπερ (ca.30 times), or the synonyms οἷον (περ) or καθάπερ (together eight times). Even an asyndetic coordination can count as a kind of syntactic form of insertion with comparative meaning: Σαοὺλ προφήτης, Μάξιμος λογογράφος! (303). Besides, there are insertion formulas which represent the same meaning periphrastically: ἐναρίθμιός εἰμι, or μή σε ... τούτων τιν' ἀριθμήσειεν (304).

4) Rhetorical figures

Less frequently, exempla are inserted through rhetorical figures. I name four of these, with examples.

---

(301) Expressions such as παλαιοτάτοισιν ὅμοιος and ὥς τις τῶν πάλαι can be rated among this same type.

(302) E.g. in epg.1. See COSTANZA, *La Scelta* for the priamel in Gregory.

(303) II,1.41. v.21 (*PG* 37,1341).

(304) Respectively II,1,1, v.433 (*PG* 37,1002) and II,2,3, v.62 (*PG* 37,1484, cf. supra p.87). Also compare ὁ τέτρατος αὐτὸς ἔοιμι, repeated several times in II,1,19 (cf. supra p.104).

(1) Ἀποστροφή

For the sake of liveliness, Gregory regularly addresses exemplary characters, often within a series of exempla, as a stylistic variation. In this address, he does not distinguish between biblical and pagan, or historical and legendary characters; by way of personifications he even speaks to lifeless objects and concepts. From the biblical sphere he thus addresses, for example, Jonadab (Καὶ σὺ ...᾿Ιωναδὰβ ἔξοχε μῆτιν), David (Ὦ θεῖε Δαβίδ, σοὶ δὲ), Samuel's mother, Hannah (Ἄννα, σὺ δ' υἷα φίλον...), and also the Ark of the Covenant (Καὶ σέ, κιβωτὸν ἄνασσαν, cf. supra p.103) (305). From the pagan sphere, he addresses Socrates (ὦ Σώκρατες, τὰ πρῶτα μέχρι νῦν φέρεις), Polycrates (Ὦ Σαμίων ποτ' ἄναξ, σὺ Πολύκρατες, cf. supra p.98), Empedocles (Ἐμπεδόκλεις, σὲ μὲν...), Heracles and others (Ἡράκλεις, Ἐμπεδότιμε, Τροφώνιε, εἴξατε μύθων, / καὶ σύ γ', Ἀρισταίου κενεαυχέος ὀφρὺς ἄπιστε·), and also, repeatedly, the Φθόνος (Ὦ Φθόνε, καὶ σύ) (306). Hence, the apostrophe cannot be used as a criterion to determine to what extent Gregory ascribes reality or historicity to these and other characters.

(2) Παράλειψις

In Gregory's poems, the παράλειψις or *praeteritio*, related to the formulas about the insertion itself, is used only a few times to insert exempla: as an introduction to the mention of David's attitude towards Absalom (Τί δεῖ λέγειν τὸν υἱὸν ὡς ἠνέσχετο), and to the interpretation of the apparition of the star of Bethlehem (Σιγάσθω Χριστοῖο μέγα κλέος ἄγγελος ἀστήρ, cf. supra p.105). Similar formulas are Οὐδ' ὁ Πολέμων ἔμοιγε σιγηθήσεται and Οὐκ ἂν παρέλθοιμ' οὐδὲ τὸ Στεφάνου καλόν (307).

(3) Διαπόρησις

Similarly the διαπόρησις or *dubitatio* is a rhetorical figure concerning the insertion itself. Thus, Gregory does not know what to do with the exemplary characters Elijah (Ἠλίαν δὲ ποῦ / στήσωμεν, ὃν Κάρμηλος ἔτρεφεν μέγας), and Adam, Solomon and Judas (Ποῦ μοι πρωτογόνοιο μέγα κλέος; (...) / Ποῦ Σολομῶν πινυτός; (...) / Ποῦ δὲ δυωδεκάδος συναρίθμιος ἦν ὅτ' Ἰούδας...) (308). And when wondering how to describe his own problems, he only knows how it should not be done:

---

(305) Respectively I,2,2, v.152 (*PG* 37,590); I,2,10, v.617 (*PG* 37,725), ept.68, v.4 (*PG* 38,46) and II,1,13, v.136 (*PG* 37,1238).

(306) Respectively II,1,11, v.1035 (*PG* 37,1100); II,2,3, v.42 (*PG* 37,1483); ept.69, v.1 (*PG* 38,46); ept.70, vv.1-2 (*PG* 38,47); II,1,34, v.189 (*PG* 37,1320).

(307) Respectively I,2,25, v.210 (*PG* 37,828); I,1,5, v.53 (*PG* 37,428); I,2,10, v.793 (*PG* 37,737); I,2,25, v.231 (*PG* 37,830).

> ἃ δ' ἦλθεν ἡμῖν αὖθις ἐκ τούτων κακά –
> ὢ πῶς ἂν ἐκφράσαιμι τοὺς ἐμοὺς πόνους;
> (...)
> οὐχ αἷμά μ' οὐδὲ βάτραχος, οὐ σκνιπῶν νέφος
> οὐδὲ κυνόμυια οὔτε τις κτηνῶν φθορά,
> οὐ φλυκτίς, οὐ χάλαζ', οὐκ ἀκρίς, οὐ σκότος,
> οὐ πρωτοτόκων ὄλεθρος, ἔσχατον κακῶν,
> ἔκαμψεν ἡμᾶς (ταῦτα γὰρ τῶν ἀγρίων
> Αἰγυπτίων μάστιγες ἐκβοώμεναι).
> *When we get to the troubles that came my way subsequently, however,*
> *their very narration leaves me at a loss.*
> *(...)*
> *It was no blood, or frogs, or gnats,*
> *or flies, or pestilence of flocks,*
> *or boils, or hail, or locusts, or darkness,*
> *or (the last plague) the destruction of the firstborn,*
> *that afflicted me. These were the celebrated plagues*
> *of the fierce Egyptians* (309).

(4) *Laudatory σύγκρισις*

A special type of comparison is that in which a comparative value judgment is expressed on both the discussed character and an exemplary one, usually in favour of the former. This laudatory σύγκρισις can be spun out broadly, especially in ἐγκώμια and ἐπιτάφιοι λόγοι, in which it is a τόπος. What is interesting to us here is the terminology used by Gregory to insert this kind of exempla. Most explicit are terms of comparison such as οὐ τόσσον... ὅσσον (310), comparatives (οὐδὲν ἀτιμοτέρη προτέρων // ἄλσεος Ἀλκινόου τερπνοτέρη // δεύτερος ἐξ Ἀαρὼν // τούτων οὗτος ἀνὴρ οὐ δεύτερον ἔργον ἔρεξεν (311)), and verbs expressing the superiority or at least equality of the compared character (θηλυτέρῃσι μεταπρέπει εὐσεβέεσσι // θυσίην μεγάλοιο πατρὸς ζήλωσε παλαιὴν Ἀβραὰμ // ὑπερβάλλων Κῦρον τὸν Μῆδον ἢ τὸν Κροῖσον ἢ Μίδαν πόροις (312)), or the inferiority of the exemplary one (σοι Κῦρος κάτω καθέζηται // εἴκῃ δέ σοι Λυκοῦργος ἢ Σόλων νόμοις // εἴξατε μύθων (313)). A more subtle form, which frequently occurs in Gregory, is an *a fortiori* argument in which the exemplum is placed in a protasis prefaced with εἴ τις:

---

(308) Respectively I.2,10, vv.523-524 (*PG* 37,718); I.2,15, vv.105-107 (*PG* 37,773-4: in the last verse, I changed ἦν, ὅ τ' into ἦν ὅτ').

(309) II.1.11, v.736-745 (*PG* 37,1080, translation Meehan, *three poems* p.98). This pedantic enumeration of the plagues of Egypt is at the same time also a kind of παράλειψις.

(310) The most elaborated passage is II.1.16, vv.67-76 (*PG* 37,1259), in which Gregory hyperbolically describes his nostalgia for the Anastasia: Οὐ τόσον Ἀσσυρίοισιν ὅτ' ἤγετο τηλόθι πάτρης / Λαὸς δουρεαλής, νηὸν ἔκλαυσε μέγαν, / Οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδὲ κιβωτόν, ὅτ' ἀλλοφύλοισιν ἐμίχθη / Οὔτ' Ἰακὼβ τοπάρος υἷα κλαπέντα φίλον (...) / Ὅσσον ἐγὼ νεόπηκτον ὀδύρομαι εἰσέτι καὶ νῦν Νηόν, ὃν ἄλλος ἔχει καρπὸν ἐμῶν καμάτων. Further examples: II.1.45, vv.3-7 (*PG* 37,1353: general anonymous exempla, but through the parallel with the above σύγκρισις, Cosmas probably rightly sees an allusion to Jacob mourning Joseph behind verse 3: Οὔτε τόσον παίδων τις ἑὸν ἔκλαυ-

> 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.
> *If mourning made any one into a tree or a stone,*
> *if any spring ever flowed as the result of lament,*
> *all Caesarius' friends and neighbours should be stones,*
> *rivers and mournful trees* (314).

Most non-metaphorical exempla are inserted with one or a combination of the above types of linking terms and formulas (315). Some of these are connected with the function of the

---

σατο τόσσον) and II,2,3, vv.206-210 (Peter's grief is greater than that of Echo searching for Pan).

(311) Respectively II,1,45, vv.223-224 (*PG* 37,1369); II,2,3, vv.140-141 (*PG* 37,1490); II,2,1, v.302 (*PG* 37,1473); epg.88, v.3 (*PG* 38,125).

(312) Respectively ept.69, v.5 (*PG* 38,47); II,2,1, vv.145-146 (*PG* 37,1462); II,1,12, vv.434-435 (*PG* 37,1197).

(313) Respectively I,2,10, vv.34-35 (*PG* 37,683); I,2,10, v.41 (*PG* 37,683); ept.70, v.1 (*PG* 38,47).

(314) Ept.18, vv.1-4 (*PG* 38,19, translation PATON, *AG* 8,97). Allusion is successively made to Helios' children (who turned into poplars out of grief over their brother Phaethon), Niobe, and, I suspect, Byblis (cf. Antoninus Liberalis, 30; *PWRE* III,1 p.1098, s.v. Byblis 4; Cosmas thinks that Niobe's tears are concerned here). Other exempla introduced with εἴ τις: ept.40, vv.1-2 (*PG* 38,30: Εἴ τις Τάνταλός ἐστιν ἐν ὕδασιν αὖος ἀπίστοις,...: he who desecrates Martinianus' grave, deserves the same punishment as Tantalus and Tityus), and ept.57, vv.1-2 (*PG* 38,39-40: Εἴ τις ὄρους καθύπερθεν ἁγνῆς ὀπὸς ἔπλετο μύστης / Μωσῆς, καὶ μεγάλου Γρηγορίοιο νόος: if a Moses was initiated by a sacred voice, then so too the elder Gregory).

(315) Besides, there are some original ways to insert exempla, which escape all categories. For example, an unusual formulation introduces the exemplum of Daedalus who made a painted wooden cow for Pasiphaë, to attract the bull: when Gregory sees gaudy women, he attaches credence to this myth: πείθομαι, ὥς ποτε ταῦρον ἀνὴρ σοφὸς ἤπαφε τέχνῃ, / χρώμασι μορφώσας δουρατέην δάμαλιν – / ξεῖνος ἔρως ἀπινύοισιν ἐπ' εἴδεσιν ἔμπνοα βαίνειν –, ὁππότε καὶ σὺ νέοις μήσαο τοῖον ἄγος (I,2,29, vv.165-168, *PG* 37,896).

exempla, but none appears to be restricted to a specific subject matter, whether pagan or biblical.

B. Types of exempla according to insertion

1) Full exemplum: (a) (b) (c) (d), or (a) (b) (c)

With this term, I refer to those exempla in which the illustrans is clearly distinguished from the illustrandum (usually by a linking term or formula), and in which the history's significance for the case (the *Ernstbedeutung*) is explicitly represented. In his letters, it happens a few times that Gregory announces this *Ernstbedeutung* in so many words: Τί μοι βούλεται τὸ διήγημα; or Πρὸς τί βλέπει μοι τὸ παράδειγμα; (316). In his poems, he does not use similar emphatic transitional formulas between history and semantic intention.

Full exempla have already been quoted, with indication of the *Ernstbedeutung*, in n.161 (I,2,29, vv.153–162, with analogical argument), and on p.91 (I,2,1, vv.296–341, with Hermogenic argumentation). Most exempla with inductive argumentation are full exempla by definition, since *Ernstbedeutung* and illustrandum coincide in these (examples pp.88–91 with footnotes).

In some exempla, of which the *Ernstbedeutung* is clearly formulated, a linking term is missing, as in the following passage from the poem Πρὸς παρθένους παραινετικός:

illustrandum (b)
Σὺ δὲ εὐπλόει, τὸ ἱστίον πετάσασα τῆς ἐλπίδος.
Ernstbedeutung (c)
Οὐ τῶν κάτω τὸ πίπτειν, τῶν δ᾽ ἄνω φερομένων
Ὀλίγοι πτερορρυοῦσιν, οἱ πλείους δ᾽ εὐδρομοῦσιν.
illustrantia (a)
Ἔπεσεν Ἑωσφόρος, ἀλλ᾽ οὐρανὸς ἀγγέλων.
Ἰούδας ἦν προδότης, οἱ δ᾽ ἕνδεκα λαμπτῆρες.
But you: steer a good course, spreading the sail of hope.
He who stays on the ground, does not fall; of those who do rise aloft, there are some who shed their feathers and fall, but most maintain a good flight.
Lucifer has fallen, but heaven belongs to the angels.
Judas was a traitor, but the eleven are radiant stars (317).

Even without any linking term, the distance between illustrandum and illustrans is preserved in these cases, and the meaning is explicit: consequently, I consider them as full exempla.

---

(316) Respectively ep.178,3 (cf. p.143) and ep.230,2 (cf. p.118).
(317) I,2,3, vv.44–48 (*PG* 37,636).

2) **Minimal exemplum** (a) (b) (d)

Likewise in a minimal exemplum, the illustrandum is distinguished from the illustrans, but then only by an insertion formula. The *Ernstbedeutung* of the quoted history is not made explicit (but is usually clear from the context). The more information the insertion formula includes (e.g. about the function), the more this type resembles the full exemplum: the vaguer it is, the slighter the difference with the metaphorical exemplum. Terms of comparison as ὡς nearly always introduce minimal exempla.

Exempla with *morphological insertion forms* are situated on the borderline between minimal and metaphorical exempla: the genitive of a proper name or the adjective derived from it make clear that the exemplary character or episode is quoted proverbially, without being identified with or replacing the case. Examples of this use of the genitive: Ἀλκινόοιο τράπεζα (a sumptuous table, like that of Alcinous); τὰ Γύγου τοῦ πολυχρύσου (as much possessions as Gyges with his pile of gold) (318). In the following passage, an Old Testament history is inserted through the adjective derived from the city name of Gath (LXX: Γεθθα), where the Ark was transported by the Philistines. Its inhabitants were punished for this in an unusual manner: χεὶρ κυρίου ἐπάταξεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὰς ἕδρας αὐτῶν (1Rg 5,9). Gregory makes use of the double meaning of the word ἕδρα, (bishop's) see and bottom, to put the unworthy bishops in their proper place:

> Ὡς ὄφελον Γετθαῖαν ἀναπλήσαιεν ἀνίην,
> Ἔνδικον ἑδρήεσσαν ἐφ' ἕδρῃ τίσιν ἔχοντες.
> *I would like to see them exposed to the full ulcer plague of Gath,*
> *thus paying with a just and firm punishment, on their seat* (319).

3) **Metaphorical exemplum**: (b) = (a), or (a)

A metaphorical exemplum contains no insertion formula and also the explicit *Ernstbedeutung* is missing. As stated in the theoretical introduction, one can distinguish between Vossian antonomasia (substitution of a name) and allegory (transposition of a history) (320). In both cases, specific signals may be given, for example by means of actualizing attributes.

---

(318) Respectively I,2,2, v.131 (*PG* 37,589) and I,2,10, v.31 (*PG* 37,683).

(319) II,1,13, vv.149-150 (*PG* 37,1239).
Other example of an insertion by means of an adjective: II,2,3, vv.213-215 (*PG* 37,1495-6): Τίς χάρις, εἰ μὴ πατρὸς ἐν οὔασι κείσετ' ἀοιδή, / Εἴ μου καὶ **Ὀρφείη** τις ἐν Ὀδρυσίοις σκοπέλοισι / Λᾶας ἄγοι, καὶ θῆρας ἀπόπροθε, καὶ πετεηνά;

(1) Vossian antonomasia

Most Vossian antonomasias in Gregory's poems are accompanied by actualizing attributes. Together with the implicit but mostly unambiguous *Ernstbedeutung*, they see to it that exempla of this form seldom give rise to interpretation problems.

In the form (b) = (a), the exemplum is used predicatively (as a qualifying predicate) or attributively: the exemplary character tells something more about the person mentioned in the case. As for predicative use, the copulative verb in itself can already function as a kind of actualizing attribute:

> Πάντα γάρ, ὅσσ᾽ ἐθέλῃσι, πέλει θανάτοιο σοφιστής,
> **Γεγὼς ὁ Πρωτεὺς** εἰς κλοπὰς μορφωμάτων.
> *Since whatever he wants becomes the sophist of death:*
> *a born Proteus in his deceitful transformations* (321).
>
> Τῇ νῦν, Χριστέ, φέροις με, ὅποι φίλον. Ἄλγεσι κάμφθην.
> Κητείαις λαγόνεσσι τετρυμένος **εἰμὶ προφήτης**.

---

(320) The difference between a Vossian antonomasia and an allegory is indeed not only determined by the quantitative elaboration. Accordingly, I consider the following elaborated exemplum as a Vossian antonomasia (the same also goes for the allusion to the schism of Antioch through the elaborated mention of Paul and Apollos, cf. supra p.84):
Γενοῦ Ζακχαῖος· τοῖς μὲν ἠδικημένοις
μὴ πλεῖον, αὐτὸ τὸ κεφάλαιον, εἰ δοκεῖ,
μόνον κατάθες· οὐ γὰρ φέρεις τὸ τοῦ νόμου·
τοῖς δ᾽ αὖ πένησιν εἰσένεγχ᾽ ὅσον θέλεις,
καὶ τότε γε Χριστὸν ἑστιάσεις ἀξίως. (II,1,12, vv.457-461, *PG* 37,1199). Only the last verse contains an allegorization of the story of Luke: in the preceding verses, allusion is made to the actual course of the Zacchaeus-episode (who gave back four times as much as he had extorted, according to the Roman law: τὸ τοῦ νόμου). Meier p.124 explains vv.457-460 correctly, but in the last verse, he sees an » Anklang an Matt.25,40. « In my view, however, the verse is an overt allusion to Luke 19,6-7, in which Jesus is Zacchaeus' guest. This is again an illustration of Gregory's technique of including an allusion to the same history alongside a name-mentioning.

(321) II,1,83, vv.9-10 (*PG* 37,1429).

> *Lead me now, Christ, wherever you wish. I am bent low with grief.*
> *I am the prophet, become weak in the belly of a whale* (322).

Usually, though, the name of the exemplary character is moreover preceded by an actualizing adjective and/or pronoun. For instance, Gregory now calls his father *a second* Abraham:

> Ἦν μοι πατὴρ (...) / πάτραρχος ὄντως, Ἀβραάμ **τις δεύτερος**.

and then *a new* Moses or *an* Aaron:

> Μείλιχος, ἡδυεπής, Μωσῆς **νέος**, ἢ **τις** Ἀαρὼν (323),

and himself *another* Job:

> **Ἄλλος** Ἰὼβ **νέος** εἰμί·

or *a new* Lazarus:

> Λάζαρος ἐν νεκύεσσιν ἐγὼ **νέος**.

or else: *a new* Samuel (here, attributively):

> Ἡ δέ με σοῖς ἱεροῖσι νέον ἀνέθηκε Σαμουήλ (324) .

The Anastasia, he calls the *very newest* Bethlehem:

> Ἀλλ᾽ οὐ τόσσος ἔμοιγε πόθος καὶ ἄλγος ἐκείνων,
> Ὅσσος Ἀναστασίης, Βηθλεὲμ **ὑστατίης** (325).

---

(322) II,1,19, vv.83-84 (*PG* 37,1278). The poem was probably written in the middle of 382, at the beginning of the second and last period in which Gregory was in charge of the community of Nazianzus, against his will and after a time of seclusion on his country estate. The comparison with Jonah, who was also obstinate in taking on his responsibility, is appropriate here.

Other examples in which the (possibly omitted) copula serves as actualization:

Ἄφωνός ἐστιν, ἀσθενής, βοηλάτης. / Ῥήτωρ, Μίλων, τύραννος ἡμῖν ἀθρόως. (I,2,25, vv.125-126, *PG* 37,822)

Πίθηκός ἐστι, καὶ Τυφωεὺς **γίγνεται** (I,2,25, v.134, *PG* 37,823)

Σίμων Μάγος χθὲς, σήμερον Πέτρος Σίμων (II,1,12, v.430, *PG* 37,1197).

(323) Respectively II,1,11, vv.51-53 (*PG* 37,1033) and II,1,1, v.128 (*PG* 37,979).

(324) Respectively II,1,19, v.31 (*PG* 37,1273), II,1,50, v.69 (*PG* 37,1390), and II,1,1, v.431 (*PG* 37,1002).

(325) II,1,16, vv.61-62 (*PG* 37,1258).

Other examples of actualizing attributes accompanying a Vossian antonomasia:

In form (a), the exemplary character substitutes for the person actually concerned. When a specific person is dealt with, this type can cause problems of identification, when the context is not clear enough: this is, for instance, the case with the governess of Peter's sisters, who is described as θηλυτέρη Χείρων. Mentioning her real name would have avoided an intricate prosopographical aporia (326).

Elsewhere, it is possible to identify the intended person: in the following verse for example, Gregory undoubtedly has Maximus in mind:

> Αἰγύπτιόν **τιν' ἄλλον** ὕδει Πρωτέα (327).

In other cases, the exemplary character does not stand for a concrete person, but for a group or a type, for example for the eromenes of Socrates: οἱ Χαρμίδαι (morphological signal: plural form) (328), or for desecrators of graves:

> Σκείρων **τίς οὗτος**, ἢ Τυφωεύς, ἢ γίγας
> Ἥκει τυραννῶν νερτέρους, τύμβον τ' ἐμόν;
> Τί ταῦτα; καὶ ποῦ μῆνις ἔκδικος τάφων;
> Νῦν δεῖ κεραυνοῖς τοὺς κακοὺς τεθνηκέναι.
> *Which Sceiron, or Typhoeus, or giant,*
> *comes here to tyrannize the people of the underworld, and my grave?*

Ὡς χρυσὸς χοάνοις **ἴσθι** καθαιρόμενος· / Ἢ φθονεροῖο πάλη κάμνων δέμας, **ἄλλος** Ἰὼβ **τις** (I,2,38, vv.4-5, *PG* 37,967, to a righteous person complaining that he is worse off than many criminals);

Εἰ Παῦλός **τις** ἐὼν χριστοκτόνον υἷα φυτεύσει, / Ἄνναν ἢ Καϊάφαν ἀτάσθαλον, ἤ **τιν'** Ἰούδαν· (I,2,1, vv.485-486, *PG* 37,559: argument of Παρθενίη: nobody knows what his children will become: virtuous people can produce criminals. Annas and Caiaphas are not accompanied by an actualizing attribute, but they are used attributively with χριστοκτόνον υἷα, cf. n.284);

Νῦν μοι δικαστής, καὶ Δανιήλ **τις** ἀθρόως (II,1,12, v.419, *PG* 37,1196, to former corrupt lawyers, who now administer justice as bishops).

(326) II,2,3, v.168 (*PG* 37,1492; the same Vossian antonomasia is used attributively in II,2,6, v.99 (*PG* 37,1550: Θηλυτέρη Χειρωνίς), for Theodosia, Olympias' governess).

Also in II,1,11, v.823 (*PG* 37,1086), it is uncertain who is aimed at by Gregory, - probably Peter of Alexandria: ὁ πρῶτος ἦν Βελίας, ἄγγελός ποτε. In this sentence, the antonomasia is an identifying, not a qualifying predicate, so that the type of insertion is actually (a), not (b) = (a).

(327) II,1,11, v.808 (*PG* 37,1085).

(328) I,2,10, v.288 (*PG* 37,701).

> *What is this? And where is the wrath which avenges the graves?*
> *Now the criminals must perish through thunderbolts* (329).

On the rare occasions that the exemplum is not accompanied by actualizing attributes, the context is usually unambiguous, in the following verse because of the contrast with the adjective πένης:

> Σοφὸν πένητα μᾶλλον ἢ Μίδαν κακόν.
> *Rather poor and wise than a wicked Midas* (330).

Identification may be difficult or impossible sometimes, but in Gregory's poems there is never any real confusion in the sense that a Vossian antonomasia would not be recognized as such. This kind of confusion has emerged in the reading of the funeral oration for Basil, in which one has searched for a Barnabas-quotation on the basis of the words Βαρνάβας, ὁ ταῦτα λέγων καὶ γράφων, whereas Gregory calls himself Barnabas (and Basil Paul) in a metaphorical exemplum: ταῦτα thus indicates Gregory's own words (331).

(2) *Allegory*

The allegory always belongs to the form (a): it does not give a further explanation about the case, but formulates the case itself by means of an exemplary history, whose literal meaning is altered. In Gregory, allegories are sometimes signalled by forms of the verb γίγνομαι or by « actualizing adverbs » such as πάλιν and αὖθις. I include an example of both. In his autobiography, Gregory inserts a pathetic valedictory speech on the occasion of his resignation as head of the council, by means of, among other things, this allegorically used exemplum:

---

(329) Epg.43 (*PG* 38,105). The giant is probably Enceladus, who, like Typhoeus (and Sceiron?, thus according to MASSON-VINCOURT p.30, without reference: but probably he is merely quoted for his proverbial rapacity) was cast down by Zeus (v.4: the epigram illustrates Gregory's technique of inserting the same exemplum alternately by mentioning a name (v.1) and by means of an allusion (v.4)).
A similar example with the interrogative pronoun: **Τίς** πήξει Φινεὲς πορνοφόνῳ παλάμῃ / Ζηλήμων ψυχήν τε καὶ οὔνομα, ἢ **τίς** ἀρήξει / Δόγμασιν Ἑβραίοις πλησσομένοις ἀδίκως / Μωσῆς (II,1,15, vv.22-25, *PG* 37,1252).

(330) I.2,10, v.392 (*PG* 37,708). Compare also I,2,29, vv.139-140 (*PG* 37,894), in which Danaë, as the prototype of natural beauty, is opposed to an ugly (dolled-up) woman: οἶδεν ἄκοσμον / εἶδος ἔχουσα γυνή, καὶ πατέει Δανάην. KNECHT p.90 mentions some parallels, among which there is a textbook example of a Vossian antonomasia from Petronius, 126,18: *haec vera est Danae*.

(331) Or.43,32 (*PG* 36,540B), cf. HANRIOT-COUSTET. She rightly remarks: « Grégoire est un lettré, rompu aux exercices d'école de la seconde sophistique: il parle ici par images, comme en bien d'autres passages où un personnage de son temps est présenté sous les traits d'un modèle ancien » (p.290).

> ἐγὼ δ' Ἰωνᾶς ὁ προφήτης **γίνομαι**.
> δίδωμ' ἐμαυτὸν τῆς νεὼς σωτηρίαν
> καίπερ κλύδωνος τυγχάνων ἀναίτιος.
> ἄραντες ἡμᾶς ῥίψατε κλήρου φορᾷ.
> κῆτός με δέξετ' ἐκ βυθοῦ φιλόξενον.
> *Now I become Jonah the prophet.*
> *I am giving myself as victim for the safety of the ship,*
> *even though I am not to blame for the storm.*
> *Take me then on the issue of the lot and cast me forth,*
> *the hospitable whale will welcome me from the depths* (332).

And in an ironical appeal to aspirant bishops, he proclaims that the enthronement (with the corresponding advantages) is free, just as the manna for Israel:

> Μάννα **πάλιν**, ξένος ὄμβρος· ἅπας κόλποισι λέγοιτε,
> Ὃς πλέον, ὅς τ' ἐπιδευές, ἴην χάριν. Εἰ δ' ἐθέλοιτε,
> Μηδ' ἁγίου φείδοισθε θεουδέος ἤματος ἀργοῦ.
> Ἦ τάχα καὶ παλάμῃσιν ἐν ἀπλήστοισι πύθοιτο.
> *There is the manna again, an unprecedented rain: collect it all in your laps,*
> *in varying quantities, one and the same gift. And if you want,*
> *you do not even have to observe the godlike sacred day of rest.*
> *Of course it might also rot in your insatiable hands* (333).

Besides, there are also allegories without an actualizing signal. A frequently recurring warning example is the flight from Sodom, during which Lot's wife turned into a pillar of salt when she looked back:

> Κεῖνος δ' ἐστὶν ἄριστος ὃς ἰθείην ὁδὸν ἕλκει,

---

(332) II,1,11, vv.1838-1842 (*PG* 37,1158, translation MEEHAN, *three poems* p.127-8, except for v.1840, which he translates « *even though it will be a case of the innocent encountering the waves* »). See already n.201 for the interpretation of v.1840 (in my view, a distancing from Jonah). The allegory requires no further explanation: the ship stands for the Church, the storm for the quarrel at the council, the casting overboard for the accepted resignation of Gregory; does then the hospitable whale stand for the quiet Nazianzus, in the depths of Cappadocia?

(333) II,1,13, vv.92-95 (*PG* 37,1235). Cf. Ex 16, especially 17-30.

> Οὐδὲ μεταστρέφεται Σοδόμων ἐπὶ τέφραν ἐρήμην,
> Ἣν διὰ μαργοσύνην ξείνῳ πυρὶ δηϊωθέντων.
> Φεύγει δ' ἐσσυμένως ἐς ὄρος, πάτρης δὲ λέλησται.
> Μὴ μῦθος καὶ λᾶας ἁλὸς μετόπισθε λίπηται.
> *The best thing is to follow the straight path,*
> *not turning aside to the sad ashes of Sodom*
> *where lust brought down the strange consuming fire.*
> *And so one flees precipitately to the mountains, forgetting fatherland,*
> *lest one's legacy for posterity become a pillar of salt and a cautionary tale* (334).

A last example is furnished by the address of the Anastasia, only seed of orthodoxy after the flood of Arianism:

> κιβωτὲ Νῶε, τὴν ἐπίκλυσιν μόνη
> κόσμου φυγοῦσα καὶ φέρουσα δεύτερον
> κόσμον τὸν ὀρθόδοξον ἐν τοῖς σπέρμασιν,...
> *Ark of Noah, you alone escaped the flooding*
> *of the universe and the seeds you bore*
> *contained a second universe of orthodoxy* (335).

4) Exempla without insertion (b)

In the previous types of exempla, the exemplary character or history is explicitly present (it is impossible to overlook them, - even without name-mentioning) and necessary (without the understood presence of the exemplum, the text is incomplete). For some allusions, this is not the case: illustrandum and illustrans are no longer distinguished, and other than for the metaphor, it is the illustrans which disappears into the background. I would like to make a further distinction according to whether the allusion is revealed through the *history* or through the *Ernstbedeutung*. The former is the case in lexical allusions and contaminations (cf. pp.145 and 150). In the second type, the author uses a general argument which *can* be recognized by the attentive reader as the *Eigenbedeutung* of a particular history, so that the argument can be considered as the *Ernstbedeutung* of a non-inserted exemplum. I illustrate this with an example from the introduction to the *arcana*, in which - in a topical motive of modesty - Gregory deems himself unequal to his task, but derives courage from the morals of a gospel story:

---

(334) II,1,1, vv.479-483 (*PG* 37,1005-6, translation MEEHAN, *three poems* p.40). The same history occurs also as allegory and in analogous terms in I,2,2, vv.51-57 as well. The exemplary use of this episode may be traced back to Luke 17,29-32 (32: μνημονεύετε τῆς γυναικὸς Λώτ).

(335) II,1,11, vv.1081-1083 (*PG* 37,1103, translation MEEHAN, *three poems* p.107). The addition of ὀρθόδοξον functions as *signal*, as the key to the interpretation of the allegory.
One of the most interesting allegories in Gregory's poems, taken from the Odyssey (II,2,7, vv.148-150), has not been commented upon in this part, but will be in the discussion of mythology in Gregory's writings.

> Ἔμπης δ' (οὐδὲ Θεὸν γὰρ ἀρέσσατο πολλάκι δῶρον
> Πλειοτέρης ἀπὸ χειρὸς ὅσον φιλίης ὀλίγης τε),
> Τοὔνεκα θαρσαλέως ῥήξω λόγον.
> *Yet (for often God is pleased not with a gift from the hand*
> *of a wealthy man so much as with the offering of a humble and loving giver),*
> *I shall break into confident speech* (336).

C. Macro-analysis

1) Frequency of the different types of insertion

The three main types occur with more or less equal frequency:

FULL	262	33%
MINIMAL	276	34%
METAPH.	211	26%
NO INSERTION	54	7%

On average, in Gregory's poems, the semantic intention of one out of three exempla is explicitly stated (full); on the other hand, for one out of three the insertion is not even indicated (metaphorical and no insertion). A further investigation reveals considerable differences behind this even distribution.

---

(336) I,1,1, vv.6-8 (*PG* 37,399, translation SYKES, *translation*). In parentheses we find the general (πολλάκι) lesson which is illustrated in the N.T. by the history of the poor widow's offering.
Compare with a passage in which Gregory seems to allude to the parable of the Pharisee and the publican, first through the *Eigenbedeutung* (already made explicit in the N.T.), and next through a generalization (πολλάκις) of the history itself: Τοῖος ἐμοῦ Χριστοῖο μέγας νόμος, ὃς χθαμαλοῖσιν Εὐμενέει πάντεσσιν, ὑπερφιάλους ἀθερίζων (see Luke 18,14). / Πολλάκις ἐξαγόρευσις ἁμαρτάδος ἄνδρ' ἐσάωσε / Μούνη, καὶ δακρύοισιν ἀπέκλυσε πήματα πικροῖς, / Καὶ ψυχὴν κάθηρε μελαινομένην κακότητι (II,2,3, vv.116-120. *PG* 37,1488). The detail of the tears is not included in Luke, but Gregory also adds it in I,1,27, v.93 (expressly about the publican of the parable) and II,1,19, v.92 (cf. p.104).

2) *Correlation with the function*

The kind of insertion appears to depend most upon the function fulfilled by the exemplum in the text:

	(average)	EVIDENCE		MODEL		ORNAMENT	
FULL	33%	122	74%	114	40%	24	7%
MINIMAL	34%	37	22%	99	34%	140	40%
METAPH.	26%	5	3%	66	23%	140	40%
NO INSERTION	7%	1	1%	9	3%	44	13%

The *Ernstbedeutung* of the *exempla probationis*, especially those with evidential function, is indicated much more than of the ornamental exempla – which is not astonishing, of course. What *is* quite remarkable is that Gregory uses the technique of metaphorical insertion without any restraint in the case of model exempla, but hardly ever in the case of evidential exempla. The allusive non-insertion is restricted nearly exclusively to ornament. The exempla with model function fit in most closely with the average distribution, whereas they show the sharpest deviation in terms of elaboration. This points to the fact that the expected connection between insertion and elaboration is not absolute.

3) *Correlation with the elaboration*

It can be expected that full and minimal insertion go together respectively with narration and name-mentioning, and metaphorical with allusion (non-insertion is by definition linked with the allusion ([337])). There is indeed such a correlation, but only to a limited extent (less pronounced than for the function):

	(average)	NARRATION		NAME-MENT.		ALLUSION	
FULL	33%	105	57%	111	30%	46	19%
MINIMAL	34%	49	27%	152	41%	75	31%
METAPH.	26%	29	16%	112	30%	70	29%
NO INSERTION	7%	1	1%	0	0%	53	22%

4) *Correlation with the subject matter*

As in the case of the elaboration, here as well the correlation with the subject matter is less predictable. Again, I also list the percentages for the subgroups of biblical and pagan exempla:

---

(337) The one exception is the non-inserted narration about Absalom in II.2.3 (cf. p.99 and n.190), where it is possible to comprehend the text without identification of or even attention to the (model) exemplum.

	(aver.)	BIBLICAL		hist.	par.	PAGAN		hist.	myth.	fable
FULL	33%	165	33%	36%	8%	92	32%	44%	24%	38%
MINIMAL	34%	156	31%	33%	17%	120	41%	48%	38%	31%
METAPH.	26%	166	33%	28%	68%	45	15%	4%	21%	31%
NO INSERTION	7%	19	4%	3%	6%	35	12%	4%	17%	0%

The explicit types of insertion reveal no differences between biblical and pagan material: full exempla have the same share in both groups, and the deviation in the case of the minimal exempla is insignificant (³³⁸). There is actually a striking distinction in the case of the metaphorical insertion, which is used especially for biblical subject matter (166 versus 45, 33% and 15% of the respective totals), and in the case of non-insertion, which is more frequent with pagan material (35 versus 19, respectively 12% and 4%). In other words: biblical characters and episodes especially are suitable to give expression to persons or situations described by Gregory, whereas pagan characters or histories remain rather implicit in the background, visible to those who are familiar with this kind of material. The fact that lexical allusions especially concern pagan material, might be due to the (classical) verse form and language, which stimulate reminiscences of Greek poetry and its content.

The division into subgroups refines this image somewhat, but does not invalidate the observation about biblical and pagan (as in the case of elaboration). Myths (24%) and especially parables (8%) turn out to be accompanied relatively rarely by a pronounced *Ernstbedeutung*. Parables are quite often (68%) inserted metaphorically, as also are the fables (31%, but here we are facing a very small absolute number): not coincidentally the two types of subject matter which were originally *intended* metaphorically or allegorically. Conversely, the only type of material which is *not* appropriate for allegorical *interpretation*, namely the Greek-historical, is scarcely ever inserted metaphorically (4%). Hence, there does certainly exist a correlation between interpretability and metaphorical incorporation.

Finally, it turns out that the discrete presence (allusive non-insertion) of pagan material can be detected particularly in myths (in absolute figures: 30 out of the 54 - pagan and biblical - exempla without insertion are mythological).

---

(338) It has already been pointed out that the insertion formulas are the same for biblical and pagan exempla (p.161); while here they appear to occur equally frequently as well.

5) Correlation with rhetorical γένος and literary genre

	(average)	JUDICIAL		DELIBERATIVE		EPIDEICTIC	
FULL	33%	35	30%	173	41%	54	20%
MINIMAL	34%	47	41%	121	29%	108	40%
METAPH.	26%	27	23%	89	21%	95	35%
NO INSERTION	7%	7	6%	34	8%	13	5%

When interpreting the above figures, the question once more arises as to how far the poems' rhetorical γένος itself is responsible for the already not too spectacular deviations. The only conclusion I dare to draw is that an explicitly formulated *Ernstbedeutung* is more significant in the agonal γένη - especially in the deliberative - than in the epideictic γένος. The high score of the metaphorical exempla in the latter γένος should be ascribed to the 22 metaphorically inserted parables from I,1,27.

From the following tables, it emerges that the ratios within the *biblica* are entirely determined by these 22 metaphorically inserted parables (26 of the 27 exempla in the *biblica* come from this one poem ((339))).

	(average)	DOGMATICA	BIBLICA	GNOMOL.	PRAYERS
FULL	33%	10 (59%)	1 (4%)	0	13 (32%)
MINIMAL	34%	5 (29%)	4 (15%)	4 (57%)	4 (10%)
METAPH.	26%	0	22 (81%)	0	24 (59%)
NO INSERT.	7%	2 (12%)	0	3 (43%)	0

	θρῆνοι	MORALIA	AUTOBIOGR.	EPISTOLARY	EPIGRAMS
FULL	17 (28%)	155 (45%)	30 (20%)	28 (34%)	8 (11%)
MINIMAL	26 (43%)	93 (27%)	62 (42%)	34 (41%)	44 (62%)
METAPH.	14 (23%)	74 (21%)	47 (32%)	16 (19%)	14 (20%)
NO INSERT.	3 (5%)	26 (7%)	10 (7%)	5 (6%)	5 (7%)

In fact, only the second series of genres, which contain a sufficiently high number of exempla, can be relevantly commented upon. Again, the epigrams reveal the sharpest deviation: their lapidary form explains the predominance of minimal exempla. The difference between the two most extensive genres is also notable: in the *moralia*, the full exempla are the most important group by far, whereas in the autobiographical poems, they come far behind the minimal and metaphorical exempla.

---

(339) According to textual tradition and external form (enumeration of parables), I,1,27 belongs to the *biblica*; but due to the exemplary (especially metaphorical) use of these parables, it rather fits in with the (paradigmatic) prayers where content is concerned. One might add the data of I,1,27 to the prayer-column, without causing any radical changes in its ratios.

The metaphorical exempla are treated in detail in the concluding chapter of this work. With a view to this, I point to another statistical fact about the same two genres: in the autobiographical poems, the share of *pagan* metaphorical exempla is much smaller (8 out of 47) than in the *moralia* (24 out of 74) (340). Thus, it seems that, for the description of his own situation, Gregory appeals nearly exclusively to biblical images (see, for example, the Vossian antonomasias for his father and himself, p.164).

2.3.3 Exempla in series

By a series of exempla, I mean a number of exempla with a similar *Ernstbedeutung*, which are thus quoted within one and the same train of thought. The quoting of more exempla can be necessary for the argumentation (as in Aristotle), or can only be a form of αὔξησις (hence the frequent use of series in the case of the laudatory σύγκρισις, often in priamel form (341)).

The series in Gregory's poems are examined according to the following questions: how does he arrange the exempla within the series, what determines this organization (not only order, but also, for example, number)? And does this organization tell us something about the conception (possible sources, but also the way in which certain exempla are brought together, the εὕρεσις)? To that end, I first refer to what Gregory stated about this himself. Then, I discuss some extensive series from longer poems, in search of any fixed organization principles – in some three passages, *ad hoc* explanations of other scholars function as a starting point. Finally, I draw attention to a number of fixed clusters, and try to find out what can be deduced from these.

---

(340) In the two other groups with more than 20 metaphorical exempla (*biblica*, and hymns and prayers) they are – evidently – all biblical.

(341) Thus e.g. in epigram 88 (*PG* 38,125), in which the activity of a desecrator of graves is equated with the ventures of some unnamed mythological characters (the first might be Orpheus, Odysseus, Theseus or Peirithous; followed by Icarus, Heracles and probably Prometheus and Deucalion, cf. Masson-Vincourt pp.42-43):

Ἤλυθεν εἰς Ἀΐδην τις, ὁ δ' ἔπτατο, ἄλλος ὄλεσσε
  θῆρας, ὁ δὲ πλεκτὸν υἱέϊ τεῦξε δόμον·
τούτων οὗτος ἀνὴρ οὐ δεύτερον ἔργον ἔρεξεν,
  τόνδε τάφον ῥήξας χείρεσιν οὐχ ὁσίαις.

In a second part, the paradigmatic prayers, a special form of series, are treated.

A. Organization and conception

1) Explicit indications

Now and again, Gregory actually says *that* he quotes or might quote a sequence of exempla (342), but *how* he arranges these exempla or *where* he gets them from is not explicitly mentioned. We do find enunciations about the organization as transition between (series of) exempla with *different Ernstbedeutung*, yet here they rather point to the organization of the argumentation or of the text itself (343).

2) Principles of organization

Elaborate series of exempla occur especially in the *moralia*; of the commentaries to I,2,28, I,2,25 and I,2,2, the first two devote some attention to the organization of these series. From each of these poems, and from I,2,10, I discuss one passage, in search of a principle of organization. Parallels or counter examples should reveal whether these principles also apply to Gregory's poems to a more general extent.

---

(342) E.g. after a series: ἀρκεῖ τοσαῦτα (cf. p.154), or in a παραίνεσις: διὰ πλείστων ὑποδειγμάτων ἐστὶ μαθεῖν (or.6,19, *PG* 35,745C). In both cases, there is an unstated supposition that a multitude of examples enhances the persuasiveness.

(343) See e.g. for the explicit transitions in I,2,10 supra p.123, and n.238, and n.144. Precisely in this poem, discussion might arise about the function of the transitions between the series of pagan and biblical exempla: when the exempla are considered as evidence of the divergent appreciations of both groups, then the series have different semantic intentions; but when the exempla are considered as models of a similar virtue, then the series actually have the same *Ernstbedeutung*. Both approaches are legitimate, dependent on the smaller or broader context in which the exempla are situated. Anyhow, the transitions draw attention to a difference according to the form of argumentation: the pagan exempla are quoted ἀπ᾽ ἐλάττονος or ἀπ᾽ ἐναντίου, the biblical ones ἀφ᾽ ὁμοίου or ἀπὸ μείζονος. In this poem as well, nothing is stated about the organization of exempla with the same form of argumentation.
The same ambiguity goes for the transitions within the series of exempla in I,2,25, discussed from p.177 on.

I,2,28, vv.139-168 (*PG* 37,866-9)

In this passage, Gregory quotes some exempla (ebb, Charybdis, Midas, the διψάς snake, the hoarding of manna) which are meant to illustrate the pointlessness and injuriousness of the πλεονεξία:

Οὐδὲν διοίσει ταῦτα τῇ ἀμπώτιδι,
140 Ἢ καὶ Χαρύβδει τῇ ῥοφούσῃ τοὺς στόλους.
Μικρὸν τι καὶ ὁ πλοῦτος ἐκβλυσθήσεται (344).
(...)
Ἢ πάντ' ἔδει σοι χρυσὸν, ὡς Μίδα ποτὲ
Φασὶ, γενέσθαι, ὡς τὰ Μίδου καὶ πάθοις,
150 Ἔχων δίκαιον λιμὸν ἐξ εὐχῆς κακῆς.
Διψάς τίς ἐστι τῶν ἐχιδναίων γενῶν,
Τούτων, ὅσ' ἡ ἔρημος Αἰγύπτου φέρει (345).
Ταύτης τὸ τύμμα οἷον, ἡ κλῆσις λέγει.
Τὸ θηρίον γὰρ τοῦ πάθους ἐπώνυμον.
Πίνων διόλλυθ', ὃς τὸν ἰὸν ἔσπασεν·
Εὑρών τι ῥεῖθρον, χανδὸν ἐμπεσὼν ὅλος,
Ἕως τὸν εἴσω φόρτον ἐκρήξῃ ποτῷ.
Ὁμοῦ δὲ τὸ ζῆν καὶ τὸ δίψος ἐσχέθη.
Οὐκ οἶσθα τοῦτο, φίλτατ', οὐδ' ἀκήκοας,
160 Ὡς ἄρτον ὗσεν οὐρανὸς λαῷ ποτε.
Περῶντι τὴν ἔρημον εἰκὸς ἄτροφον,
Δῶρον δαψιλὲς, ὡς Θεοῦ, καὶ ἄφθονον;
Ἀλλ' οὖν ἔκειτο τοῖς ἀμέτροις καὶ δίκη.
Ἔπωζεν εὐθὺς τὸ πλέον· μέτρον γὰρ ἦν
Ἡ χρεία τοῦ δωρήματος. Τοῦτ' οὖν ἀεὶ
Πάσχειν ἕκαστον τῶν ἀδίκων ἔνδικον,
Ψοφεῖν ποθοῦντας, ἢ συνόζειν οἷς κακῶς
Ἔχουσιν. Οὕτως ἂν μόνως ἦσαν σχετοί.

---

(344) Probably an allusion to Job 20,15: πλοῦτος ἀδίκως συναγόμενος ἐξεμεσθήσεται (BEUCKMANN p.76).

(345) The sources used by Gregory for this curiosity (Lucianus, *Dips.* and Nicander, *Ther.*334-342, cf. WYSS, *RLAC* p.852-853), situate the διψάς in Libya, not in Egypt. BEUCKMANN p.78 calls this a « Gedächtnisfehler » of Gregory. In my opinion, he did not locate this snake in the Egyptian desert by coincidence: just as Midas' hunger is consciously mentioned as a transition to the thirst-causing snake, so the mention of the Egyptian desert is also intended as an allusive announcement of the following exemplum: the manna in the desert for the people that has left Egypt. Moreover, it is possible that Gregory thought also of the passage from Deuteronomy to which Cosmas - who otherwise merely paraphrases here - refers (τούτου δὲ τοῦ θηρίου καὶ Μωϋσῆς μέμνηται, p.667 MAI): τοῦ ἐξαγαγόντος σε ἐκ γῆς **Αἰγύπτου** ἐξ οἴκου δουλείας, τοῦ ἀγαγόντος σε διὰ τῆς ἐρήμου τῆς μεγάλης καὶ τῆς φοβερᾶς ἐκείνης, οὗ **ὄφις δάκνων** καὶ σκορπίος καὶ **δίψα** (Dt 8,15).

At that point there is no difference between you and the ebbing tide.
or Charybdis which swallows up the fleets.
A bit longer and these riches of yours are belched out,
(...).
Even better: everything should become gold for you, as once for Midas,
they say, so that you would also undergo Midas' fate:
a just hunger due to a perverted wish.
There is a « thirst-causer » (dipsas) in the snake family,
in the kind which lives in the Egyptian desert.
Its bite corresponds to its name,
since the animal bears the name of the illness it causes.
Whoever absorbs its venom, perishes by drinking:
if he finds a brook, then he greedily throws himself upon it,
until the sheer bulk of what he drinks bursts him open.
And thirst and life are quenched together.
And don't you know the following episode, friend, even by hearsay?
Once bread rained down from heaven for the people,
when it crossed the desert, which obviously did not offer food.
The gift was rich - since from God -, and generous,
but for those who knew no measure a fair punishment was provided:
the excessive part immediately began to smell: the gift
was measured by need. Always to experience that
would be a just punishment for every unfair person:
to burst from desire, or to stink with what they wrongfully
possess. Only thus would they perhaps restrain themselves.

For the whole of these four exempla (he considers ebb and Charybdis as one exemplum), Beuckmann sees an increasing reality, and related to this an increasing authority, as organizational principle (346). To me, it does not seem so obvious that the mention of the διψάς has a higher *degree of reality* than that of the other physical curiosities, ebb and Charybdis. Of course, with a view to the *Ernstbedeutung*, it is more *illustrative*: excessive greed should be punished (vv.165-168). Mentioning διψάς between Midas and the manna especially seems to have to do with the possibility of associative transitions between the last three exempla (between Charybdis and Midas there is an interval of six verses of moralizing): hunger leads to thirst, the Egyptian desert to Exodus (see also n.345).

In any case, in Gregory's poems, increasing reality does not appear to be a fixed principle of organization when nature-exempla are combined with legendary and / or biblical ones: in

---

(346) BEUCKMANN p.75: « Die Anordnung der Beispiele wird geleitet vom Prinzip eines gestuften Realitätsgehalt, der gleichbedeutend ist mit einer stufenweise fortschreitenden Autorität. »

II,1,16, vv.67-76, he first compares his nostalgia for the Anastasia with biblical scenes (quoted in n.310), and afterwards with φυσιολογίαι; and in II,2,3, vv.105-136, Peter urges his father to be merciful by referring successively to some parables (prodigal son, lost sheep, Pharisee and publican), biblical examples (Manasseh, Niniveh, Zacchaeus), and exempla from the animal realm: these form a climax here (ἀπ᾽ ἐλάττονος προσώπου): Σοὶ δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ καὶ θηρῶν ὀλοώτερος ἔπλετο θυμός (II,2,3, v.133, *PG* 37,1489).

One might speak of increasing authority in the numerous passages where New Testament exempla follow Old Testament ones, but of course, this succession is in the first place chronologically determined (347).

I,2,25, vv.183-303 (348)

This is such a passage with first Old and then New Testament exempla, also announced in this way by Gregory:

> Βίους σκόπει μοι **τῶν πάλαι καὶ τῶν νέων.**
> (...)
> Μωσῆς ἐκεῖνος, Ἀαρών, οἱ φίλτατοι,
> Δαυΐδ, Σαμουήλ, εἶτα Πέτρος ὕστερον; (vv.184-189, *PG* 37,826-7).

After Peter, Stephen (Οὐκ ἂν παρέλθοιμ᾽ οὐδὲ τὸ Στεφάνου καλόν, v.231, *PG* 37,830), and Christ himself (Ταῦτ᾽ οὐ προδήλως τῆς Θεοῦ τυπώσεως, v.237, *ibidem*) are mentioned. Only then, the profane (349) exempla follow. Hence, the organization of the entire series is not at all determined by increasing authority.

Oberhaus has three remarks about the organization of this series:

- the order O.T. - Christian - pagan is traditional
- the choice each time of three exempla from O.T. and N.T. is canonical

---

(347) There are other factors which also play a part in the succession of biblical exempla; thus, choice, order, and description of the series of Old Testament characters in I,2,1, vv.305-322 (quoted p.92) are (sometimes literally) determined by the summaria in Sir 44-48 and Heb.11.

(348) For the explicit introduction and conclusion of this series, cf. supra p.81, for the transition between biblical and pagan exempla p.102.

(349) Among these, Constantius is listed, so that it would be inappropriate to speak of *pagan* exempla here.

- the fact that this series contains exclusively positive examples is exceptional within ancient literature on this subject (controlling feelings of anger) (350).

The observations are correct for this poem, even though the second one can be disputed (351). However, they cannot be generalized: in Gregory, the mentioned order is not common (cf. the previous and following text), and there is no sign of any preference for the canonical groups of three. In this respect, the paradigmatic prayer with the symmetrical whole of three publicans, three lame persons and three dead persons (quoted on p.104) is an exception.

I,2,10, vv.214-579

As pointed out, a large part of the poem περὶ ἀρετῆς consists of pagan and biblical (counter) examples of successively εὐτέλεια, ἐγκράτεια, ἀνδρεία, and σωφροσύνη. The passage discussed here deals with the first aspect, the attitude towards possessions. In contrast with the poem against anger, here the pagan exempla are mentioned before the biblical ones (first O.T., then N.T., but Gregory situates the most significant split at Adam's violation of the commandment, punished with insatiability), and not only positive but also negative examples are quoted. I give a survey of the structure by means of (often already quoted) hinge verses:

> Μεμνήσομαι δέ, δείγματος χάριν, τινῶν
> ὡς ἂν μάθῃς κἀνθένδε τὴν ἀρετὴν ὅση,
> (...).
> Τίς οὐκ ἀκούει τὸν Σινωπέα τὸν κύνα;
> οὗτος – τί τἄλλα χρὴ λέγειν; – ἀλλ᾽ εὐτελὴς
> οὕτω τις ἦν, καὶ μέτριος τὰ τοῦ βίου...
> *I will mention some of them, as examples,*
> *so that you might learn from them also the importance of virtue,*

---

(350) Oberhaus pp.105-106.

(351) In the quoted verses, Gregory himself announces four Old Testament characters and one New Testament one. Beuckmann links Moses and Aaron, and complements Peter with Stephen and Jesus to obtain two groups of three. In the case of Moses and Aaron, it indeed concerns one and the same history (the – initially – « gentle » treatment of Egypt), but about David, three different episodes are recounted, clearly distinguished from each other (his patience with Saul, with Absalom and with Shimei). And, within the New Testament exempla, Gregory makes a clear distinction between Peter and Stephen on the one hand and Christ on the other: the latter, ὢν Θεός τε καὶ κεραυνῶν δεσπότης (v.239, *PG* 37,830), is on a higher level than his two disciples.

> *(...).*
> *Who does not know the fame of the dog from Sinope?*
> *He was - is it necessary to speak of the rest? - also such a frugal person, and abstemious about the necessities of life,...*(vv.214-220, *PG* 37,695-6).

After the inevitable mention of the barrel of Diogenes follow some positive anecdotes about other cynics as well, including Crates (352). But Gregory feels compelled to scarify them as well:

> Ταυτὶ μὲν οὖν ἴσα τοῖς ἐμοῖς νόμοις σχεδόν.
> (...)
> Ἀλλ' εἴ τι χρή με καὶ ξέσαι τὰ τῶν βίων,
> *All these are almost similar to my laws,*
> *(...)*
> *but I also have to censure some of their habits* (vv.259 and 265, *PG* 37,698-9).

In the following verses, he does so for Diogenes, Socrates, Alcmaeon, Plato, Aristippus and Sophocles. These χρεῖαι serve as negative exempla. As in the passage from I.2,28, the succession seems determined by associative transitions: Diogenes had already been quoted as a positive example, and hence had to be somewhat tarnished. The allusion to Socrates' pederasty is concluded with the proverb Χωρὶς τὰ Μήδων καὶ Λυδῶν ὁρίσματα (v.293, *PG* 37,701), a variation on the Telephus-proverb (cf. p.145) in which usually - also elsewhere in Gregory's work - the Phrygians are mentioned instead of the Lydians. But here it serves as a transition to the anecdote about Alcmaeon who amasses riches at the court of the *Lydian* Croesus and makes a fool of himself. This leads Gregory to mention Plato's flattery of another foreign monarch. The criticism against Plato is concluded with the sarcastic remark that a Libyan had to purchase his freedom (353). The connection with Aristippus, τοῦ δ' ἐκ Κυρήνης, v.319, is immediately found (in Gregory's time, Libya was the common name for Cyrenaica). Two anecdotes are told about Aristippus: in the second, Plato - quoting Euripides - and Archelaus play a part as well. In the last anecdote, the same Archelaus (Ὁ δ' αὐτὸς Ἀρχέλαος, v.335) holds – together with Euripides – Sophocles up to ridicule because of his rapacity.

---

(352) Brief discussion of this passage, » besonders durch Züge der Diatribe ausgezeichnet », in GEFFCKEN, pp.23-24.

(353) Gregory keeps to τῆς Λιβύης. Diogenes Laertius, in whom many of the anecdotes recounted here can be encountered, puts it more concretely: Ἀννίκερις ὁ Κυρηναῖος εἴκοσι μνῶν... (D.L. III,20). If my explanation of the organization is correct, it might be an interesting detail to know that the redeemer came from Cyrene.

In v.341, Gregory switches back to two positive exempla: Aristides Dicaeus and Fabricius (Οὐκ ἂν παρέλθοιμ' οὐδὲ τὰ Ῥωμαίων καλά, v.350, *PG* 37.705). The actual exempla are followed by a number of (mainly anonymous) quotations from Greek literature, first the negative ones:

> Ἀρκεῖ τοσαῦτα καὶ τάδε μετρίου πέρα,
> ὧν ἄν τις εἴποι χρημάτων καταφρονῶν.
> Μήτ' οὖν ἐκεῖνα προσδέχου τὰ μὴ καλὰ
> βίβλων παλαιῶν, ὠγαθ', αἷς ἐνετράφης·
> ἔα με κερδαίνοντα κεκλῆσθαι κακόν (354).
> *I quoted enough, or more than enough, examples*
> *which might be given by someone who disparages possessions.*
> *(...)*
> *Do not accept, my good friend, the wrong things*
> *from the old books in which you have been trained:*
> *« Call me bad! If only I make a profit! »* (vv.365-369, *PG* 37.706-7).

Then, some wise sayings are added:

> Ταῦτ' οὖν ἅπαντα φεῦγε τούς τ' εἰρηκότας,
> εἴτ' ἄλλο τούτοις ἐμφερές τι ἐν λόγοις,
> καὶ ταῦτ' ἐπαίνει τῶν σοφῶς εἰρημένων·
> *All of that you have to escape from, like their authors,*
> *and so too if another similar saying is to be found in their words.*
> *Praise the following wise sayings: ...* (vv.382-384, *PG* 37.708).

Among these profound sayings, there is also an episode from the Odyssey (explained as ἀρετῆς ἐγκώμιον by Homer himself in an ἠθοποιΐα, v.406) and the story about Midas (Τὸν μῦθον αἰνῶ τὸν Φρύγιον, ὡς εὖ ἔχει, v.407, *PG* 37.709).

---

(354) The verse is not known from anywhere else, according to Wyss, *RLAC* p.848, who thinks he is able to derive from vv.367-368 that Gregory draws from an anthology here (which is probably the case, but how does this emerge from precisely these verses?). Davids p.7 completely misinterprets the same verses: « Hij (sc. Gregory) is doorvoed van de wijsheid der oude boeken: vzn. 367-368 laat hij zich fictief tegenwerpen. » Of course, there is no question of a fictitious objection here. Gregory is merely addressing the young man at whom the whole poem is directed.

The pagan exempla are followed by the biblical ones:

> Τί μοι ξένων μύθων τε καὶ διδαγμάτων;
> Αὐτοὺς σκόπει μοι τοὺς ἐμοὺς ἤδη νόμους.
> *Why do I need those foreign words and lessons?*
> *Look at the following instructions of my own* (vv.412-413, *PG* 37,710).

After an implicit refusal of the encomiastic τόποι (my γένος, πατρίς, δόξα, πλοῦτος are not of this world), he explains the origin of the insatiability of mankind: the violation of the first commandment on self-restraint (the story of Eden is thus not quoted as exemplum: it is part of the case itself). Hence the necessity of a second law, prescribing extreme sobriety:

> Πρῶτος μὲν οὗτος εὐτελοῦς ζωῆς νόμος,
> ἔστιν δ' ἐκεῖνος δεύτερος. Τὸν Ἀβραάμ...
> *This was the first law on the simple life;*
> *the second is the following: Abraham* ... (vv.488-489, *PG* 37,715).

This is followed by Old and New Testament exempla of people who chose a propertyless life: Abraham, Jacob, the Levites - with a digression about Moses -, Jonadab, Elijah - with a digression containing irrelevant episodes -, Samuel's mother (355), John the Baptist, Paul, Peter and the apostles, the rich young man (who eventually did not choose poverty, but Gregory only describes Jesus' appeal), and Zacchaeus. He concludes:

> Εἶεν· τὰ μὲν δὴ χρημάτων οὕτως ἔχει.
> *Be that as it may: so far as to possessions* (v.579, *PG* 37,722).

The same order recurs in the treatment of the other virtues: first come pagan exempla (and sometimes quotations), alternatively positive and negative ones, then positive biblical ones, in chronological order. But the most important observation from this discussion is that the different series each have their own associative dynamics: in the pagan exempla these determine the order, in the biblical ones the digressions.

---

(355) Gregory has to use a cunning manœuvre here to be able to insert the mother of his « patron »: because of her promise, she did not even « own » her own son: Εἰ μὴ λίαν τολμηρὸν εἰπεῖν τοῦτό γε· Οὐδ' αὐτὸν εἶχεν· ἐκ βρέφους Θεῷ δοθείς (vv.538-539, *PG* 37,719).

I,2,2, vv.152-210

This whole passage from the Ὑποθῆκαι παρθένοις forms one series of biblical exempla, which are apparently (they are not introduced) designed to illustrate the preceding triple advice:

(a) take the hard way uphill (vv.62 and 112-124)
(b) be chaste and beware of men, specifically συνείσακτοι (vv.74-111)
(c) be sober in matters of housing, clothing, food (vv.125-151) (356).

Gregory starts the series by addressing *Jonadab*, who held up absence of property before his children: model for the last advice (c). After that, he goes back in time, and speaks about the *exodus*, as an example of the choice for the hard way (a), and a sober life (c). Yet he does not confine himself to the relevant episodes (manna and water from the rock): out of an apparent automatism (cf. infra: fixed clusters, and table p.196-7), he also mentions five other miraculous interventions of God during the exodus. Thereupon, *Elijah* follows, with two episodes of austerity corresponding to manna and water: the ravens feeding him, and the inexhaustible supplies of the widow of Zarephath. As for the *three young men* in the fiery furnace, Gregory changes the true reason of their torture (their refusal to worship Nebuchadnezzar's gods), so as to make them fit in with the list:

> Ἑβραῖοι δέ τε παῖδες ἑὴν ποθέοντες ἐδωδήν (357),
> Ὄφρα κε μὴ βασιλῆος ἐνὶ χρανθῶσι τραπέζῃ,
> Ἀσσυρίης καθύπερθε φλογὸς χαίροντες ἔβησαν,...
> *The Jewish young men longed only for their own food,*
> *from fear of becoming tainted at the king's table,*
> *and therefore merrily stepped upon the Assyrian flames* (vv.177-179, *PG* 37,592).

As a consequence of their mention, Gregory also quotes *Daniel*'s adventure in the lion's den and *Jonah*'s stay in the whale: elsewhere in his œuvre as well, these histories are often mentioned together (358).

---

(356) Zehles pp.111-112 discusses the entire passage rather briefly. According to him, the biblical examples fit in only with the paraeneses in vv.125-151. He gives no comment upon the organization, but does give some parallels with the same exempla from Gregory's œuvre.

(357) See Dn 1,5-16, but their refusal to consume Assyrian food did not result in punishment (see also Zehles p.124).

Inevitably, John follows, manifestly illustrating advice (c):

> Ἀκρὶς Ἰωάννου δὲ τροφὴ καὶ κηρίον ἦεν
> Ἄγριον, ὑψιλόφων τε τρίχες ἐσθῆμα καμήλων,
> Καὶ δόμος οὐρανὸς εὐρὺς, ἐρημαῖαί τε χαμεῦναι.
> *Locusts were John's food, and wild honey;*
> *as attire he had the hairs of high-humped camels,*
> *as a home the open sky, and a place to sleep in the desert* (vv.187–189, *PG* 37,593).

Subsequently, the salvation of Thecla and Susannah is mentioned: the chronological order is again interrupted here, but the association of both episodes is obvious: God interferes when chastity is threatened: exempla of advice (b). Finally, Thecla's companion Paul is cited: those who take the hard way uphill (a) are confronted with his model behaviour. The series is concluded with a typical transitional formula:

> Τῶν σὺ μνωομένη, τήρει βίον ἁγνὸν Ἄνακτι.
> *Be heedful of these examples, and see that your life remains pure for the Lord* (v.210, *PG* 37,595).

This series does not follow the common chronological order, and does not even respect the division into Old and New Testament. The organization seems determined in particular by the advice which needs to be illustrated. Most exempla can indeed be connected with these points of view, but still, the series again has its own, rather associative dynamics.

The above passages are representative of all series, short and long, in Gregory's poems: there is definitely no fixed principle of organization, neither *qua* order (not even within the biblical exempla), nor *qua* number (there is no preference for grouping in threes, as Schneiderhan observed in Jerome), nor as for quality (presence and alternation of positive and negative exempla). The only constant seems to be Gregory's inclination to link up the different exempla within one series associatively, a technique which is comparable to the transition between allusive and explicit insertion of the same exemplum. It is difficult to tell whether this organization should be ascribed to the τάξις (*dispositio*), or whether it reflects the course of the εὕρεσις (*inventio*): in the former case, the associative way of writing is a matter of suggestive fiction; in the latter, it reflects a (sometimes annoying) actually associative thought process. More concretely: the passage from I,2,10 in which different pagan episodes are connected through small signs is apparently composed according to a well-thought-out procedure, whereas in the passage from I,2,2, some biblical episodes seem to be added mechanically.

---

(358) Cf. infra table p.197; also in II,1,11, vv.675–677. The common message of these three episodes is: in awkward circumstances, God brings salvation. This also goes for the less relevant episodes of the exodus (see e.g. v.171, *PG* 37,592: πίστις δ' ἐπέδησεν ἀκωκάς, about Moses' victory over Amalek). But the actual, more specific *Ernstbedeutung* of the whole series of exempla is: God demands and supports an ambitious, chaste and sober life.

The associative connection is not confined to the exempla in series: also separate exempla are often combined in a similar manner. Thus, the mention of the punishment of the inhabitants of Gath in II,1,13 (cf.p.162) was already prepared for by the preceding exempla of punished profanation (cf.p.103). And in the following passage from a poem about the unworthy bishops, in which charges of abuse of authority and hypocrisy are brought, Gregory has it in for those who wanted to deprive him of his episcopacy; probably, Maximus is intended. The two exempla are inserted metaphorically, in a combination of allusion and name-mentioning. The train of thought is not lucid, and seems determined by the resolution to link up the second history (Jacob and Laban) with the first (David and Nathan). By means of the mention of a lamb in verse 684, and the adjective φαιός in verse 686 (in the LXX only about sheep, repeatedly in the history of Jacob and Laban), the story from Genesis, in which abuse of power and hypocrisy go hand in hand, is announced allusively:

> φεῖσαι τῶν ἐμῶν·
> ἐμὸν γὰρ ἴσθι, κἂν ὑποκρίνῃ σοφῶς.
> ἀποστερεῖς με καὶ σὺ τὴν μίαν ἀμνάδα (359).
> μοιχεύεται τὸ σχῆμα· τίς Νάθαν φράσει;
> ῥήξω τὸ φαιὸν προσδραμὼν χιτώνιον,
> εἴ σου λαβοίμην· καὶ γὰρ ἐν τούτοις ποτὲ
> τρυφᾶτε, ὥσπερ βρωμάτων τοῖς χείροσιν,
> ὅταν πάθητε πλησμονὴν ἐν τιμίοις.
> ῥῆξόν τι καὶ σὺ τῶν ἐμῶν, ἄν του λάβῃ
> τῶν μαλθακωτέρων τε καὶ νόθων ἐμοί.
> τούτων τί ἂν γένοιτο ἐνδικώτερον;

---

(359) Cf. Nathan's allegorical charge against David's adultery with Bathsheba, 2Rg 12,1-4.

ἔστω Λάβαν τὰ λευκά· τἀπίσημα δὲ
τοῦ πολλὰ μοχθήσαντός ἐστι ποιμένος,
νυξὶν παγέντος, ἡλίῳ κεκαυμένου.

And do spare my flock;
because, for your information, however cleverly you play your part,
you also, you're depriving me of my own ewe lamb.
The (bishop's) vestment is being debauched: what Nathan will denounce it?
That grey garment of yours I shall rend
if I get a chance: you have resort to it occasionally for a change
just as one turns to coarser fare from satiety with finer foods.
You, in turn, may rend a garment of mine,
that is if you ever find me in the softer, meretricious kind.
Could anything be fairer?
Yes, Laban must have the white ones; the stained ones
are the portion of the shepherd who has labored much,
who has shivered by night and been scorched by the day's heat (360).

---

(360) II,1,12, vv.682-695 (*PG* 37,1215-6, translation MEEHAN, *three poems* p.70, with some corrections). The history of Laban and Jacob can be found in Gn 30-31; explanation by Sicherl in MEIER pp.151-152.
Elsewhere, Gregory forms more obvious associations between several biblical episodes: in II,1,58, vv.4-7 (*PG* 37,1402) e.g. the snake from the story of Eden and the bronze snake from Numbers: Ἀλλ' οὔτι πείσεις· τοῦτ' Ἀδάμ πέπεικέ με. / Εἰς γῆν ἀποστράφηθι, καὶ κάραν πατοῦ. / Εἰ δ' ἰσχύς ἐστι μικρὸν ἐγχρίψαι ποδί, / Κρεμῶ σε χαλκοῦν, ὡς βλάβην ὁρῶν φύγω.
In ept.90, vv.1-3 (*PG* 38,56), the historical Abraham's family and the Abraham from the parable of poor Lazarus are connected in a peculiar triple Vossian antonomasia (Sarah = Nonna, Isaac = Gregory himself, Abraham = Gregory sr.): Σάρρα φίλη, πῶς τὸν σὸν Ἰσαὰκ λίπες, ἡ ποθέουσα / τῶν Ἀβραὰμ κόλπων ὡς τάχος ἀντιάσαι, / Νόννα Γρηγορίοιο θεόφρονος;
A connection which is probably originally made by Gregory can be found in II,1,12, vv.663-665 (*PG* 37,1214): χωρὶς τὰ Μερρᾶς (Ex 15.23) καὶ Σιλωὰμ (John 9,7) ῥεύματα· / τὰ μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲ γευστά, τῶν δὲ καὶ νόσοι / ἡττῶντο πρῶτον ἀγγέλῳ κινουμένων. After – and probably through – Gregory, the first verse has become proverbial (thus STERNBACH, *Dilucidationes* p.19). The meaning of the last verse has not been understood by the scholars up till now: « Von der Einwirkung eines Engels auf Siloam bzw. Siloach findet sich in der Bibel nichts » (MEIER p.149). Yet Gregory makes a contamination here of the healing of the blind person in the pool of Siloam with that of the lame one in the pool of Bethesda (John 5,1-8). A number of manuscripts include the following addition in John 5,4 (critical apparatus Nestle-Aland p.260): αγγελος γαρ κατα καιρον κατεβαινεν εν τη κολυμβηθρα και εταρασσε το υδωρ· ο ουν πρωτος εμβας μετα την ταραχην του υδατος υγιης εγινετο. Hence, the passage is not only interesting as one more example of a contamination in Gregory; it also proves that he indeed read the extensive version of the fourth Gospel about Bethesda.

3) Fixed clusters

In Gregory's work, certain histories often or nearly always appear in fixed combinations. This goes more for biblical than for pagan material, which is statistically normal: in his entire œuvre, the same biblical history is mentioned four times on average, whereas a pagan history or character occurs only twice ([361]). Yet some groups of pagan exempla give the impression that they constitute fixed clusters, even without their occurring more than once. Parallels in other authors can give some useful indications in this respect. I first discuss some biblical, then some pagan clusters.

Many of the **biblical clusters** can be found in the paradigmatic prayers: the examples will illustrate this in the discussion of this category of poems. In general, the biblical clusters can be subdivided into
a) groups with an « organic » coherence, by which I mean episodes or characters which are also connected in the Bible itself *or* in the interpretation of the biblical history; the cluster is already existing, apart from the context in which it is found ([362]);
b) groups with a « functional » coherence: brought together on account of their similarity, their shared *Eigenbedeutung* and thus possible *Ernstbedeutung*; the cluster is determined by the context.

Examples of the first type are legion: the Eden-episodes, the exodus-episodes, the wonders of Elijah, the three young men and Daniel, Paul and Thecla. They can be picked right out of the Bible. Still, Gregory appears to apply a more or less fixed selection with regard to the larger unities, for example the complex of stories about the Exodus and about Elijah: certain episodes recur regularly, whereas others are never or only exceptionally mentioned ([363]).

---

(361) The *type* / *token* ratio for the biblical items is 489 / 1805 (489 different items occur 1805 times in all), for the pagan items 443 / 890.

(362) A possible consequence is that a cluster is inserted without actually fitting in the specific context: we came across this phenomenon in the passages from I,2,10 with a cluster of Elijah-episodes, and from I,2,2 with a cluster of exodus-episodes.

(363) In the case of Elijah, this is easily established on the basis of I,1,16, one of the *biblica* (Εἰς τὰ θαύματα Ἠλίου τοῦ προφήτου καὶ Ἐλισσαίου). In this poem, 9 wonders of Elijah and 13 of Elisha are summed up. Elijah especially is frequently quoted by Gregory in other passages as well (see inventory 2), but in the poems it is usually with one or more of the three following episodes: his stay at the Cherith with the ravens who feed him,

Other episodes are not directly connected in the Scripture itself, but are so in the soteriological reading of it. For instance, as an introduction to the incarnation, the same fruitless divine interventions are repeatedly mentioned or suggested:

> Καὶ πολλοῖσι πάρος παιδεύμασι πλάσμα δαμασθὲν
> Γλώσσαις τεμνομένῃσι, καὶ ὕδασι, καὶ πυρὸς ὄμβροις,
> Καὶ γραπτοῖο νόμοιο διδάγμασιν, ἠδὲ προφήταις.
> *Previously the creature was chastised with many lessons:*
> *the division of the languages, and masses of water, and rains of fire,*
> *and the rules of the written law, and the prophets* (364).

Clusters of the second type are, for instance, Elijah and John as models of sobriety (365), Uzzah and Nadab and Abihu as examples of punished profanation (366); Judas and Lucifer as the evidence that one failure does not affect the merits of those who succeeded (367); Manasseh, Nineveh, the prodigal son, the lost sheep, and Zacchaeus as examples of sinners who were granted forgiveness (368); Achan and Ananias and Sapphira as warnings against greed (369). Already in the scriptural passages, the histories in these clusters all have the same intention, which fits into Gregory's argument.

In some other cases, the joining of different episodes in one cluster is entirely determined by the context. Thus, the description of the census under Augustus and the episode about the temple taxes have no common *Eigenbedeutung*, but still Gregory mentions these two next to one another twice, with a strained *Ernstbedeutung*. Twice, the creation of this cluster is occasioned by

---

his visit to the widow of Zarephath with the wonder of flour and oil (or, less frequently, with the raising of her son), and his ascension in a chariot of fire. For the selection from the Exodus-stories, cf. the paradigmatic prayers.

(364) I,2,1, vv.131-133 (*PG* 37,532). The salvation history in a nutshell, with among others Babel, the Flood and Sodom, also e.g. in I,1,9b, vv.16-17; I,2,1, vv.448-450; I,2,14, vv.87-92.

(365) Along with the discussed passages from I,2,10 and I,2,2, see also II,1,11, vv.292-294; ep.99,1; or.10,1; or.14,4; or.26,7; or.43,29.

(366) II,1,13, vv.124-137 (cf. p.103) and II,1,34, vv.99-102.

(367) I,2,1, vv.680-683 (cf. p.83); I,2,3, vv.47-48 (cf. p.161); I,2,6, vv.20-23; II,1,13, vv.176-177; epg.22.

(368) II,1,46, vv.41-46 and II,2,3, vv.105-125.

(369) I,2,2, vv.432-437 and or.34,14.

the fact that he addresses a financial counsellor (370). And when he adopts a whole cluster of exemplary parables from *carmen biblicum* I,1,27 in the Ὑποθῆκαι παρθένοις, he is guided in his selection by the broad context, in which the παρθένοι are addressed as Christ's brides (371).

Should we, on the basis of these numerous - often identically phrased - clusters, postulate a Christian collection of paradigmata, of which Gregory would have availed himself? Schneiderhan did so starting from a similar observation for Jerome's œuvre (cf. p.54). To me, such a hypothesis seems absolutely superfluous, certainly in the case of Gregory. Also apart from the exempla, identical formulations often occur in Gregory's writings. Many of the exempla contain literal reminiscences from the original text, which suggests direct contact. And above all: it is evident that Gregory was utterly acquainted with the Bible, which he considered as one large collection of paradigmata (cf. the quotation from or.2 on p.80): I do not see why he would have needed a *book of quotations*. Of course, this does not mean that his clusters may not be influenced by earlier Christian exegetes. Undoubtedly, many of the mentioned associations were already traditional by then (372).

---

(370) Respectively Hellenius (II,2,1, vv.337-340) and Julian (or.19,13). Without any knowledge of the prose text, the passage in the epistolary poem is completely incomprehensible; even the combination of both passages remains rather obscure.

(371) I,2,2, vv.371-401 = I,1,27, vv.1-7 and 43-66. In my view, the abrupt insertion of the passage in I,2,2 with an unnatural transition from advice in the second person to the metaphorical application of the parables to the first person (which is sustained in the whole of I,1,27) argues in favour of the anteriority of the latter poem.
Gregory selects all parables in which marriage is dealt with; where necessary, he chooses the version of one specific gospel, or he combines different versions (e.g. vv.389-396: in the parable about the guests who refused to come, he derives the reasons for the refusal from Luke, and the marriage situation from Matthew). The marriage image is resumed at the end of the poem (vv.653-678), an epithalamion for the παρθενίῃ following the rhetorical rules, with ἔκφρασις of the bridal chamber and invocation of the θεοὶ γαμήλιοι (see Regali p.90).

(372) Or.14,2-4 seems based upon such traditional characterizations. This passage is a sort of mini-collection of paradigmata itself, grouped around some fifteen virtues. (Compare with the Epistle to the Corinthians of Clement of Rome, especially §§4-19.)
Gallay, *Bible* p.321, does take into account the possibility that Gregory would have drawn from Bible-florilegia.

With regard to the pagan material, the situation is quite different. It is generally agreed that Gregory made an appeal to anthologies, doxographic literature, collections of apophthegmata etc. for many quotations from classical literature and anecdotes about Greeks (373). Moreover, during his rhetorical education he certainly has been confronted not only with the technique of the παράδειγμα – as is sufficiently clear by now –, but also with the ways in which it is traditionally employed, possibly by means of collections of paradigmata (374). The question could arise whether we can draw any conclusions from the **pagan clusters** with regard to the sources used (375). In my opinion, attention to the forming of clusters is more relevant for the identification of obscure allusions.

Despite the absence of a demonstrable source text, the pagan exempla can also be subdivided into two types of clusters. Among the groups with an *organic coherence*, I consider the metamorphoses of Zeus (376), the punished criminals in the underworld (377), Xerxes' adventures (378), a series of famous philosophers (379) or oracles (380). A *functional coherence* links Gyges,

---

(373) See in more recent literature Kertsch, *Bildersprache*, Einleitung, Jungck p.26, Oberhaus p.120, and especially Wyss, *RLAC* passim. Wyss indicates moreover (p.815) that nearly all pagan items can be traced back to the Apologists as well.

(374) In two letters (ep.233.1 and ep.235,3-4), he mocks the clusters Marathon and Salamis, Cynegeirus and Callimachus (both traditional to the rhetoricians).

(375) Zeegers-Vander Vorst pp.45-62 has the same question for the poetic quotations in the Apologists' work. She concludes (pp.288-290) that it cannot simply be decided that they reach back to specific florilegia, but at the same time she establishes that most quotations (whether or not in clusters) have a « previous history ».

(376) Thus e.g. II,2,7, v.96 (*PG* 37,1558): six of Zeus' affairs in one verse: Ταῦρος, κύκνος, χρυσός, ὄφις, πόσις, ἄρκτος,... More or less identical enumerations in I,2,2, v.500 and I,2,10, vv.841-842.

(377) Or.5,38 (*PG* 35,713C): Τάνταλος, Τιτυός, Ἰξίων, and ept.40, vv.1-3 (*PG* 38,31), in which only the first is called by name. Because of the parallel (both passages also mention the Pyriphlegethon) I think that in v.3 of the epigram (δαπτόμενόν τ' ὄρνισιν ἀγήραον ἧπαρ ἀλιτροῦ), Gregory does not allude to Prometheus, as Cosmas explains, but to Tityus, about whom the following is written in or.5,38: ὄρνισι τὸ ἧπαρ κειρόμενος, οὔποτε λεῖπον, ἀεὶ δὲ πληρούμενον.

(378) Epg.1, vv.3-4 (anonymously, which leads to confusion in Cosmas) and or.43,45.

(379) Pyrrho, Chrysippus, Aristotle and Plato are summed up in identical phrasings in II,1,12, vv.303-305 and in or.32,25.

(380) II,2,7, vv.252-280; or.4,103; or.5,31-32, or.39,4-5.

Croesus, Midas and Cyrus as prototypes of the wealthy man (381): Orpheus and Amphion as evidence of the magical force of words and singing (382); Empedocles, Heracles, Empedotimus, Trophonius and Aristaeus as examples of deceitful « ascensions » (383): Anaxarchus, Epictetus and Socrates as models of perseverance in mortal ordeals (384).

---

(381) I.2.10, vv.31-35; II.1,12, vv.434-435; II,1,88, vv.7-17; or.43.21, yet nowhere are the four of them mentioned together. Other prototypes mentioned by Gregory: Sardanopalus and Polycrates. About these exemplary wealthy persons in Gregory, see Dziech pp.50-62, who also discusses the exempla of εὐτέλεια and τρυφή (respectively pp.101-113 and 114-127).

(382) II.1,41, vv.46-47 and II.2.5, vv.193-196. They are also mentioned together in Menander's Περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν (twice: 392 and 443). Other clusters in Gregory also mentioned by Menander: Aeacids and Heraclides (or.43,3, Menander 380), Minos and Rhadamanthys (or.43,23, Menander 380); Aristides Dicaeus and a Roman (I.2,10, vv.341-364, Menander 416).

(383) II.2.7, vv.281-290; ept.69-70; or.4,58.

(384) I.2,10, vv.684-693; epg.4; or.4,70; ep.32,8-11 (epigram and letter are addressed to Gregory's erudite friend Philagrius). Comparison of the four passages reveals that Gregory sometimes distorts his material according to the context or situation, and is interesting for textual criticism. In the first text, the mention of the three Greeks fits in with the treatment of the third virtue, the ἀνδρεία. The three Greek martyrs are praised for their phlegmatic attitude towards the threat, but this praise is put in perspective *because they were brave merely when confronted with unavoidable evil*, in contrast with the Christian *athletes* (Σὺ ταῦτ᾿ ἐπαινεῖς; καί τι κἀγώ, πλὴν ὅσον / ἐν τοῖς ἀφύκτοις ἦσαν ἀνδρεῖοι κακοῖς· / (...) / Ἐντεῦθεν ἐλθὲ πρὸς πάλην τὴν ἔνθεον / ἐμῶν ἀθλητῶν..., I,2,10, vv.694-698, *PG* 37,730). The fact that the distortion here is the result of a *conscious* process so as to magnify the contrast between Greeks and Christians - as also in or.4, the polemic against Julian, and in John Chrysostom's *In epist.I ad Cor. hom. IV*,4, cf. Malingrey, *Socrate* p.169 -, is proved by the letter to Philagrius, in which Socrates' (declined) opportunity to escape from death by going into exile is actually mentioned: φυγεῖν ἐξὸν ἀπηξίωσεν. Apparently, in writing to Philagrius he did not consider it necessary to detract in any way from Socrates' heroism.

In an article on the letter of condolence in Basil and Gregory, Mitchell observes that the letters to Philagrius show a complete blending of a pagan and a Christian range of thought. She also indicates (p.312) that Anaxarchus and Epictetus are also mentioned together in Origen, *Cels.* 7,53, and concludes - in my opinion too affirmatively: « It is fairly clear that this is Gregory's immediate source for the anecdotes. » With regard to Origen, it actually is with a *negative* appreciation.

Epg.4, vv.2-3 (*PG* 38,84) runs as follows in the Maurists text (the epigram is not included in *AG* VIII), about Epictetus: ἀγνύμενος / Τὸ κλέος οὐκ ἀλέγιζεν (*confractus gloriam non curabat*, translation Caillau). Cosmas correctly read Τὸ σκέλος (Mai p.532: *when his bones were broken*, ...), cf. I,2,10, v.684 (*PG* 37,729): Λέγεις Ἐπικτήτου τε τὸ κλασθὲν σκέλος. The corrupt

Especially for the second type of clusters, the odds are that Gregory adopts a traditional grouping, with which he has become acquainted during his studies. Parallels in the work of his friend and fellow student Basil also point in that direction. Yet also from these clusters in the writings of author friends, we learn more about the interpretation or identification of certain exempla than about the precise source. For instance, in the poem against anger, we read:

> Ἐλοιδόρει τις τὸν μέγαν Περικλέα,
> Πολλοῖς ἐλαύνων καὶ κακοῖς ὀνείδεσι
> (Τῶν οὐδὲ τιμίων τις), ἄχρις ἑσπέρας.
> Ὁ δ' ἡσυχῇ τὴν ὕβριν, ὡς τιμήν, φέρων,
> Τέλος καμόντα καὶ βαδίζοντ' οἴκαδε
> Προὔπεμψε λύχνῳ, τὸν χόλον τ' ἀπέσβεσεν.
> Ἄλλος δ' ὑβριστήν, πλουσίαις ἐφ' ὕβρεσι
> Προσθέντ' ἀπειλήν· « Ὡς ὀλοίμην παγκάκως,
> Εἰ μὴ κακὸν κακῶς σε κτείναιμι σθένων. »
> Τούτοις ἀμείβεθ' ὡς φιλανθρώποις λόγοις·
> « Κἀγώ γ' ὀλοίμην, εἴ σε μὴ θείην φίλον. »
> *Someone abused the great Pericles,*
> *and pursued him with many vile spiteful remarks,*
> *(it wasn't a very respectable fellow), until late in the evening.*
> *But Pericles calmly endured the insults, as if they were praise,*
> *and when the man was finally tired and wanted to walk home,*
> *Pericles had him accompanied with a torch, and thus quietened down his rage.*
> *Someone else had to deal with a brute who also added a threat*
> *to abundant insults: « Truly may I die in the most horrible manner,*
> *if I do not inflict upon you a bad death, when I get the chance, bad man that you are ».*
> *He answered with the following extremely humane words:*
> *« May I truly die, if I do not make you my friend »* (385).

In Basil's treatise Πρὸς τοὺς νέους, §7, we find the same anecdotes, in the same order and with the same details, but Basil mentions the name of the latter character: Euclides of Megara. In the same paragraph, he moreover recounts another third χρεία which occurs in Gregory as well (Alexander's reticence towards

---

text in the Maurists edition should be ascribed to the influence of v.1: Ἐπικτήτοιο μέγα κλέος ἐν προτέροισιν. (See also Palla. *epigrammi* p.191: τὸ σκέλος is indeed the text in all mss.; the textual error is due to Muratori).

(385) I,2,25, vv.279-289 (*PG* 37,833).

Darius' female slaves (386)), so that there is every chance that the ἄλλος in Gregory's v.285 can be identified as Euclides (387).

B. Paradigmatic prayers

The paradigmatic prayer is a special type of series, rooted in Greek poetry since Homer as well as in the Bible. In these prayers, the deity is confronted with himself as a model. Gregory's poems contain some ten pure examples of this type. The quoted histories and typical insertions of these prayers are dealt with here, but first I quote some passages, from three ἐπιτάφιοι λόγοι, in which Gregory comments on the phenomenon itself.

1) Gregory's representation of former paradigmatic prayers

In the traditional part on the θαύματα of the funeral oration for Gorgonia, Gregory tells the story of his sister who went through a grave illness. She was cured by a paradigmatic prayer and by touching the altar:

> καὶ **πασῶν αὐτὸν τῶν πώποτε δυνάμεων ὑπομνήσασα** (σοφὴ γὰρ ἐκείνη καὶ τὰ παλαιὰ καὶ τὰ νέα), τέλος εὐσεβῆ τινα καὶ καλὴν ἀναισχυντίαν ἀναισχυντεῖ· μιμεῖται τὴν τοῖς κρασπέδοις Χριστοῦ ξηράνασαν πηγὴν αἵματος.
> *and recalling all His miraculous works, for she was familiar with those of old as well as the new, she finally committed an act of pious and noble impudence. She imitated the woman whose hemorrhage was dried up by the hem of Christ's garment* (388).

---

(386) Cf. I.2,10, vv.818-822, as an example of σωφροσύνη. This does not prove any direct influence of Basil on Gregory or conversely, but most probably, they both drew from the same source, or went back to common textbook examples (literally). All these anecdotes can also be found in Plutarch and/or Stobaeus and/or Diogenes Laertius, to mention only these three.

(387) On the other hand, in I.2,10, in the treatment of the εὐτέλεια, Gregory tells an anecdote about Crates, which is ascribed to Zeno in Basil's letter 4. In both passages, Cleanthes' activity as water drawer is mentioned as well. It seems to deny the legitimacy of identification on the basis of a similar cluster in Basil, yet Gregory does indicate that the anecdote is also recounted about another philosopher: Φασὶν τὸν αὐτὸν (sc. Crates) – ὡς τινες δ', ἄλλον τινὰ / τῶν φιλοσοφούντων ἐξ ἴσου φρονήματος –… (I.2,10, vv.236-237, *PG* 37,697). KERTSCH, *Carmen de virtute* pp.175-177 deals with some other passages from the same poem in which Gregory mentions a different version or major character of an anecdote, deviating from tradition.

(388) Or.8,18 (*PG* 35,809C, translation MCCAULEY p.113).

In the same part of the funeral oration for his father, Gregory recounts an analogous incident: one Easter Saturday night, the old Gregory lay in bed, fighting against a fatal disease. His family was in church attending worship, and thanks to the ardent prayers of the whole community, he awoke during the consecration, read Mass himself and was cured. The church-scene is described as follows:

> καὶ ταῦτα ἦν, ἐξαρχούσης τῆς ἐμῆς Μαρίας, καὶ ἀνακρουομένης τὸ τύμπανον, οὐ τὸ ἐπινίκιον, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἱκέσιον, καὶ τότε πρῶτον ἀναισχυντεῖν μαθούσης ὑπὸ τοῦ πάθους, καὶ καταβοώσης τοῦ λαοῦ τε ὁμοίως καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ· τοῦ μὲν, συναλγεῖν πασχούσῃ, καὶ προσφιλοτιμεῖσθαι τοῖς δάκρυσι· τοῦ δέ, εἰσακούειν τῶν δεομένων, **πάντων αὐτὸν τῶν πρὸ τούτου θαυμάτων (καὶ γὰρ εὑρετικὸν τὸ πάσχειν) ὑπομιμνήσκουσα.**
> *My Mary led them and struck the timbrel, not of triumph but of supplication, learning then for the first time to put aside shame in the face of sorrow, and calling both upon the people and upon God: upon the people, to sympathize with her in her distress and to vie in pouring out their tears; upon God, that He might hear her petitions, reminding Him, with the inventive power of grief, of all His miracles in former times* (389).

In the funeral oration for Basil. Gregory illustrates his friend's descent (γένος, one of the topoi) with a story about his ancestors on his father's side, who retreated to the mountains of Pontus on the run from the persecutions under Maximinus. When they were hungry, they expressed their trust in God by means of a paradigmatic prayer, after which the game came running along spontaneously, ready to be slaughtered (Τίς ἔγνω τοιοῦτον θήραμα;). Gregory paraphrases the prayer as follows:

> Τί γάρ ἐστιν, ἔλεγον, τῶν ἀπίστων εἰ ὁ τῶν θαυμασίων Θεός, ὁ θρέψας πλουσίως ἐν ἐρήμῳ ξένον λαὸν καὶ φυγάδα ὥστε καὶ ἄρτον ὀμβρῆσαι καὶ βλύσαι ὄρνιθας, τρέφων οὐ τοῖς ἀναγκαίοις μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς περιττοῖς· εἰ ὁ τεμὼν θάλατταν καὶ στήσας ἥλιον καὶ ποταμὸν ἀνακόψας – καὶ **τἄλλα δὴ ὑπειπόντες ὅσα πεποίηκε φιλεῖ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις φιλιστορεῖν ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ πολλοῖς**

---

(389) Or.18,28 (*PG* 35,1020B, translation McCauley p.141-2). It is not made clear by the actualizing attribute either who is dealt with in the Vossian antonomasia ἡ ἐμὴ Μαρία (cf. Ex 15.20; Miriam is Moses' and Aaron's sister: in §29, Gregory sr. is described as Moses). Van de Paverd pp.198-199 thinks of Nonna or Gorgonia. To me, it seems most likely that Nonna, the wife of the bishop took the lead here, which can moreover be connected with a verse from a funeral epigram for her: νοῦσόν τε πικρὴν ἀποέργαθεν ἀνδρός (ept.78, v.9, *PG* 38,52).

> **θαύμασιν ἀνυμνεῖν τὸν Θεόν –**. οὗτος, ἐπῆγον, καὶ ἡμᾶς θρέψειε σήμερον τοῖς τῆς τρυφῆς τοὺς τῆς εὐσεβείας ἀγωνιστάς.
> *Why, they said, should it be incredible that the God of miracles, who so generously nourished a wandering and fugitive people in the desert, as to rain down bread and supply them with quail, nourishing them not only with necessities, but with superabundance, who divided the sea, and made the sun stand still, and held back the river - and they added all the other things that He had done, for the soul tends in such circumstances to devote itself to such narratives and to glorify God for His many wonders - why should it be incredible, they went on, that the same God should also today nourish us, as athletes of the faith, with delicacies?* (390).

Also in his longest autobiographical poem, Gregory tells of a paradigmatic prayer, at which he, as in the preceding text, partly describes the quoted exempla. Place of the event: a storm at sea between Alexandria and Athens:

πάντων δ' ὑπομνήσας σε τῶν πρὶν θαυμάτων,
187 οἷς τὴν μεγίστην χεῖρά σου γνωρίζομεν,
190 Αἰγυπτίων μάστιξιν ἐκτετριμμένων,
188 πόντου ῥαγέντος Ἰσραὴλ ὡδευκότος,
189 χειρῶν ἐπάρσει δυσμενῶν ἡττημένων,
191 αὐτῆς στρατάρχαις τῆς κτίσεως δουλουμένης,
σάλπιγξι τειχῶν καὶ δρόμῳ πορθουμένων.
προσθείς τε τἀμὰ τοῖς πάλαι βοωμένοις,
« σός », εἶπον, « εἰμί. καὶ τὸ πρὶν καὶ νῦν ἔτι.
(...)
200 καὶ νῦν μαθητὴς ἐν σάλῳ· τίνασσέ μοι
τὸν ὕπνον ἢ πέζευε. καὶ στήτω φόβος. »
I reminded thee of all the miracles of time past
when we had experience of thy mighty hand:
of the affliction by scourges of the Egyptians;
of the sea sundered and the passage of Israel;
of enemies defeated by hands raised in prayer;
of the reduction to servitude of creation itself by the leaders;
of walls collapsing at the sound of the trumpet and the people's onset.
And I added my own experiences to the famous works of old.
« Thine », I said, « I have been formerly, thine am I now.
(...)
At this moment thy disciple is tossed upon the wave. For my sake dispel slumber, or walk to me, and let the fear be stilled » (391).

---

(390) Or.43,7 (*PG* 36,501C, translation McCauley p.32).

(391) II,1,11, vv.186-201 (*PG* 37,1042-3, translation Meehan, *three poems* p.82, adapted to the critical text by Jungck and slightly changed).

From these texts, the following information can be derived:

> - the use of ὑπομιμνήσκω in three of the four texts confirms that the exempla are quoted as models to be used by God; in two texts this is brought into connection with « pious impudence » (ἀναισχυντεῖν);
> - in the four cases, it concerns an emergency (illness or death threat), a situation which Gregory explicitly describes as encouraging this kind of prayer (φιλεῖ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις φιλιστορεῖν ἡ ψυχή);
> - both Old and New Testament episodes are appropriate as subject matter (σοφὴ γὰρ ἐκείνη καὶ τὰ παλαιὰ καὶ τὰ νέα), but from the two texts which also describe the prayer's content, emerges a preference for Exodus-episodes.

2) Gregory's paradigmatic prayers

Along with the above *account of* the prayer during the storm at sea, we find ten actual paradigmatic prayers in Gregory's poems: three in θρῆνοι (II,1,46, vv.39-50; II,1,50, vv.69-78; II,1,51, vv.32-36, each time as conclusion of the poem), three in elegiac-autobiographical poems (II,1,1, vv.1-23; II,1,1, vv.577-595; II,1,19, vv.90-98, as introduction or conclusion), four in / as prayers (I,1,36; I,1,38; II,1,3, vv.5-12; II,1,22a, vv.1-12). In eight cases, Christ is directly addressed (preferably as Χριστὲ ἄναξ). In five paradigmatic prayers, the illustrantia are clearly distinguished as such, through minimal or full insertion; in four others they are metaphorically quoted; in II,1,46 there is a transition from the first to the second type, more or less as in the quoted passage from II,1,11, which Gregory concluded with an allusion to the storm at the lake from the New Testament (vv.200-201).
By way of illustration, I quote one « regular » and one metaphorical paradigmatic prayer:

> Ὃς πυρὶ καὶ νεφέλῃ στρατὸν ἤγαγες, ὃς δ' ὁδὸν εὗρες
> Ἐν πελάγει πήξας κύματ' ἐλαυνομένοις.
> Ἄρτον δ' οὐρανόθεν ὕσας ξένον οὐ δοκέουσιν·
> Ἐκ δὲ πέτρης πηγὴν ἔβλυσας ἀκροτόμου.
> Καὶ νῦν τῷ θεράποντι συνέμπορος ἐλθὲ καλεῦντι,
> Χριστέ, φάος μερόπων, δεξιὰ πάντα φέρων.
> *You who have guided an army with fire and cloud, who by holding back the force of the waves*
> *found a way through the sea for those who were pursued;*
> *who let a peculiar bread rain down from heaven for those who did not expect it,*
> *and let a well spring from a sheer rock:*

now also come as a fellow traveller for your servant who calls you,
Christ, light of mortals, who make everything turn out right (392).

Χριστέ, φάος μερόπων, πυρόει στῦλε Γρηγορίοιο
Ψυχῇ, πλαζομένῃ πικρῆς βιότου δι' ἐρήμης,
Σχὲς Φαραὼ κακόμητιν, ἀναιδέας ἐργοδιώκτας·
Καὶ πηλοῦ μ' ἀδέτοιο, καὶ Αἰγύπτοιο βαρείης
Ἐξερύσαις, πληγῇσιν ἀεικελίῃσι δαμάσσας
Δυσμενέας, λείην δὲ πόροις ὁδόν. Ἢν δὲ κίχῃσιν
Ἐχθρὸς ἐπισπέρχων, σὺ δέ μοι καὶ πόντον ἐρυθρὸν
Τμήξειας, στερεὴν δὲ διεκπεράοιμι θάλασσαν,
Σπεύδων ἐς χθόνα δῖαν, ἐμὸν λάχος, ὥσπερ ὑπέστης·
Καὶ ποταμοὺς στήσειας ἀπείρονας, ἀλλοφύλων τε
Κλίναις θούριον ἔγχος, ἀγάστονον. Εἰ δ' ἐπιβαίην
Γῆς ἱερῆς, μέλψω σε διηνεκέεσσιν ἐν ὕμνοις.
Christ, light of mortals, pillar of fire for Gregory's
soul, which wanders through the bitter desert of life,
stop the malevolent Pharaoh and his shameless taskmasters;
and deliver me from the loose clay, and from the burdensome Egypt;
conquer my enemies with shaming strokes,
and make smooth my way. And if the enemy who always menaces me
is on my heels, then divide the Red Sea for me,
so that I can cross a dry sea,
and haste me on my way to the divine land, my inheritance, as you have promised;
and hold back the immense rivers, and deflect the furious
force of the strangers, which causes suffering. And if I enter
the holy land, I will sing your praises in uninterrupted hymns (393).

In conclusion, I give a schematic survey of the histories quoted in the paradigmatic prayers. I also list the exempla occuring in the account from the autobiographical poem, and at the extreme right of the table, the exempla from I,2,2, which I described above (p.182) as having probably been inserted due to a kind of automatic formation of clusters. With regard to the notation of the poems, I,1 = A; I,2 = B; II,1 = C.

	A36	A38	C1a	C1b	C3	C11	C19	C22	C46	C50	C51	B2
EXODUS-EPISODES												
Moses in the basket											x	
plagues of Egypt						x		x				
pillar of fire	x	x			x			x				x

---

(392) I,1.38 (*PG* 37,521-2).
(393) II,1.22a (*PG* 37,1281).

	A36	A38	C1a	C1b	C3	C11	C19	C22	C46	C50	C51	B2
crossing the Read Sea	x	x			x	x		x				x
Manna and flesh	x	x			x							x
water from the rock	x	x										x
Amalek	x		x		x	x		x				x
the sun's standing still	x					x						x
Jordan	x				x			x				x
OTHER O.T.												
Jericho						x						
Daniel			x								x	x
the three young men			x								x	x
Jonah			x								x	x
Elijah's chariot of fire											x	
remissions									x			
N.T. EPISODES												
storm at the lake	x		x	x		x			x	x		
healings			x	x			x		x	x		
raisings				x			x		x			
Poor Lazarus				x								
multipl. of the loaves				x								
publicans							x		x			

2.3.4 Conclusion

As for **elaboration**, it appears that the exempla with simple *name-mentioning* (for which knowledge of the history is necessary for a full understanding of the text) are most frequent in Gregory's poems. The less numerous *narrations* (which are clear also to those who are not familiar with the history) occur in the shape of διήγημα, χρεία, ἔκφρασις, ἠθοποιΐα; some narrations are anonymous: apparently, the history is more important than the authority of the character in these narrations. About one third of the exempla are *allusions* (knowledge of the history is required here for the identification of the exemplum, but usually not for the comprehension of the text). Some allusions are easily recognizable: proverbs distilled from fables, κρίσεις, and antonomasias; others are likely to elude the inattentive or ignorant reader's notice: lexical allusions, unannounced quotations, and lexical contaminations, in which a recounted or mentioned exemplum conceals another. One of Gregory's favourite techniques is the alternation of allusion to and mention / narration of the same exemplum in the same – sometimes quite extensive – context.

For lack of reference material, it is uncertain whether the predominance of name-mentioning should be considered as a clinging to the ancient type of exemplum (in which the « hero » was more significant than the history itself). What can be established for certain is that *biblical* exempla occur notably more than average with name-mentioning, and the *pagan* (historical) ones as (also anonymous) narration, from which it appears that in the first type, the persuasiveness is the result of the authority of the character, while in the second it is rather due to the history itself. Furthermore, it is noticeable that the *mythological* exempla occur extremely often in the form of an allusion (an indication for a learned audience), and hardly ever as narration (a token of restraint).

Correlations between elaboration on the one hand, and function, rhetorical species and genre on the other, are less apparent. Still, it can be stated that exempla with model function are frequently elaborated as narration, and, in connection with this observation, that narrations occur most in deliberative poems. The fact that allusions particularly fulfil an ornamental function is not amazing.

For the **insertion** of exempla, Gregory has an extensive repertory of *linking terms and formulas*. Explicit insertions, with announcement of the exemplum, are relatively rare; mostly he uses one of the four types of standard formulas, which can all be traced back to prototypical examples from rhetorical treatises. Also rhetorical figures such as the ἀποστροφή, the παράλειψις, the διαπόρησις and the laudatory σύγκρισις serve as transitions between issue and exemplary history. None of these formulas or figures is exclusively restricted to pagan or biblical subject matter, but expressions such as ὡς ἐνέπουσι and ὡς πιστεύεται actually function especially as relativizing dissociations from pagan (and even more from physical) exempla. A number of terms indicate the (evidential or model) function of the exempla, and are thus respectively confined to these two types.

According to the kind of insertion, *four types of exempla* can be distinguished in Gregory's poems: full (with *Ernstbedeutung* and linking formula; the only type in the case of inductive argumentation), minimal (with linking formula or at least a morphological form of insertion), metaphorical (to be subdivided into Vossian antonomasia and allegory), and non-inserted (hidden allusions). The first three types occur with more or less equal frequency, spread among the whole body of poems.

The *macro-analysis* shows that the insertion is determined most by the *function* of the exempla: evidential function is usually related to full exempla, ornament to metaphorical or non-inserted exempla. The two *exempla probationis* apparently make different demands on the literary form, dependent on whether it concerns insertion or elaboration: in Gregory, an insertion with explicit *Ernstbedeutung* is more important for evidence, an elaborate narration for a model. Besides, there is much less correlation between insertion and elaboration than expected.

What actually is significant is the correlation between metaphorical insertion and biblical *subject matter* (especially parables) on the one hand and non-insertion and pagan matter (especially mythological) on the other; in the latter case, the influence of classical language and verse form probably plays a role. As for the distribution among the *genres*, it is striking that the *moralia* contain many full exempla, and the autobiographical poems many minimal and metaphorical exempla. These metaphorical exempla are especially biblical; more than half of the pagan metaphorical exempla are found in the *moralia*. Thus, for autobiographical purposes, Gregory prefers to use biblical metaphors.

Examples of this can be found in the *paradigmatic prayers*, a form of **exempla in series**. Gregory's representation of former paradigmatic prayers of himself and of others (with ὑπομιμνήσκω as a recurring term), shows that these are connected with emergencies and that Old and New Testament histories are both appropriate, with a marked preference for Exodus-episodes. This also appears from his own (ten) specimens, in which often the same episodes are quoted. Half of these are metaphorically inserted, and they are found in prayers, θρῆνοι and elegiac-autobiographical poems.

From the analysis of some other passages with series of exempla, it emerges that nothing points to a fixed principle according to which Gregory would have constructed his series: not an increasing authority or reality, not a specific order O.T. - N.T. - pagan (even the chronological order O.T. - N.T. is not always sustained), not a grouping in threes. The organization of the examined passages at first creates the impression of being *associative*; in many cases, however, the sequence of exempla is the result of a well-thought-out process, which can also be found in the transition between separate exempla, and which is comparable to the technique of alternation adopted for the elaboration of subsequent exempla; but sometimes, the digressions seem to be the outcome of a quasi-automatic forming of clusters.

The numerous recurring clusters in Gregory's œuvre are more significant for the information they provide about interpretation, identification and textual criticism than for what they might tell us about the author's sources. Both biblical and pagan clusters can be subdivided in an « organic » and a « functional » class. The latter type is more interesting, because the forming of clusters is less obvious here. Certainly in the case of the biblical clusters, this does not necessarily lead to postulating a Christian collection of paradigmata; conversely, pagan functional clusters do probably go back to collections, and are - as is the whole of his writing - the result of his rhetorical studies, as emerges also from the parallel clusters in Basil's work. Finally, we also came across three exempla which were twisted by Gregory so as to make them fit in better with the context or so as to make a required « associative » transition possible.

CONCLUSION OF THE FIRST PART

Rather than going through the separate results of the rhetorical analysis of Gregory's παραδείγματα again, I prefer to answer the questions put forward at the beginning of this part:

1. Can Gregory's use of the rhetorical exemplum indeed be described as a concrete filling-in of the omnipresence of the Greek παίδευσις and rhetoric in his œuvre; in other words, do we recognize the influence of the ancient rhetoricians' directions in his poetry? Is his practice comparable to that of other Church Fathers whose work has been examined on this point, and does it represent, as Le Goff posited in general terms about the late-antique Christian exemplum, a transitional stage leading to the medieval exemplum?
2. Does the literary-rhetorical incorporation of pagan histories differ from that of biblical ones, and what does this teach us about Gregory's attitude towards pagan material?

The rhetorical παράδειγμα in Gregory

Gregory's use of the **terms** παράδειγμα and especially ὑπόδειγμα as indication of a literary phenomenon largely corresponds with the definition I formulated in chapter 1, based on the post-Aristotelian rhetorical tradition. It should be noted however that Gregory also uses both terms to indicate a comparison (παραβολή), which is still a part of παράδειγμα in Aristotle's rhetoric.

It is difficult to evaluate the **frequency** of the exempla in Gregory's poems, but it seems to be rather high (an average of 46 per 1000 verses, or ca. 1 per 20 verses); it is comparable to the frequency in his orations, but is much higher than in his letters. The frequency is highest in the deliberative poems: according to Aristotle, these form the most suitable γένος to contain παραδείγματα as arguments. The dispersion among genres and individual poems is extremely irregular.

The most frequent **function** is the *ornamental* one, associated with the παράδειγμα only after Aristotle, and drifting off into the background in the medieval exemplum. Of the *exempla proba-*

tionis in Gregory, the *model* is nearly twice as frequent as the evidence; to influence people's behaviour, he actually assesses examples much more highly than mere words. To the exempla as *evidence*, he seems to attribute only a minor persuasiveness: moreover, the analogical method ὡς μέρος πρὸς μέρος is used relatively rarely in comparison with the inductive method; the use of παραδείγματα by opponents is considered as σοφίσματα; the Aristotelian refutation by means of one counter example seems insufficient to Gregory. For this λύσις, he especially adopts the method advised by later rhetoricians, that is, challenging the validity of the quoted examples. Gregory appears to know the Hermogenic form of argumentation, but hardly ever applies it himself. All four of the rhetoricians' topical degrees of similarity occur frequently in Gregory, in correlation with function (evidential exempla are nearly exclusively ἀφ' ὁμοίου – ἀπ' ἴσου) and subject matter.

With regard to this **subject matter**, Gregory explicitly follows the traditional subdivisions into παλαιά / νέα and οἰκεῖα / ἀλλότρια, but usually fills them in with a Christian content: O.T. / N.T. and biblical / pagan. In the latter division, we find the most considerable deviations (more too than in the division historical / fictitious), according to, among other things, function and degrees of similarity, the two most influential factors. These deviations are summed up when the second question is dealt with; here, it can be pointed out that the frequent ἀπ' ἐλάττονος use of the ἀλλότρια is in line with the rhetoricians' suggestions.

The ancient rhetorical treatises give very few directions concerning the **literary form**. Still, Gregory's rhetorical education turns out to have its influence, both in the formal *elaboration* of the exempla (narrations take progymnasmatic shapes, especially διήγημα and χρεία), and in their *insertion* (his most frequent insertion formulas have their origins in the traditional examples of the rhetoricians; and besides, he also repeatedly uses figures such as the ἀποστροφή, the διαπόρησις, the laudatory σύγκρισις and the παράλειψις).

As for the elaboration of the exempla, Gregory mostly opts for name-mentioning, more than for allusion (especially with ornamental function) and narration (somewhat more with model function): *qua* insertion, full, minimal and metaphorical exempla are more or less as numerous (the first occur relatively more frequently with evidential function, and in the *moralia*; the last with ornamental function, and in the autobiographical poems). The preferred literary form also depends upon whether the subject matter is biblical or pagan.

Gregory follows the advice of some rhetoricians to join together several exempla. He does not employ fixed principles of organization for these *series*: sequences seem determined by (sometimes contrived) associations and (occasionally automatic) forming of clusters. A number of fixed, functional clusters of pagan exempla once more refer to his rhetorical studies.

All things considered, Gregory's use of the παράδειγμα is positively in keeping with the rhetorical theories, especially post-Aristotelian: it can be considered as another illustration of the omnipresence of Greek rhetoric in his œuvre.

A comparison with the observations of Pétré and Schneiderhan about the exemplum in Tertullian and Jerome respectively reveals a greater correspondence with the former than with Gregory's contemporary and (for a short period) student. Like Tertullian, he prefers to use pagan exempla ἀπ' ἐλάττονος, and Old Testament exempla relatively often with evidential function; on the other hand though, proportionately, the New Testament exempla are certainly not less numerous in his work. In contrast with Jerome, the exempla in Gregory are not especially found in letters and polemical writings (394), are not quoted nearly exclusively ἀφ' ὁμοίου, and are not put with notable frequency in a *praeteritio* or grouped in series of three.

Le Goff's thesis seems to hold true for Gregory's exemplum: the predominance of the ornamental function is still ancient whereas the inductive form of argumentation and the more frequent model than evidential function are indicative of the medieval exemplum. The persuasiveness of the biblical exempla seems largely determined by the authority of the characters, as in the ancient exemplum; that of the pagan exempla by the history itself, as in the medieval one. I give this situation within Western evolution with caution (see also n.97): further research of the παράδειγμα in Greek-patristic and Byzantine literature (which I hope to carry out in the near future) should determine the significance of this observation. The only reference material for Greek-Christian literature (in Pyykkö) merely shows that the mythological exempla are much more numerous in Gregory than in the other Cappadocians (Basil contains practically none) and John Chrysostom.

---

(394) At least not in the polemical poems; in the polemical λόγοι, they are extremely numerous.

Pagan and biblical exempla

The analysis has shown that there is no *systematic* difference between the manner of incorporation of pagan and biblical subject matter in Gregory's poems: not a single function, method of argumentation, insertion formula or literary form is exclusively restricted to one of the two; and there is, with the exception of the prayers and the *biblica*, no literary genre, rhetorical γένος, or type of reader/addressee which occurs only with one of the two sorts of exempla.

Is there indeed, as Mossay posited, « aucun motif d'ordre littéraire qui permette de distinguer l'utilisation des sources païennes de celle des sources bibliques dans l'œuvre de Grégoire »?

Divergent tendencies have actually been established for each of the above areas, so that we can agree with Sykes: « there is a certain variety to be discerned in Gregory's dealing with classical and biblical sources. » As for *function*, pagan material is used notably more as ornament, and biblical matter as model. When pagan exempla do function as model, then it is often ἀπ' ἐναντίου or ἀπ' ἐλάττονος, nearly always ἀπ' ἐλάττονος προσώπου. The complementary *degree of similarity*, ἀπὸ μείζονος, is as good as restricted to biblical exempla; the one pagan exception is ἀπὸ μείζονος πράξεως. This use of the topical degrees reveals a higher appreciation of the pagan πράξεις than the pagan πρόσωπα. The main point established about the *elaboration* runs in parallel: the historical pagan exempla are elaborated notably often in a narration (the history is significant), the biblical with a mere name-mentioning (the authority of the character suffices). With regard to the mythological exempla, Gregory is more reserved: these are quoted mostly in the form of an allusion. A final aspect of the exemplum itself is the *insertion*: biblical exempla, especially parables, are inserted particularly metaphorically; pagan ones, especially myths, are more often non-inserted (hidden allusions).

The choice of subject matter, whether pagan or biblical, is also determined to a certain extent by the *form*, *content* and *audience* of the poems and prose texts; in this respect, the persuasive function of the whole of the text (the rhetorical situation) seems of hardly any significance. The distribution among genres and individual poems of the pagan exempla is much more irregular than that of the biblical. The highest *concentration* of pagan exempla can be found in the epigrams, the epistolary poems and the *moralia* (395). In the (prose) letters, the concentration is smaller, but still these letters are the only group in which the pagan exempla are more numerous than the biblical. Metaphorical pagan exempla are especially found in the *moralia*, biblical metaphors in the autobiographical poems (396).

The influence of the *audience* has been examined for poetry and for prose. It turns out to influence the choice of the subject matter in two ways: when the addressee is a Hellene, Gregory confines himself nearly exclusively to pagan exempla; in the other, most frequent case he takes into account the (average) παίδευσις of his reader or public. So, biblical material is appropriate for Christians (λόγιοι *and* ἀπαίδευτοι), pagan material for λόγιοι / πεπαιδευμένοι (Hellenes *and* Christians).

Even though, broadly speaking, the biblical exempla are clearly designated as superior, Gregory's choice of biblical or pagan subject matter is certainly not dogmatic: didactic usefulness, liveliness, intelligibility or elegance seem to prevail. The alternating appreciation for sometimes identical pagan characters (even about a similar episode, cf. Socrates' attitude before death) reminds of his changing explicit appreciation of the Greek παίδευσις and rhetoric in general: and just as this rhetoric is omnipresent in Gregory's œuvre, so he often adorns his poems with unpronounced lexical and literary allusions to pagan histories, which eventually constitute an important component of his poetic art (36 % of the exempla are pagan). It is one of the ways in which he claims cultural Hellenism as a right for the Christians. In his rhetorical use of the παράδειγμα we can consider Gregory as σοφίης ἀμφοτέρης πρύτανιν (397).

---

(395) Sykes' proposition about the moralia (the group I,2 in the Maurists), that they reveal a strong pagan bias, is thus confirmed for the *moralia* in a narrow sense (34 pagan items per 1000 verses versus 40 biblical), but not for the θρῆνοι (27 versus 46) and the gnomologies (3 versus 30), which partly belong to the same group in the *PG*. The fact that the *carmina historica* display a more biblical nature, as he remarked as well, is certainly not true for the epistolary poems (56 pagan as against 24 biblical) and the epigrams (72 as against 21), but does apply to the autobiographical poems (11 as against 28). Thus, the rough classification of the poems by the Maurists once more appears to be inappropriate for detailed literary analysis.

(396) Sykes indeed mentioned « Gregory's desire to identify himself with characters and situations in scripture. »

---

(397) As he has his mother call him in ept.58, v.3 (*PG* 38,40). The expression is already chosen by CONSOLINO for the title of his article on the funeral epigrams.

PART TWO
PARADEIGMA AND HERMENEUTICS

In the first part, attention was focused on the παράδειγμα as rhetorical phenomenon. The purpose was to give a complete and profound survey of the way in which Gregory makes use of exempla in his poems. The discussed and quoted examples served as illustration of a specific type of παράδειγμα.

In this part, I deal with the relation between on the one hand Gregory's interpretation of myths and the Bible, and on the other, his literary reception of this subject matter in his exempla. Can the meaning of the individual exempla in the context (the *Ernstbedeutung*) teach us something about Gregory's interpretation of the histories concerned, about the *Eigenbedeutung* in his view? And conversely, what does the study of his hermeneutic stance teach for the semantic analysis of his exempla?

It goes without saying that I do not want to have the last word on Gregory as an exegete: this goes far beyond the scope of the study of the exemplary material. Neither shall I deal with all kinds of exempla: I shall concentrate on the type in which the tension between *Eigen-* and *Ernstbedeutung* is at its highest: the metaphorical exemplum.

Also with regard to the subject matter, I follow a selective procedure. Concerning the biblical material, an inquiry into the relation between literary reception and hermeneutic approach is relevant both for the *historical* exempla and for the *parables*. This differs somewhat where the pagan exempla are concerned: the *Eigenbedeutung* is under discussion only in the case of the *mythological* histories. As for the fables, this *Eigenbedeutung* is abundantly clear and usually made explicit in the fables themselves; a literal interpretation is not under consideration. Conversely, the historical histories only allow for this literal interpretation: hermeneutics do not enter into this matter at all (1).

---

(1) Of course, a semantic analysis of the historical pagan exempla *can* provide interesting information about Gregory's attitude towards the pagans, more specifically the Greeks from the period before Christ. In the first part, this attitude was only indirectly mentioned: it can be summarized by the expression ῥόδ' ἐξ ἀκανθῶν συλλέγων (I,2,10, v.216; compare Amphilochius' Πρὸς Σέλευκον v.61 (OBERG), on the same subject: καὶ τὰς ἀκάνθας φεῦγε καὶ ῥόδον δρέπου). The fact that « wisdom » can at all be found in Hellenic tradition is now and then brought by Gregory into connection with the traditional explanations since Justin (for this tradition, see e.g. DANIÉLOU, *Message* pp.41-72, about *La sagesse des nations*): the theory of the σπέρμα τοῦ Λόγου or the universal λόγος (II,1,45, vv.175-176 seem to allude to this) and the theory of plagiarism from the Mosaic books (explicitly e.g. in II,2,7, vv.239-251 and or.43,23, with commentary of

The first two chapters of this part are composed in parallel. The first (chapter 3) deals with Greek mythology in Gregory's writings, the second (chapter 4) with the Bible. In both, I first give a survey of the repertory of the selected material. After that, I examine Gregory's explicit enunciations about the interpretation to be followed (or to be avoided), with special alertness to terminology. Finally, I compare the result of this examination with the sketches of the mythological and the biblical exemplum, as they were described in the first part. In the final chapter, then, I discuss the reception of mythology and the Bible in the metaphorical exempla, as well as the hermeneutic position which this kind of literary reception entails.

Boulenger p.lxxxv). Yet, a real attempt at recuperation through the *praeparatio evangelica*-idea seems out of the question in his writings. Moreover, one of the conclusions from the first part was that Gregory is unstable in his appreciation.

By way of illustration, I give one example: the exemplary use of **Socrates**. Nowhere does Gregory attempt to elevate him to a Christian before Christ, as Justin did (Döring pp.150-153), nor do we detect a systematic sympathy or admiration, as in the case of Eusebius (Malingrey, *Socrate* p.159). The traditional episodes and typifications are found: his brave attitude towards death (but in two cases with significant relativizations, cf. part 1 n.384), his pederasty, the Chaerephon-oracle which appointed Socrates as ὁ σοφώτατος, his guard duty in Potidaea, his refusal to go into exile. These are functionally chosen episodes, which do not betray a principally positive or negative attitude towards the famous Greek.

CHAPTER III

GREEK MYTHOLOGY IN GREGORY

To leave no doubt: I do not start from a viewpoint which attempts to define the « actual meaning » of the Greek myths (2). Recent mythologists agree that «there can be no single and comprehensive theory of myth. » (3) Besides, it is typical of the Greek myths that, in the form in which we know them, they are a product of a literary community, constituted in aesthetic freedom by poets, philosophers and moralists: they are a cultural factor and no manifestation of the unconscious or subconscious.

Hence, a definition of myths has to take on a pragmatic meaning: *a Greek myth is a traditional story in which gods or legendary heroes take action* (4). About this also the Greeks themselves agreed.

3.1 Repertory

The mythological repertory made use of in Gregory's œuvre, is exceptionally extensive: in comparison with the other fourth century Greek Church Fathers, Pyykkö rightly calls him a « Sonderfall » (5) on this point. She observes 167 mythological keywords (6); in my inventory, in which different episodes with a similar character are indicated separately, I list 268 such words.

It has been pointed out already that nearly half of the mythological items in the poems are not used in an exemplary way: a much larger share than for the other types of subject matter (cf. p.126). This is partly due to the fact that a number of myths form the subject itself of the argument (see further in the discussion of Gregory's attitude towards the Greek myths), but also and especially because non-narrative material has also been selected as pagan matter. Gregory profusely avails himself of this material:

---

(2) Cf. DÖRRIE, *Sinn* p.10: « es ist eine durch nichts gerechtfertigte Vermessenheit (...) behaupten zu wollen, was bestimmte Mythen 'eigentlich' bedeuten. » When I speak of the *Eigenbedeutung* of mythological exempla in this study, then I refer to the literal meaning, or to the « actual » meaning *according to Gregory*.

(3) KIRK p.38. See also DAY p.VII: « the totality of myth is far more complicated than Middle Eastern politics. »

(4) After STÄHLIN p.775 and KIRK p.22.

(5) PYYKKÖ, *Mythos* p.121.

(6) PYYKKÖ p.22.

on the one hand, it concerns names and place-names originating unambiguously in mythology, some of which have spread generally in Christian language (Charites, Erinyes, Erotes, Phaethon, Hades (7), Muses, Pyriphlegethon, Tartarus), and on the other, personifications of abstract concepts, which were significant in mythology (Dike, Phthonus, Lyssa, Momus, Plutus, Themis, Tyche) (8). Without referring to any concrete mythological histories, these names give a pagan flavour to some of his poems, in particular quite a few of his epigrams (9).

From the rhetorical analysis it also emerged that the mythological exempla are quoted remarkably often in an allusion (cf. p.152). Due to this, the inventory contains a considerable number of keywords which need a justification: either because it is uncertain *who* the exemplary character is (in an antonomasia, an anonymous narration, a proverb), or because it is unclear *if* there is an allusion (in the case of non-insertion: lexical allusion and contamination). Where this is necessary, the justification is included in inventory I.

3.2 Attitude towards the Greek myths

3.2.1 Μῦθος and related terms in Gregory

In the dictionary of *LSJ*, the semantic field of μῦθος is subdivided into two entities: the first is principally defined as *word, speech*, with as derivatives *thing said; thing thought; saying.* The second is described as *tale, story, narrative*, with as more specific meanings *fiction; legend, myth; fable; plot.* The subdivision can be followed in the discussion of the terms in Gregory.

---

(7) Cf. Prestige. Of course, the use of this term by the Greek Church Fathers was prepared for by its occurring in the Septuagint. A short comment on *Hades* in Gregory's work can be found in Oberhaus pp.189–190 (about I,2,25, v.527).

(8) Where this second category is concerned, it is sometimes unclear whether or not it concerns a personification (see Zehles on I,2,2, vv.36 and 39 about Μῶμος and Λύσσα; Sundermann p.217 speaks of « allegory »). For these names, the Maurists tend to avoid using a capital letter (as a token of the personification) as much as possible.

(9) Besides, there are also epigrams with « real » mythological exempla. Keydell, *Epigramm*, passes this over in his discussion of Gregory's epigrams (pp.541–546), when he posits that mythology is admitted only when the characters in question can be abstracted.

A. Word(s)

This basic meaning can be further subdivided into
1) word, sound: speaking as act (10)
2) pronounced words, speech / oration (11)
3) words, message, doctrine (12)
4) eloquence (13)
5) in an even broader sense: οἱ μῦθοι, like οἱ λόγοι a quasi-synonym of παίδευσις (14).

Μῦθος has a positive (meaning 4) or neutral connotation here; context or attributes usually determine the alternating appreciation (see the examples in the footnotes: both Christian and pagan doctrine are indicated with it). The most significant observation is that this field of meaning of the word μῦθος is employed only in Gregory's poems; in the prose, we usually find λόγος for this. This immediately explains why, of the more than 200 times that μῦθος occurs, the majority are situated in poetry.

B. Story, fiction

1) μῦθος and ἀλήθεια

In Gregory, μῦθος occurs only once in the technical meaning of plot, ὑπόθεσις, *argumentum* (of a tragedy, in Aristotle) (15). In all other cases, this second field of meaning, which is the only one occurring in prose, is contrasted with ἀλήθεια. This does not by definition mean that there is no truth at all in the μῦθος (*fictitious story*). It does signify, though, that its literal meaning is not historical.

---

(10) Examples: ὑποβλύζειν μῦθον ἐμῶν στομάτων (II,1,34, v.24, *PG* 37,1309); λῆξον μύθοιο (II,2,7, v.219, *PG* 37,1568); εἴπω μείζονα μῦθον (I,2,1, v.333, *PG* 37,547 = I,2,15, v.39 = II,2,3, v.161).

(11) Examples: ἐμοῦ μύθοιο τελευτήν (I,2,1, v.700, *PG* 37,575); στήσομεν ἐνθάδε μῦθον (I,2,1, v.472, *PG* 37,558 = II,2,3, v.338); μῦθον πτερόεντα (II,2,7, v.316, *PG* 37,1575).

(12) Examples: about the own (Christian) doctrine: ἡμέτερον ψυχῆς πέρι μῦθον ἄριστον (I,1,8, v.53, *PG* 37,451); σοφὸν καὶ ἐχέφρονα μῦθον (I,2,1, v.389, *PG* 37,551); οὐράνιος μύθοισιν εἰμί (I,2,9, vv.51-52, *PG* 37,671); further I,2,2, v.154; II,1,50, v.31; II,2,7, vv.143 and 301. About other (pagan or challenged) doctrines: μῦθος ἀσαυρός (I,1,4, v.3, *PG* 37,416, on Greek cosmology); οὐ πινυτῶν ὅδε μῦθος (I,1,8, v.32, *PG* 37,449, on Greek psychology); τί μοι ξένων μύθων τε καὶ διδαγμάτων (I,2,10, v.412, *PG* 37,710).

(13) Examples: ἀμφήκη μῦθον ἔδωκε Λόγος (II,1,93, v.4, *PG* 37,1448); μῦθον καὶ Πολύδαμνα κεράσσατο (II,2,5, v.200, *PG* 37,1536). Furthermore, often in the expressions μύθων κλέος / σθένος / κράτος.

(14) Μῦθοι as synonym of λόγοι (literary and rhetorical studies, παίδευσις) can be found especially in the epistolary poems about Nicobulus' education, and in the passages on Gregory's own Athenian studies.

(15) II,2,3, v.51 (*PG* 37,1483): πῶς μῦθον (...) ἐδώκαμεν (fully quoted supra p.87).

Gregory knows the definition given by the rhetoricians to the μῦθος, as appears from a relativizing addition after he has situated Julian among Pyriphlegethon, Cocytus and Acheron, punished more severely than Tantalus, Tityus and Ixion:

> εἴτε ἀλήθεια ταῦτά ἐστιν εἴτε μῦθος παραδεικνὺς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν τοῖς πλάσμασιν.
> *whether all of this is truth, or myth representing truth through inventions* (16).

Μῦθος as narrative concealment or framing of a truth: ἀλήθεια and μῦθος are not contradictory in this respect: ἀλήθεια is the « naked truth » (17), μῦθος the « concealment of a truth », which has two aspects: a true core, and the πλάσματα (18).

Elsewhere, Gregory does not make this last distinction: μῦθος and πλάσματα are considered as synonyms (19), and are both contrasted with ἀλήθεια, in which (historical) reality and truth are exclusively linked. In that case, μῦθος means as much as λῆρος: « nonsense » (20).

Thus, in Gregory's language, two types of relations can be established between the concepts μῦθος (as *fictitious story*) and ἀλήθεια: a *possibly* inclusive and an exclusive one. In this way,

---

(16) Or.5,38 (*PG* 35,713C). Compare with the identical definitions of Aphthonius (SPENGEL II p.21), Theon (SPENGEL II p.72) and Nicolaus (SPENGEL III p.453): Μῦθός ἐστι λόγος ψευδὴς εἰκονίζων ἀλήθειαν.

(17) For Basil, this is the only legitimate form of truth: repeatedly, he emphasizes: γυμνὴ ἡ ἀλήθεια (PYYKKÖ, *Mythos*).

(18) Of course, this theory on the two aspects of the μῦθος implies an allegorical interpretation (see 3.2.2.A).
In or.4,119, Gregory deals with the two aspects (in this context, the « true core » is not correct in Gregory's view): he first calls them τὸ νοούμενον and τὸ προβεβλημένον; at the end of §119 he speaks of μυθολογήματα and either σκεπάσματα (in the text of the Maurists and of Bernardi), or σκέμματα (a variant which is clearly preferable according to KURMANN pp.406-407). In any case, to Gregory, μυθολόγημα signifies one aspect of the μῦθος here, according to the first reading « le contenu des mythes », according to the second, « leur revêtement narratif » (descriptions of PÉPIN, *Mythe* p.471, who follows the text of the Maurists).

(19) E.g. in ep.96,1: ὡς γοῦν τοῖς μύθοις δοκεῖ καὶ τοῖς πλάσμασιν.

(20) E.g. in or.5,32 (*PG* 35,704C): οὐκέτι Πυθία πληροῦται (...) μύθων καὶ ληρημάτων.

Gregory is less unequivocal in his semantic use - also in the second field of meaning - of the term μῦθος, than the New Testament letters and the early Christian tradition (21).

2) μῦθος: fictitious story

Within the broad field of meaning « story, fiction », μῦθος has a number of specific meanings. Some of these correspond completely to one type of relation to the ἀλήθεια: 1 and 2 are a fictitious framing of truth, 4 is its opposite. All terms in Gregory which are derived from μῦθος (as μυθολόγημα, discussed in n.18) are connected with this semantic field; their meaning is mentioned at the equivalent of μῦθος itself.

1) (New Testament) parable (22).
2) fable (23); the terms (δια)μυθολογέω and μυθολόγος signify « telling fables » and « fableteller » (24) in Gregory.
3) legend (25): μυθώδης means « legendary », μυθικός can have the same meaning (26).
4) nonsense (27); the one passage in which μυθικός is the opposite of ἀληθής fits in with this category (28).

---

(21) As for the N.T.: 1Tim 1,4 and 4,7; 2Tim 4,4 (ἀπὸ μὲν τῆς ἀληθείας τὴν ἀκοὴν ἀποστρέψουσιν, ἐπὶ δὲ τοὺς μύθους ἐκτραπήσονται); Titus 1,13-14; 2Pet 1,16. According to the prevailing opinion, the early Christian tradition radically distinguishes between μῦθος on the one hand and (religious) truth and historicity on the other, see e.g. STÄHLIN pp.771-772 and HORSTMANN pp.7-8.

(22) I,1,24, v.1 (*PG* 37,495, announcement of the parables from Matthew): Εἰ δ' ἄγε, καὶ σκοτίων αἰνίγματα δέρκεο μύθων.

(23) Examples: I,2,28, v.234; I,2,29, v.187; ep.114,1.
Gregory likes to make use of a fable to express his truth, but often adds a kind of apology, from which it appears that he associates the fable with παίζειν and / or with older men or women (see for example the announcement of the fables p.106: εἰ δεῖ τι παίζειν and p.154: ἡ πολιὴ δὲ λάλον).

(24) Examples of the verb: I,2,28, v.232; I,2,29, v.187; ep.114,1; of the noun: or.26,10 (*PG* 35,1240C: τάχα με γέροντα καὶ μυθολόγον νομίσετε).

(25) Examples: I,2,10, v.407; or.26,10; or.43,21. The first and the third passage deal with Midas: Gregory tells the legend because of the (moral) truth attached to it: τὸν μῦθον αἰνῶ, ὡς εὖ ἔχει (I,2,10. *PG* 37,709). In the same chapter of or.43 (*PG* 36,524B), the history of Gyges' ring is quoted as well, εἴπερ μὴ μῦθος ἦν.

(26) Or.2,37 respectively ep.26,2.

(27) Examples: II,1,44, v.40 (*PG* 37,1352: μῦθος ἅπαντα τάδε); or.14,33; or.31,7 (*PG* 36,141A: κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς λήρους καὶ μύθους, on Marcion).

(28) Or.39,3 (*PG* 36,337A): ὡς ἀληθῆ προσκυνοῦσιν, ὡς μυθικὰ συγκαλύπτουσιν.

5) (Greek) myth, the most frequent meaning in this semantic field; this is also the meaning in the compounds μυθολογία, μυθολογεύω and μυθόλατρις (a neologism), each used once (29). Furthermore, μυθικός can also signify « from Greek mythology » (30).

The relation of μῦθος as « Greek myth » to ἀλήθεια, in other words, Gregory's opinion on the possible veracity and historicity of Greek myths, forms the subject of the following pages.

In the second field of meaning, μῦθος is thus used for different types of exemplary material: parable, fable, legend, myth, i.e. the non-historical ἱστορίαι. Hence, the one exception, when Gregory chooses to use the term for a biblical episode (the giants (31)) is quite significant indeed. I come back to this in the fifth chapter.

3.2.2 Myth and truth

The most important texts in which Gregory explicitly comments on Greek mythology are listed below:

texts in which paganism forms a major theme
* orations 4 and 5: the invectives against Julian, more specifically or.4,115-122 (32) (about Julian's so-called propaganda project for a pagan « church ») and or.5,31-32 (an ἐπινίκιον against the defeated paganism).
* II,2,7: the epistolary poem to Nemesius, especially vv.69-171 and 239-290. In between, Gregory explicates the principles of the Christian doctrine, and the letter is concluded with jubilation about the victory of Christianity, with a call to conversion.

extensive digressions
* or.39,3-7: Εἰς τὰ φῶτα, probably delivered on Epiphany 381 in the SS. Apostles. Gregory himself repeatedly calls the first part (§§1-10) a κάθαρσις; after that he can proceed to the discussion of the feast itself (the baptism of Jesus). In the first part, the Christian κάθαρσις is opposed to that of the Greeks (33).

---

(29) Respectively or.4,108; II,2,7, v.166 and v.159. In v.166 (*PG* 37,1564) a reference to old women (πολιῇσιν ὁμοίϊα μυθολογεύειν), probably inspired here by Paul. 1Tim 4,7: τοὺς βεβήλους καὶ γραώδεις μύθους.

(30) Examples: I,2,10, v.51 and ep.175,2.

(31) Gn 6,1-4. Gregory refers to this scriptural passage in or.14,23.

(32) Paraphrase with quotations in PYYKKÖ pp.85-96; detailed commentary in KURMANN pp.385-414.

(33) DÖRRIE, *Epiphanias* p.411 speaks of a kind of exorcism. PYYKKÖ

* or.28,14-15: the second theological oration, Περὶ θεολογίας. Gregory deals with the possibility of knowledge of God: in contrast with others (elaboration on erroneous pagan images of God), the Christians transcend τὰ ὁρώμενα.
* I,2,2, vv.491-501: ὑποθῆκαι παρθένοις, a passage about the choice between celibacy and marriage.
* I,2,10, passim: as pointed out, the poem for the most part consists of a comparison of the pagan and the Christian ἀρετή.

Along with these, there are also some casual statements, spread over the entire œuvre.

I first give some **general observations** on Gregory's approach to myths, especially with regard to the first four of the texts mentioned:

1. By treating Homeric mythology as the crucial component of religious paganism, Gregory's criticism is an *anachronistic*, almost purely literary struggle (34).
2. In his criticism of paganism as a religion, he mixes up all kinds of - possibly related - phenomena: among other things, the belief in the Olympian gods and their myths, mystery religions, astrology. His criticism is directed against the *general concept of paganism*, each time in opposition to and by contrast with Christian theology. It is quite revealing that the tone, the content and even the formulation of his criticism of myths are the same in the invectives against the despised Julian as in the epistolary poem to his honoured friend Nemesius. Hence, in neither case is it to be assumed that Gregory attempted to refute the actual religious persuasion of the addressee (35).

---

pp.103-111 only comments on §§4-6 (with interesting parallel passages), but for Gregory's theoretical stance, §§3 and 7 are most relevant.

(34) Cf. Bartelink, *Antieke cultuur* pp.62-63, and Coman pp.714-716. Stählin p.778 is putting things in too general a way when he posits that myths functioned merely as τερπνόν or as προγύμνασμα for the Greeks. Julian for one wanted to rehabilitate - even though through allegorical explanation - the Homeric myths, and defended them against the assaults of the Cynics.

(35) Besides, the question arises as to whether and how far Gregory was acquainted with Julian's religious-philosophical opinions and writings. Asmus p.363 sees direct traces of the school law and of the *Misopogon* in the invectives; Bernardi *SC 309* pp.46-50, thinks that Gregory had no knowledge of Julian's writings or ideas; Criscuolo, *Gregorio e Giuliano* p.205, assumes that he must have read the most important texts.

3. The expressed criticism is *far from original*: nearly all of it can be traced back to the second-century Apologists, and quite a lot is already present in Greek and Jewish tradition (also in the books of wisdom of the Septuagint).
4. Virtually *all traditional criticisms* are resumed in the above texts (36); I treat them according to three aspects: theology, ethics and historicity.

A. Myths and theological truth

Gregory's essential objection to mythology is that it does not give a true image of the deity. I first discuss his vision on myths as theological stories; after that, I deal with his opinion on origin and nature of the pagan gods, and the role of myths in this.

1) *Criticism to the stories of the theologian-poets*

In antiquity, it was generally believed that myths were originally proclaimed by poets (37). Thus, also Gregory can level his criticism against the « theologians » Homer, Hesiod, Orpheus, Musaeus and Linus, οἳ ῥα παλαιοτάτῃσιν ἐπικλέες εἰσὶν ἀοιδαῖς (38). His argumentation against their stories and theological enunciations - which he facetiously represents in a distorted way (39) - is twofold (40):

---

(36) Horstmann, pp.10-11, provides a brief and lucid survey of the points of criticism on the Greek myths most formulated in early Christianity. All of these points might be illustrated with verses from II,2,7.

(37) Cf. Dörrie, *Sinn* pp.7-8.

(38) II,2,7, v.244 (*PG* 37,1570); see also or.4,115-116 (*PG* 35,653A), βίβλους ἀνελίξεις θεολογικάς τε καὶ ἠθικάς, including, with regard to the first aspect, a mention of Hesiod's *Theogony*, Orpheus and Homer.

(39) See e.g. a quotation which he ascribes to Orpheus:

« Ζεῦ κύδιστε, μέγιστε θεῶν, εἰλυμένε κόπρῳ
ὅσῃ τε μηλείῃ, ὅσῃ τε ἵππων, ὅσῃ τε ἡμιόνων, » ἵν' ἐντεῦθεν, οἶμαι, δειχθῇ τὸ ζῳογόνον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ φερέσβιον (or.4.115. *PG* 35,653B).

Philostratus (*Her*.25,8 de lannoy) ascribes the verses to Pamphos, and explains ὅτι Ζεὺς εἴη τὸ ζῳογονοῦν.... Gregory is the only Christian author who uses these remarkable verses in the controversy against paganism (Wyss, *RLAC* p.814-815).

(40) II,2,7, vv.130-169; or.4.117-118: or.39,3. Gregory himself speaks of a λόγος ἀμφίδετος (vv.160-161), and in or.4 as well as in or.39, the argumentation is divided into εἰ μὲν ἀληθῆ... εἰ δὲ ψευδῆ... Hence, in my opinion, Kurmann pp.396-402 is wrong when he distinguishes *three* attitudes towards the myth: the last two are subdivisions of the second possibility.

εἰ μὲν ἀληθῆ = εἰ μὴ μῦθος

At least in theory, Gregory does not rule out the possibility that the poets' stories are true, i.e., that they comply with historical reality. In that case, the Hellenes should demonstrate that the stories are not shameful rather than extenuate them as « myths » (41), – or, as is suggested to Nemesius, observe with embarrassment that they have been dispelled by the coming of Christ (42).

εἰ δὲ ψευδῆ = εἰ μῦθοι

Considering that the stories about the gods are μῦθοι (fictitious stories) for most Hellenes, he addresses the γυμνοὺς θεολόγους (43). Within this hypothesis, he distinguishes two possibilities, derived from these theologians, which correspond with the possible relations between μῦθος and ἀλήθεια indicated on p.214: either, the myths are sheer inventions, or a deeper and ineffable truth is hidden behind them.

In the first case, the myths are ἄεισμα κενόν, and only obey poetic patterns: μέτρον and μῦθος are ways to arrive at τὸ τερπνόν, without any concern about the truth (44). In this assumption, Gregory does not understand why so much money is spent on the worship of fictitious gods, and why these poets are admired instead of being condemned for blasphemy (45).

---

(41) Or.4.117 (*PG* 35,656C): εἰ μὲν ἀληθῆ, μήτ' αἰσχυνέσθωσαν καὶ φιλοτιμείσθωσαν ἢ ὅτι μὴ αἰσχρὰ πειθέτωσαν. Καὶ τί δεῖ καταφεύγειν αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὸν μῦθον ὡς τῆς ἀσχημοσύνης συγκάλυμμα; Οὐ γὰρ θαρρούντων, ἀλλ' ὑποχωρούντων ἐστὶν ὁ μῦθος.

(42) II,2,7, vv.165-169 (*PG* 37,1564): Εἰ μὴ μῦθος, ἔφελκε τεοῖς φαέεσσι καλύπτρην, (...) / Ταῦτα μὲν ἐς πόντοιο πέσῃ βυθὸν, ὥσπερ ὄλωλε / Μοίρη πλειοτέρη. Χριστὸς γὰρ ἅπαντα κατέσχεν. In the last verses, Gregory seems to allude to the exorcism of impure spirits out of the Gerasene demoniac (cf. Mark 5,13).

(43) Or.4.117. Compare II,2,7, v.130 (*PG* 37,1561): Εἰ δ', ὡς θειολόγοισιν ἐφεύαδεν ὑμετέροισιν.... The « naked theologians » are those Hellenes who try to discover the « naked truth » about the deity behind the myths, or apart from these (thus e.g. or.28,4).

(44) Or.4.118 (*PG* 35,657A): ποιητῶν (...) πλάσματα καὶ ληρήματα δύο τούτοις προσχρωμένων εἰς τὸ τερπνὸν τῆς ποιήσεως, μέτρῳ καὶ μύθῳ.
II,2,7, vv.132-133 (*PG* 37,1561): ἄεισμα κενόν, καὶ θεσμὸς ἀοιδῆς / Τερπνῆς, μιγνυμένου μέτρου σὺν παίστορι μύθῳ.
See also or.2,104 (*PG* 35,504C), in which – in opposition to the biblical stories – it is posited explicitly that in the Greek myths there is hardly any concern about the truth (τῆς ἀληθείας ὀλίγα φροντίζοντες) and that they are only oriented towards enchantment (ψυχαγωγίας ἕνεκα τῶν ἀκουόντων ... ἀκοὴν καὶ ψυχὴν γοητεύουσιν). Compare to Basil's Πρὸς τοὺς νέους §4 (BOULENGER) καὶ μάλισθ' ὅταν ψυχαγωγίας ἕνεκα τῶν ἀκουόντων λογοποιῶσι.

In the second case, there are two aspects to the μῦθος: the poetic σκεπάσματα, intended for a wide audience, and an ἀπορρητότερον καὶ βαθύτερον νοῦν, διαβατὸν ὀλίγοις τῶν σοφωτέρων (46), to be revealed through allegorical explanation (Gregory speaks of ἀλληγόρημα, θεωρία or ὑπόνοια (47)). He dismisses this vision on the Greek myth by means of two arguments in particular (48): the « frame » is pernicious and the « true significance » is improbable and incoherent (49). There is no actual connection between *signifiant* (τὸ προβεβλημένον) and *signifié* (τὸ νοούμενον); this criticism actually does not condemn the allegorical method as such, but rejects the wrong manner in which pagan « theologians » make use of it (50).

In the epistolary poem to Nemesius, the criticism is formulated as follows:

130 Εἰ δ', ὡς θεολόγοισιν ἐφεύαδεν ὑμετέροισιν,
(...)
134 Αὐτοῖς δ' αὖ νόος ἐστὶν ὑφειμένος εἴδεϊ μάχλῳ
Σεμνότερος, πινυτοῖσιν ὁρώμενος, ἀμφιπρόσωπος,
Ἑρμᾶς δίγλυφος οἷα πρόσω τὸ μέν, ἄλλο δ' ὄπισθεν,
Ἄθρει κἀνθάδε μοι λόγον ἄτροπον, ὥσπερ ὀΐω·

---

(45) Or.4,117-118: II,2,7, vv.162-164.

(46) Or.4,118 (*PG* 35,657A).

(47) Respectively or.4,115 (ἀλληγορήματα καὶ τερατεύματα), or.4,117 (θεωρίας ὑπερνεφοῦς) and or.31,16 (μῦθοι καὶ ὑπόνοιαί τινες). In Gregory, the last term occurs most often; it is chronologically also the first Greek term to indicate the allegorical interpretation (PÉPIN, *Mythe* pp.85-87).

(48) The *motive* to go over to allegorical explanation is not very pure either: τὸ αἰσχρὸν τοῦ λόγου διαδιδράσκοντες (or.31,16, *PG* 36,152A): it is a « flight forward », to preserve the Greek myth as a theological narration.

(49) Ὑμῖν δὲ οὔτε τὸ νοούμενον ἀξιόπιστον καὶ τὸ προβεβλημένον ὀλέθριον (or.4,119, *PG* 35,657C). Shortly before, he ridicules a physical-allegorical explanation (of Stoic origin?) which sees τὴν ξηρὰν φύσιν καὶ τὴν ὑγράν in respectively Oceanus and Tethys (or.4,116; cf. KURMANN p.393). In or.31,16, he argues that the allegorical explanation can impossibly be sustained consistently.

(50) In this way, Gregory can defend the allegorical explanation of the Scripture (cf. infra chapter four), without pronouncing contradictory judgements on the technique itself. PÉPIN, *Mythe* pp.466-474 and MASSON-VINCOURT pp.95-103 seem to devote little attention to this in their discussion of Gregory's criticism of the allegorical explanation of myths (which they call « paradoxical » because of his defence of the allegorical explanation of the Scripture). In this whole controversy, which implies a defence of the own allegorism, and a rejection of that of the opponent, Origen and Celsus had already been engaged.

(...)
148 Τίς Σκύλλης σκοπέλους σε διεκπλώοντα κελεύει
Σπεύδειν εἰς Ἰθάκην, μή πως πάρος ἐνθάδ' ὄληαι;
Τίς δ' ὀλοήν σε Χάρυβδιν ἀπηνέα; τίς δ' ἐπὶ πηγὴν
Τῆς καθαρῆς θεότητος, ἐν ἰλύϊ δηθύνοντα;
Ἰλὺς πρόσθ' ἐπέδησε, τὸ δ' ἔκφυγεν ἀγλαὸν ὕδωρ.
(...)
157 Εἰ δὲ θεοὺς στήσειας ἀτασθαλίης μεδέοντας,
Πρὶν μύθου δνοφεροῖο λῦσαι ζόφον ἔμφρονι μύθω,
Μυθόλατριν διέπερσας ἐπισπόμενον φαέεσσιν.

But if there is, as your theologians like to posit,
(...)
a worthier meaning hidden for themselves behind this voluptuous form,
amenable to sharp minds, with a double sense,
like a herm sculptured on two sides, on the front this way, at the back that way:
then look here, at my - so I think - irrefutable reasoning:
(... defence of the allegorical explanation of the Scripture, cf. infra ...)
who compels you to sail past Scylla's cliffs
on your journey to Ithaca? You might die before your arrival.
Who sends you past the murderous, rough Charybdis? Who forces you,
on the way to the source of the pure deity, to linger in the mud?
The mire constrains you beforehand, while the shining water escapes you. (...)
If then you establish gods who are patrons of depravity,
you may dispel the darkness of the obscure myths with smart talk:
you have in advance corrupted the worshipper of myths, who goes by what he sees (51).

Of course, it is remarkable that it is precisely in this passage that Gregory allegorically employs the Scylla and Charybdis episode from the Odyssey, to challenge the legitimacy of the allegorical explanation of myths (52). Yet, this is only paradoxical on the face of it: Gregory does not use the mythological allegory as the covering of enunciations about the deity, and *that* is what the texts are about. Moreover, an allegorical use does not necessarily imply an allegorical interpretation; I come back to this in the last chapter.

---

(51) II,2,7, vv.130-159 (*PG* 37,1561-3).

(52) Masson-Vincourt pp.206-207 completely misinterprets the vv.148-150: she translates « Qui t'empêche (as if it ran κωλύει instead of κελεύει) d'échapper aux rochers de Scylla, et de te presser vers Ithaque, afin que tu échappes à la mort? », and thinks that Odysseus is a symbol here for « le chrétien en marche vers sa patrie céleste. » Conversely, he is a symbol here for the pagan theologian who takes a dangerous and unnecessary detour on his way to the true image of god, by choosing a delusive allegorical presentation through myths. In the following verses, Gregory uses a second image to express the same thought: a path through mire

In conclusion, the entire twofold criticism of Homeric mythology and the pagan theologians' approach to it can be summarized by Gregory's own words:

> Ἃ γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῆ προσκυνοῦσιν, ὡς μυθικὰ συγκαλύπτουσιν· δέον, εἰ μὲν ἀληθῆ, μὴ μύθους ὀνομάζεσθαι, ἀλλ' ὅτι μὴ αἰσχρὰ δείκνυσθαι· εἰ δὲ ψευδῆ, μὴ θαυμάζεσθαι, μηδ' οὕτως ἰταμῶς ἐναντιωτάτας ἔχειν δόξας περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πράγματος.
> *For what they worship as true, they veil as mythical. But if these things are true, they ought not to be called myths, but to be proved not to be shameful; and if they are false, they ought not to be objects of wonder; nor ought people so inconsiderately to hold the most contrary opinions about the same thing* (53).

Do the works of the mythical poets contain no metaphysical truth at all, then? In a way, they do, and sometimes they even come quite near this truth, Gregory admits,

> Οὐ Θεόθεν, Βίβλων δὲ παρακλέψαντες ἐμεῖο.
> *not by divine providence, but by coming to steal from my Bible books* (54).

---

leading to the pure source. (An allusion to the torture of Tantalus, as Pyykkö p.135 detects in v.152, seems quite improbable; the fact that she treats this whole passage - of which she gives hardly any explanation - within the part dealing with » Die Mythen aus heilsgeschichtlicher Sicht «, and not in the one dealing with the allegorical explanation of myths, might point to the same faulty interpretation in her case.) The danger that the eventual destination is not reached is made explicit in vv.157-159. In order to support this interpretation, I refer to or.4.119 (*PG* 35,657C-D), in which Gregory employs the same images (without allusion to the Odyssey) in the same argumentation: Καὶ τίς ἡ σύνεσις διὰ βορβόρου πρὸς πόλιν ἄγειν ἢ διὰ προβόλων τε καὶ ὑφάλων εἰς ὅρμον ἐπείγεσθαι; Τί γὰρ ἐκ τούτου συμβήσεται καὶ τί τῶν λόγων τὸ πέρας; Σὺ μὲν ληρήσεις καὶ ἀλληγορήσεις τὰς σὰς ἀτυχίας ἢ φαντασίας, ὁ δὲ πειθόμενος οὐκ ἔσται· τὸ γὰρ ὁρώμενον πιθανώτερον. Οὔτε οὖν τὸν ἀκροατὴν ὤνησας καὶ τὸν θεατὴν ἀπώλεσας μετὰ τοῦ φαινομένου γενόμενον.

(53) Or.39,3 (*PG* 36,337A, translation Browne-Swallow p.352).

(54) II,2,7, v.249 (*PG* 37,1570). (Gregory goes against the Apologists' opinion here that the pagan pieces of truth were also owing to divine inspiration - along with derivation from the Bible and use of the universal

2) *Origin and nature of the mythological gods*

The principal criticism of paganism in the Jewish-Christian tradition is that the Hellenes worship creatures, not the creator. This criticism has been formulated quite sharply in the Bible, for instance in some psalms and clearly in the Hellenistic Σοφία Σαλωμῶνος (especially Sap 13-15). This basic criticism also emerges from the fact that Gregory frequently aligns the worship of mythological gods with the veneration of animals, celestial bodies, or elements of nature (55). He has different (traditional) theories about the pagan gods, which are not always clearly distinguished; I give a brief summary of these according to the increasing degree of reality ascribed to the gods (56):

1. They are *the work of human hands*. The gods are identified with their material portrayal, behind which no reality is hidden. The persons who put this idolatry into practice are addressed by Gregory as λάτριες εἰδώλων κενεόφρονες, and elsewhere, he calls them εἰς εἴδωλα κατενεχθέντας καὶ τέχνης ἔργα, καὶ χειρῶν πλάσματα (57). The myth woven around these εἴδωλα plays a pernicious role:

> Καὶ Σάραπις, ξύλον αὖον, ἔχων δηλήμονα μῦθον,
> *and Sarapis is a piece of dry wood, but with a pernicious myth* (58).

2. They are *deified passions*: the gods as projections. For this, see infra under B. Myths and ethical truth. Gregory frequently combines this theory with the preceding one.

λόγος, cf. n.1.) A concrete example of a derivation in or.43,23 (*PG* 36,528B-C): the Greeks situated Minos and Rhadamanthys in the Elysian Fields, ἐν φαντασίᾳ τοῦ καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς παραδείσου γενόμενοι ἐκ τῶν Μωσαϊκῶν, οἶμαι, βίβλων καὶ ἡμετέρων, εἰ καὶ περὶ τὴν κλῆσίν τι διηνέχθησαν, ἐν ἄλλοις ὀνόμασι τοῦτο παραδηλώσαντες.

(55) E.g. II,2,7, vv.51-68 and or.28,14. Compare Sap 13,1-3.

(56) In or.28,14-15, we find Gregory's most systematic treatment of the subject. Clement of Alexandria distinguishes seven forms of deceptive creation of gods (*Protr.* II,26), most of which are taken up in Gregory as well.

(57) Respectively II,2,7, v.91 (*PG* 37,1558) and or.39,6 (*PG* 36,341A). Similar judgements in I,2,10, vv.196-197 (*PG* 37,694: στήλας τ᾽ ἔθεντο τῆς ἀνοίας ἀξίας / ἱδρύμαθ᾽ ὕλης καὶ χερὸς ποιήματα); II,2,7, vv.69-71. Compare Sap 13,10 and 13.

(58) II,2,7, v.270 (*PG* 37,1572; in the following verse, Apis is described as a fat cow). Compare or.34,5 (*PG* 36,245A): ξύλον προσκυνούμενον μετὰ μύθου.

3. They are *deified human beings.* This theory, in keeping with euhemerism and palaephatism (59), is most clearly phrased by the following passage from the second theological oration; the role of myths in this deification is also indicated:

> Εἰσὶ δὲ οἳ καὶ εἰκόνας καὶ πλάσματα (sc. ἐσεβάσθησαν), πρῶτα μὲν τῶν οἰκείων, (...) ἔπειτα καὶ τῶν ξένων, οἱ μετ᾽ ἐκείνους καὶ μακρὰν ἀπ᾽ ἐκείνων, ἀγνοίᾳ τῆς πρώτης φύσεως, καὶ ἀκολουθίᾳ τῆς παραδοθείσης τιμῆς, ὡς ἐννόμου καὶ ἀναγκαίας, ἐπειδὴ χρόνῳ τὸ ἔθος βεβαιωθὲν ἐνομίσθη νόμος. Οἶμαι δὲ καὶ δυναστείαν τινὲς θεραπεύοντες, καὶ ῥώμην ἐπαινέσαντες, καὶ κάλλος θαυμάσαντες, θεὸν ἐποίησαν τῷ χρόνῳ τὸν τιμώμενον, προσλαβόμενοί τινα καὶ μῦθον τῆς ἐξαπάτης ἐπίκουρον.
>
> *There are yet others, who have paid divine reverence to pictures and statues. At first these were of their kin (...). Later they were of strangers too. Men remote from these strangers in time and space and ignorant of the primal nature, followed the traditional rule of honoring them. They took that honoring for right and essential, when the practice had been hardened by time into an established law. Flatterers of power too, surely, who praised and admired physical strength and beauty, in course of time made a god of the man honored, fastening on some tale to aid the deception* (60).

4. They are *real, angry demons,* whom the Greeks wrongly consider as gods (61). In this way, the pagan « gods » acquire a real

---

(59) After Euhemerus of Messene (340-260 B.C.), author of the Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή (cf. DE BLOCK and VAN DER MEER, according to whom Euhemerus should be counted among the Peripatetics), and Palaephatus (fourth century B.C.?), author of a Περὶ ἀπίστων, probably also an Aristotelian. Both reduced the myths to tall stories about people of old, in Euhemerus about historical rulers, in Palaephatus about ordinary people with a peculiar trait or who had gone through a remarkable experience (cf. HÖRLING pp.28-34, with references to further literature on both, related theories). Nowhere in his œuvre does Gregory mention either of these authors.

(60) Or.28,14 (*PG* 36,44C-45A, translation Wickham-Williams in NORRIS, *faith* p.232). The last mentioned deification of rulers and « Übermenschen » most resembles euhemerism. Related enunciations about the role of myths in this: II,2,7, vv.286-290 (*PG* 37,1573: Heracles, Empedotimus, Trophonius and Aristaeus are shown up as θνητοί, καὶ οὐ μάκαρες, (...) μύθοις ἡμεδαποῖσι νόθον κλέος ἁρπάξαντες); I,1,9, vv.15-18 (*PG* 37,458: θανόντων μορφάς, ἃς ἐτύπωσε πόθος, καὶ μῦθος ἔτισε); or.25,2; or.43,3. In the beginning of the quoted passage from or.28, Gregory extends this theory to recent « deifications » of relatives. In this, he fits in closer with Sap 14,15-17. Compare for the mythical worship of ancestors also I,2,26, vv.19-20 (*PG* 37,852: οἱ προπάλαιοι νεκροί, καὶ μύθων πλάσματα, καὶ γραΐδες); or.25,3; or.33,12.

(61) Cf. *Acta Bartholom.*6 (the pagan « gods » speak): προσκυνούμεθα ὑπ᾽ αὐτῶν ὡς θεοί· ἀλλ᾽ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἐσμὲν δαίμονες (quoted in *PGL*, s.v. δαίμων). Compare Ps 95,5: ὅτι πάντες οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν δαιμόνια.

existence (62), and obtain a place within Christian soteriology and demonology.

Gregory ascribes this mistake of the Hellenes to a trick of the jealous demon, who took advantage of their natural search for the deity to usurp their worship. It is the same demon who was envious of man's possession of Eden, after he himself was overthrown:

> Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν παιζέτωσαν Ἑλλήνων παῖδες, καὶ δαίμονες, παρ' ὧν ἐκείνοις ἡ ἄνοια, τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ τιμὴν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς μεθελκόντων, καὶ ἄλλους ἄλλως κατατεμνόντων εἰς αἰσχρὰς δόξας καὶ φαντασίας, ἀφ' οὗ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς ἐκβαλόντες ἡμᾶς, (...). Οὐ γὰρ ἔφερον, φύσις ὄντες φθονερὰ καὶ μισάνθρωπος, μᾶλλον δὲ διὰ τὴν ἑαυτῶν κακίαν γενόμενοι, τοὺς κάτω τῶν ἄνω τυχεῖν, αὐτοὶ πεσόντες ἐπὶ γῆς ἄνωθεν.
>
> *Well, let these things be the amusement of the children of the Greeks and of the demons to whom their folly is due, who turn aside the honour of God to themselves, and divide men in various ways in pursuit of shameful thoughts and fancies, ever since they drove us away from the Tree of Life, (...). For, being of a nature envious and man-hating, or rather having become so by their own wickedness, they could neither endure that we who were below should attain to that which is above, having themselves fallen from above upon the earth* (63).

In the epistolary poem to Nemesius, Gregory points to the pagan mistake of distinguishing between good and evil demons, whereas actually, they are all evil (64). Yet the central message of the poem is that these demons are now, after a long period of dominion, exorcized by the coming of Christ (65).

---

(62) Cf. HORSTMANN p.10 for parallels in early Christian literature; KENNEDY, *Rhetoric* p.208 about Athanasius; MASSON-VINCOURT p.245 about Gregory.

(63) Or.39,7 (*PG* 36,341B, translation BROWNE-SWALLOW p.354); compare or.28,15 (*PG* 36,45C: τοῦ πονηροῦ τὸ σόφισμα, τῷ καλῷ καταχρησαμένου πρὸς τὸ κακόν). Usually, Gregory uses the singular form to speak of the fallen angels, and only names Ἑωσφόρος, their « leader », e.g. or.38,9; see also BARTELINK, *nomina mille* p.294.

(64) II,2,7, vv.71-74 (*PG* 37,1556: κακούς τ' ἀγαθούς τ' ἐκάλεσσας. / Οἳ πάντες τελέθουσι κακοί, καὶ πλάσματος ἐσθλοῦ / Δυσμενέες, φθονεροί,...).

(65) II,2,7, vv.75-79 (*PG* 37,1556-7: Οὓς Χριστός, [...] ὦσεν ὀπίσσω, δηρόν δὴ κρατέοντας ἐπὶ χθόνα); the same demon is exorcized by Gregory himself by means of Christ's name or of a sign of the cross: vv.80-84. The same triumphal song recurs in vv.252-280, in which the pagan gods and oracles are summoned to admit their defeat. Gregory has Apollo prophesying his own ruin in a last oracular saying: Φοῖβος μαντεύοιτο θεῶν μόρον οὐκέτ' ἐόντων· / « Αὐτοπάτωρ, ἀλόχευτος, ἀμήτωρ ἐστὶν ἐκεῖνος, /

Thus, the pagan « gods » do positively represent a certain kind of reality for Gregory (66); the fact that the stories about them contain no theological truth has less to do with a non-correspondence to reality (see also his twofold criticism of myths, which took the factor of possible veracity into account), than with a wrong interpretation of this reality. The incorrect image of god represented by the myths is the work of the deceiver. In Gregory's eyes, the myths about the Homeric gods were probably « des fables inconsistantes (...), développées autour de figures réelles peut-être, mais qui ne sont qu'hommes, lamentablement, ou démons » (67).

B. Myths and ethical truth

One of the most repeated points of criticism in Christian apologetics, and also in Gregory, is the immorality of Greek mythology. This is in line with the criticism of such Greeks as Heraclitus, Xenophanes and Plato, as Gregory actually indicates, without mentioning any names (68).

In the first ψόγος against Julian, he ridicules, along with the theological aspect, the ethics of the myths about the Olympian gods: Τί δ' ἂν εἴποις περὶ τοῦ ἠθικοῦ μέρους αὐτῶν (69). Concerning four important moral values (ὁμόνοια, γονέων αἰδώς, χρημάτων ὑπεροψία, σωφροσύνη / ἐγκράτεια), he accuses the pagan gods of solely giving counter examples, instead of inciting to follow the

---

Ὅστις ἐμὸν διέπερσε κακὸν μένος, » ὕστατ' ἀείδων· (vv.253-255, *PG* 37,1571); cf. CAMERON for parallels in Lactantius and Nonnus, *Dion.*, and WYSS, *RLAC* p.855, in Porphyry; COMAN pp.718-723 refers to passages in Arnobius and Lactantius where pagan gods place themselves in the service of the true God. Compare also or.5,31-32.

(66) Gregory also seems to look upon the pagan underworld as real in I,2,14, vv.102-108 (*PG* 37,763): he complains that the horrendous Tartarus and Pyriphlegethon completely fail to impress the criminal: μῦθος ἅπαντα κακοῖσι. Cf. supra p.214 for the quotation from or.5,38, in which he offered no opinion on the possible reality of this pagan underworld.

(67) SIMON p.37-38, on the ancient gods in « la pensée chrétienne » in general. To my mind, COMAN p.714 wrongly deduces from II,2,7, v.88 (οὐδὲν ἐόντων) that Gregory's criticism comes down to: « les dieux n'existent pas. » In fact, it concerns gods « who are (worth) nothing » (compare II,1,32, v.10, *PG* 37,1301: Ἄνθρωποι θνητοί, ῥοιῆς γένος, οὐδὲν ἐόντες).

(68) Or.31,16 (*PG* 36,149C): Οἵ τε παρ' Ἑλλήνων σεβόμενοι θεοί τε καὶ δαίμονες, ὡς αὐτοὶ λέγουσιν, οὐδὲν ἡμῶν δέονται κατηγόρων, ἀλλὰ τοῖς σφῶν αὐτῶν ἁλίσκονται θεολόγοις, ὡς μὲν ἐμπαθεῖς, ὡς δὲ στασιώδεις, ὅσων δὲ κακῶν γέμοντες καὶ μεταβολῶν.

(69) Or.4,120, quoted more extensively supra p.79.

path of the respective virtues. In his opinion, the wrong image of god is – again – the most deplorable fact:

> Τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ δεινότατον ὅτι ἃ τοῖς νόμοις κολάζεται, ταῦτα ὡς θεῖα σέβεται.
> *For this is certainly the very worst: what is punished by the laws is worshipped as typical of the gods* (70).

Gregory repeatedly accuses the Greeks who have *consciously* deified certain passions, and invented certain myths, so as to have a « divine excuse » for their own impurity. This accusation seems original:

> παθέεσσιν
> Ἄλκαρ ἑοῖς μήσασθε θεοὺς στήσασθαι ἀλιτρούς,
> Ψεύστας, ἀνδροφόνους, σκολιούς, ἐπίορκον ὀμοῦντας,
> Ἅρπαγας, ἀνδρογύνους, μοιχούς, ἐπιβήτορας ἀνδρῶν.
> (...)
> Ὡς μὴ μοῦνον ἄτιτον ἅπαν κακόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐσθλὸν
> Ἔμμεναι, ὡς ῥα Θεῷ κεχαρισμένον, ὅς τόδ' ἔτισε.
> *In support of your own passions*
> *you have had the idea to create perverted gods,*
> *liars, murderers, crooks, perjurers,*
> *thieves, hermaphrodites, adulterers, mounters of men.*
> (... the series of metamorphoses of Zeus follows ...)
> *so that each crime would be not only unpunished, but even praiseworthy,*
> *since agreeable to the god who made it honourable* (71).

Not all myths are immoral in Gregory's eyes: in the poem περὶ ἀρετῆς he successively calls the scene of Odysseus' meeting with Nausicaa τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐγκώμιον, and praises the μῦθος about Midas (72). Of course, that he can actually approve of this last history, despite its major character being a prey to passion as well, is due to the fact that Midas is not a god or a demigod. In the judgement of the ethical significance of a μῦθος, the theological value is crucial; the myths featuring gods are assessed much more harshly than those centred on human beings.

---

(70) Or.4,120 (*PG* 35,660C).

(71) II,2,7, vv.91-102 (*PG* 37,1558). Highly similar (with three identical verses) I,2,2, vv.495-502; I,2,10, vv.829-858 (Ὧν γὰρ σεβάσματ᾽ ἐστὶν ἐμπαθέστατα, / τούτοις τὸ πάσχειν δηλαδὴ καὶ τίμιον [vv.829-830, *PG* 37,739]); or.39,7 (*PG* 36,341C: ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ θεοὺς στήσασθαι συνηγόρους τοῖς πάθεσιν, ἵνα μὴ μόνον ἀνεύθυνον τὸ ἁμαρτάνειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ θεῖον νομίζηται); the same thought in or.14,29, or.28,15 and or.41,1.
For the invention of myths as a safeguard, see I,2,10, v.195 (*PG* 37,694): μύθους τ᾽ ἀνεῦρον τῶν παθῶν συνηγόρους; compare or.27,5.

(72) I,2,10, vv.401-411. In a remarkable passage, he puts the appreciation of the Odyssey into the mouth of Homer himself, as an apology for a verse which Gregory wrongly ascribes to him (v.398 = Hesiod. *Erga* 313).

C. Myths and historical truth

As pointed out, μῦθος is a fictitious story, and hence excludes historicity: εἰ μὲν ἀληθῆ expresses exactly the same as εἰ μὴ μῦθος, and εἰ δὲ ψευδῆ as εἰ μῦθοι. Yet the question arises as to how important this fictional nature is in Gregory's judgement of Greek mythology.

First of all, it should be noted that Gregory does not always call the Greek myths (*traditional stories in which gods or legendary heroes take action*) merely μύθους, and hence does not always consider them as non-historical. We saw that, in his criticism on the theologian-poets, he allows the possibility that they are ἀληθῆ (historically, not theologically true). Moreover, in his theories on the origin and nature of the pagan gods, he appeared to take into account a historical basis of the myths (euhemerism) or an (ontological) reality of the gods, as demons. From some casual remarks too, it can be deduced that Gregory wants to leave the historicity of myths unresolved, thus for example in an attack on the history of Iphigenia:

> Σὺ δέ μοι λέγε (...) ὁ τοὺς μύθους θαυμάζων καὶ τὴν ἀντιδοθεῖσαν ἔλαφον τῆς παρθένου, εἴ τι τοσοῦτον εἰς φιλοτιμίαν ἔστι σοι, κἂν δῶμεν μὴ μῦθον εἶναι τὸ ἱστορούμενον. Ὡς τά γε ἑξῆς τοῦ λόγου καὶ λίαν αἰσχρά.
> *But do you tell me (...), you, who marvel at fables and the hind substituted for the maiden, if you wish to present any such tale in emulation and if we grant that this story is not mythical. As for what follows in the story, how extremely shameful it is!* (73).

Of course, we can assume that for Gregory, the fictional nature of most myths is an established fact, and he observes that most pagan theologians hold the same opinion. Yet, in his twofold criticism of myths, as also in the above judgement of the Iphigenia-episode, he emphasizes that the myth, *historical or not*, is scandalous. This, I think, points to the fact that the fictional nature is actually no point of criticism for him (74). This also appears from his treatment of the allegorical explanation of myths: he denounces not so much the fact itself that a fictitious story is used as the carrier of a deeper meaning (75), but rather the fact that this fictitious presentation is effected in a pernicious way. The actual criticism is directed at the theological untruth, the wrong image of God, rather than at the historical untruth.

---

(73) Or.43,8 (*PG* 36.504B, translation McCauley p.33).

3.3 The mythological exemplum

It is clear that Gregory's explicit judgement of Greek mythology (especially of the myths with gods as central characters) is plainly negative. On the other hand, the mythological exempla in his poems are relatively numerous. Below, I have confronted the results of the rhetorical analysis of these mythological exempla with Gregory's theoretical position. A specific discussion of the relation between hermeneutic point of departure and metaphorical-exemplary incorporation follows in the last chapter.

From the study of the correlation between **subject matter and function**, it is apparent that Gregory attaches least credibility to mythology (in the division historical-fictitious as well as biblical-pagan, the mythological subject matter is least appreciated). When he gives it an *evidential* function, it is nearly always in the form of an inductive exemplum as part of an explicit treatment of mythology. (Most of the mythological material occurs in the texts discussed above.) Only a small minority (21) of the mythological exempla function as a *model*, ten of which are quoted ἀπ᾽ ἐναντίου. In any case, nowhere is one of the Olympian gods quoted as a model (not even in the negative sense); usually Gregory uses as model mythological episodes in which the pagan gods are absent (76). The greater part of the mythological exempla have an *ornamental* function.

---

(74) Cf. SIMON p.34: « Pour la plupart des exégètes chrétiens allégorisants de la mythologie, le problème de la réalité historique des figures divines n'est point capital. » The fact that Gregory allegorically employs mythology already emerged from the way in which he formulates his criticism of the pagan allegorical explanation of myths in II,2,7, vv.130-159 (p.221).

(75) An exception should perhaps be made for the expression in or.39.3 (cf. p.222): εἰ δὲ ψευδῆ, μὴ θαυμάζεσθαι.

(76) E.g. Achilles' wrath, Odysseus and the Sirens, the Alpheus, Niobe's grief. The one exception is II,2,7, vv.103-105, yet in these verses, Pan and Dionysus' ithyphallic thiasus are mockingly used as examples.

As for **elaboration**, it appears that mythological exempla of all types occur least frequently as *narration*, and most frequently as *allusion*. From this observation as well, I established a certain reticence in the incorporation of this material.

The observations about the **insertion** run parallel to this: the mythological exempla constitute more than half of the total number of *non-inserted* exempla (the lexical allusions and contaminations).

The combination of theoretical rejection and exemplary incorporation is thus less paradoxical than it may seem. In general, Gregory proceeds with caution in dealing with the mythological material for paradigmata. This goes especially for the kind of myths towards which his attitude is most severe: those with false gods as major characters. As a matter of fact, these are quite numerous in Gregory's œuvre, but they occur specifically in the explicit treatments, and hence not as exempla. If they are at all quoted in the exemplary mode, it is either as an inductive exemplum (thus, in an explicit, negative treatment), or through a lexical allusion (77).

By way of conclusion, and because I deal exclusively with metaphorical exempla in the last chapter, I quote a passage containing mythological exempla with evidential function here, which is significant with regard to Gregory's hermeneutic point of view. It is a fragment from the epistolary poem of the elder Nicobulus to his son. As evidence of the value of the μῦθοι (field of meaning 1: force of the word), Gregory quotes some passages from the Odyssey which he interprets allegorically:

Οἶδα δὲ Πομποῦ
Φάρμακον, ὡς λόγος ἦεν, ὃν ἐρχομένῳ μετὰ Κίρκην
Λαρτιάδῃ πόρε δῶρον, ὅπως κε σύεσσιν ἀρήξει
Οἷς ἑτάροις, μηδ᾽αὐτὸς ἔδοι συοθρέμμονα φορβήν.
Μῦθον καὶ Πολύδαμνα κεράσσατο, Θῶνος ἄκοιτις,

---

(77) In the latter case, it is frequently an instance of the transposition of an epithet of an Olympian god onto the Christian God. When Gregory calls God or Christ ἐφέστιος (I,2,2, v.344) or Ξένιος (epg.65, v.1), this probably signifies no more to him than the restoration of an epithet usurped by the demon. Compare John Chrysostom *In epist. ad Titum hom.3* (*PG* 62,677) about Paul's Aratus-quotation (Acts 17,28): Οὐ τὰ περὶ τοῦ Διὸς εἰρημένα εἵλκυσεν εἰς Θεόν, ἀλλὰ τὰ προσήκοντα τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ οὐ γνησίως οὐδὲ κυρίως ἐπιτεθέντα τῷ Διΐ, ταῦτα ἀποδίδωσι τῷ Θεῷ (quoted by PYYKKÖ p.59).

Αἰγυπτίη, δῶκεν δ᾽Ἑλένῃ ξεινήϊον ἐσθλόν,
Νηπενθές τ᾽, ἄχολον τε, κακῶν ἐπίληθον ἁπάντων.
I know that the drug of Hermes (who escorts the souls of the dead)
was the logos. *He gave it as a present to the son of Laertes*
on his way to Circe, in order that he might help his friends,
changed into swine, and avoid eating swine fodder himself.
It was the mythos *as well which the Egyptian Polydamna, Thon's wife,*
mixed; she gave it to Helen as a noble host's gift,
banishing sorrow and anger, causing all evil to be forgotten (78).

This interpretation of μῶλυ and νηπενθές is traditional (79); it proves Gregory's intimacy with the allegorical explanation of Homer, and his openness towards this material, that is to say, as long as no theological aspirations are involved.

---

(78) II.2,5, vv.196-202 (*PG* 37,1535-6). The stories stem from *Od.*10,275-308 (Hermes gives the μῶλυ to Odysseus) and *Od.*4,220-232 (Helen uses the νηπενθές). A third exemplum follows these two: the naked Odysseus who commands respect through his eloquence (quoted supra p.149).

(79) For Hermes' herb (often associated with the λόγος), cf. KAISER pp.209-212 and RAHNER, *Mythen* pp.164-196. This Stoic allegorical explanation seems to go back to Cleanthes, and is followed by e.g. Plutarch, Philostratus, Themistius and Himerius. Apparently, RAHNER does not know Gregory's passage, and wrongly establishes that « Wirklich, in Byzanz ist die seelenheilende Blume im Herbarium getrocknet worden » (p.190). For Helen's concoction, cf. ZEEGERS-VANDER VORST p.272 (in Clement of Alexandria, following the Pythagorian interpretation).

CHAPTER IV

THE BIBLE IN GREGORY

Unlike the mythological material, the biblical subject matter goes back to a specific text, *the* text. On the one hand, this gives fewer problems for the delineation of the material, but on the other, it involves a different type of questions – which are dealt with in the first part of this chapter –: which books did Gregory's Bible consist of? In which text version did he read them? Did he turn to the source for quotations from and exemplary use of the Bible?

The second part comments on Gregory's exegetical position. Without his œuvre having actually been examined in this regard, rather divergent opinions can be found about this subject. Usually, one tries to place him within the so-called opposition between the allegorical exegesis of the Alexandrians (with Origen as figure-head) and the typological exegesis of the Antiochenes. First, I give a rough description of this background, devoting special attention to the terminology used, after which I give a *status quaestionis* of the judgement of Gregory as an exegete. Within the treatment of Gregory's exegesis itself, I comment not only on his explicit enunciations about his hermeneutic viewpoint (which *are* usually quoted), but also on some revealing oblique remarks, and on the terminology he uses.

Finally, I compare this vision of the Scriptures with the overall manner in which he incorporates these as exempla into his writings.

4.1 Repertory: Gregory's Bible

4.1.1 Canon

One of Gregory's Bible poems is a versified canon (80). After a short introduction about the benefit of Bible reading (81), Gregory indicates the purpose of this list: warning against the numerous Apocrypha:

---

(80) I,1,12: Περὶ τῶν γνησίων βιβλίων τῆς θεοπνεύστου Γραφῆς.

(81) Vv.1-5 (cf. infra); according to Palla, *Ordinamento* p.177 an introduction to the whole series of *biblica*.

> Ὄφρα δὲ μὴ ξείνῃσι νόον κλέπτοιο βίβλοισι
> (Πολλαὶ γὰρ τελέθουσι παρέγγραπτοι κακότητες),
> Δέχνυσο τοῦτον ἐμεῖο τὸν ἔγκριτον, ὦ φίλ', ἀριθμόν.
> *Lest your mind be misled with false books*
> *(since numerous are the evil interpolations):*
> *take knowledge here, dear friend, of my canonical series* (⁸²).

The whole of the Old Testament consists of twenty-two books (as many as there are Hebrew letters, I,1,12, vv.28-29); to this, Esther, Judith, Tobit, the Maccabees, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, the Odes and the Psalms of Solomon do not belong (⁸³). With regard to the New Testament, only the book of Revelation is missing, of which the canonicity was contested for a long time. Gregory categorically concludes:

> Πάσας ἔχεις. Εἴ τι δὲ τούτων ἐκτός, οὐκ ἐν γνησίαις.
> *With this you have them all. What falls outside the scope of this does not belong to the genuine ones* (⁸⁴).

In practice, Gregory himself does not keep to this canon. He quotes from or alludes to most of the mentioned books which do not occur in his canon, in the case of the books of Wisdom and of Revelation even with the mention of the name (⁸⁵). Moreover, he devotes an entire oration to the praise of the Maccabees (⁸⁶).

Besides, Gregory also makes use of the actual Apocrypha, of both Old and New Testament, and of traditional facts which do not stem from the canonical books (⁸⁷).

---

(82) I,1,12, vv.6-8 (*PG* 37.472).

(83) Also Susanna and *Bel et Draco* are not mentioned, but can be part of the book of Daniel in Gregory's view. In any case, both texts are used, e.g. in I,2,2, vv.181-183 respectively vv.194-201.

(84) I,1,12, vv.38-39 (*PG* 37.474).

(85) GALLAY, *Bible* p.317: mention of Solomon as author of the book of Wisdom in or.43,23 (not or.42,23, as Gallay reports), and of John's book of Revelation in or.42,9.

(86) Or.15. SINKO, *De laudibus*, shows that Gregory was not only inspired by the (deuterocanonical) second book of the Maccabees (2Mcc 6-7), but also by what he calls Ps.-Flavius Josephus' περὶ αὐτοκράτορος λογισμοῦ, better known as the apocryphal fourth book of the Maccabees.

(87) For the apocryphal tradition about Enoch, cf. supra p.92 n.173; further traces of Old Testament Apocrypha in Gregory's poetry: Isaiah's martyrdom (II,1,14, v.61) and Adam's weeping after his expulsion from paradise (II,1,46, v.40; Cosmas MAI p.438 seems to know this tradition). For the New Testament Apocrypha relating to Peter, see my *apocryphes*; Gregory frequently draws from the *Acta Pauli et Theclae*, especially with regard to Thecla's ordeals (see inventory 3, see also DAGRON, *Thecle* p.56).

4.1.2 Text

Gregory, who did not know Hebrew (88), read the Old Testament in the Greek translation (usually the one of the LXX), which was also considered as inspired. Yet the text which he read is not always the same as in the modern critical editions, and exceptionally he also used Theodotion's translation (89).

With regard to the New Testament as well, we frequently find *variae lectiones* in Gregory which occur in the critical apparatus of Nestle-Aland (90); a number of times he seems to use an unknown version (91), unless it is a matter of mistakes.

4.1.3 Mistakes, distortions, contaminations

Manifest departures from the Bible text are indeed quite frequent in Gregory (92). In certain cases, it is clearly a matter of *confusion or a wrong conception*. Above, some examples of

---

He furthermore mentions both the division of the mission areas among the apostles (or.33,11) and the target groups of the different Gospels (I,1,12, vv.31-33 and the opening lines of I,1,21 and 22).

(88) See II,1.39, vv.82-83: also in the Jewish Bible there are metrical parts, *as he knows from hearsay*. The Hebrew etymology of the word Πάσχα, to which he refers (or.45,10), was generally known, and does not point to any direct knowledge of the language.

(89) In I,1,15, vv.8-9, Gregory gives the Decalogue in the order of the *codex Alexandrinus* (Ex 20,13-15), which diverges from the other LXX-manuscripts. The narration of the story of Susanna in I.2,2, vv.194-201 clearly goes back to the version of Theodotion (especially vv.195-199 = Sus θ 54-9, 22, 52, 45).

(90) Examples from the poems: I,1,18, v.74 (Luke 3,33); I,1,20, v.7 (Matt.8,28); I,1,21, vv.9-10 (Mark 7,26); I,1,27, vv.36-41 (Matt.21,28-32); I,2,25, v.334 (Matt.5,44). With regard to the comprehension of certain allusions, it may be important to devote some attention to this, cf. supra p.185 n.360 for the healing in Bethesda, where the identification is complicated even more by a contamination with the healing at Siloam.

(91) I,1,21, v.17 mentions under the θαύματα κατὰ Μάρκον the cures of the blind and the lame at the cleansing of the temple, but we only know these from Matt.21,14. I,1.25, v.3 gives as one of the παραβολαὶ κατὰ Μάρκον that of the weeds among the wheat, but in the text or the apparatus of Nestle-Aland, this is not included in Mark.

(92) As also in the preceding footnotes, I do not refer to free quotations here, but to « anomalies » in the representation of histories. The free or combined *quotations* are legion of course; along with these, Gregory is sometimes mistaken in the assignment of some quotation or other: thus, in II,1,12, v.514, he names Μιχαίας as author of a text from Haggai (Hgg 2,12-14). Compare with the erroneous assignment of a Hesiod-verse to Homer, supra n.72.

this have already been given: the identification of Herod Antipas and Herod the Great (p.110 n.211), the so-called execution of the messenger of Absalom's death (p.99 n.189), the contamination of different episodes from the history of Jezebel (p.109 n.209). Behind Gregory's account of the conflict between Peter and Paul, there lies a similar mistake (93).

Elsewhere, Gregory seems *consciously to « adapt »* a biblical story to the context, see for example the reason for the condemnation of the three young men (p.182). Thus as well, he mentions Samuel as a model of kind-heartedness and leniency in the poem against anger:

> Αἰνῶ Σαμουήλ, ὅς ποθ' ὕβριν δυσφορῶν,
> Ῥήξαντος αὐτῷ τὴν διπλοΐδα τοῦ Σαούλ,
> Εἶτ' ἀξιωθείς, ὥς γε συγγνώμην ἔχειν,
> Ἀφῆκεν εὐθὺς τῷ λόγῳ τὴν αἰτίαν.
> *I praise Samuel, who once reacted strongly to an insult*
> *(Saul had torn his cloak)*
> *and then, when he was asked pardon,*
> *responded promptly by forgiving the offence* (94).

In fact, Saul tore Samuel's robe only when the latter wanted to leave without granting Saul forgiveness, despite his insistence. Also afterwards, Samuel did not forgive him, but was only prepared to join him when Saul worshipped the Lord, who did not forgive Saul either, for that matter (95). Hence, it is clear that Gregory tells the episode in a somewhat distorted and incomplete manner, so as to make it fit in better with the other examples of leniency (96).

---

(93) I,2,25, vv.222-230 (*PG* 37,829-30). Peter reacts μακροθύμως on Paul's reproach ὡς συντράπεζος οὐ καλῶς ἦν ἔθνεσιν, and this happens ἐν ἄστει τηλικούτῳ. Gregory seems to make a contamination of Gal.2,11-14 (Paul reproaches Peter with his hypocrisy ἔμπροσθεν πάντων, in Antioch; not a word is mentioned about Peter's reaction) and Acts 11,1-3 (in Jerusalem, Peter is reproached for eating with uncircumcised men; he defends himself with convincing arguments). With « in such a big city », Gregory may mean Antioch as well as Jerusalem.
In the poems, I have found no traces of a manifestly wrong comprehension of the text; conversely, from or.40,26 it appears that Gregory wrongly considers Κανδάκης (Acts 8,27) as a nominative, and thus as the name of the Ethiopian eunuch, whereas it is a genitive of the title of the queen of Ethiopia (cf. *DEB* s.v. Candace).

(94) I,2,25, vv.197-200 (*PG* 37,827).

(95) 1Rg 15,24-31.

(96) In or.32,16 as well, I suspect a conscious mistake. As witnesses of

A third kind of deviation from the Bible text is the *combining* of several synoptic versions of the same episode. An example of this has already been indicated with reference to the choice of « marriage parables » (p.188 n.371). In other passages as well, this combining usually concerns parables, where details from the different Gospels are merged (97).

From the above observations, it can be concluded that at times, Gregory handled the Bible text quite freely, and did not check each reference when quoting or retelling passages from it. The inaccuracies which may result from this form one of the reasons for the uncertain identification of some exempla.

4.2 Exegesis

4.2.1 Typological and allegorical interpretation (98)

> Ἀδὰμ ὅς ἐστιν **τύπος** τοῦ μέλλοντος (Rom.5,14).
>
> οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν πάντες ὑπὸ τὴν νεφέλην ἦσαν καὶ πάντες διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης διῆλθον (...). Ταῦτα δὲ **τύποι** ἡμῶν ἐγενήθησαν, εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἐπιθυμητὰς κακῶν, καθὼς κἀκεῖνοι ἐπεθύμησαν (...). ταῦτα δὲ **τυπικῶς** συνέβαινεν ἐκείνοις, ἐγράφη δὲ πρὸς νουθεσίαν ἡμῶν (1Cor.10,1-11).

---

the covenant, Gregory also mentions, besides Aaron and seventy of the elders, Ithamar and Eleazar, two sons of Aaron. In the Bible text (Ex 24,1 and 9), the two other sons are mentioned: Nadab and Abihu. Yet, because of their later crime and punishment (Lv 10,1-2), they are repeatedly quoted elsewhere as negative exempla. Of course, Gregory's mistake might be unintentional; in or.28,2, Nadab and Abihu *are* mentioned together with Aaron and the γερουσία.

(97) E.g. I,1,24, v.10 (Matt.18,12-13 and Luke 15,3-7) and I,1,26, v.14 (Luke 14,15-24 and Matt.22,1-10). The contaminations are obvious here because they occur in the poems παραβολαὶ καὶ αἰνίγματα κατὰ Ματθαῖον and παραβολαὶ κατὰ Λουκᾶν.
In II,1,50, vv.75-76, Gregory makes a contamination of two healings, that of the crippled woman and that of the Canaanite woman.

(98) Mainly based on Daniélou, *Message* and *Sacramentum*, de Lubac, *allégorie*, *Exégèse* and *Histoire*, den Boer, Dörrie, *Symbolik*, Esper, Gerber, Goppelt, Grant, *History* and *Letter* (especially Appendix II, Greek exegetical terminology, pp.120-142), Guinot, Harl, Joosen-Waszink, Meyendorff, Pépin, *Mythe*, Schäublin, *Untersuchungen*, Špidlík, *théologie*, Wifstrand. See now also Frances Young's recent book and article on this theme; I had not yet read them when writing this book.

> γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχεν, ἕνα ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης καὶ ἕνα ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας. (...) ἅτινα ἐστιν **ἀλληγορούμενα**· αὗται γάρ εἰσιν δύο διαθῆκαι,... (Gal.4.22-24).
>
> οἵτινες **ὑποδείγματι** καὶ σκιᾷ λατρεύουσιν τῶν ἐπουρανίων, καθὼς κεχρημάτισται Μωϋσῆς μέλλων ἐπιτελεῖν τὴν σκηνήν· ὅρα γάρ φησιν (sc. Ex 25,40), *ποιήσεις πάντα κατὰ τὸν* **τύπον** *τὸν δειχθέντα σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει* (Heb.8,5).

In the famous fourth book of his Περὶ ἀρχῶν, the Alexandrian Origen quotes the last three passages (in his eyes, all three from Paul) as examples of πνευματικὴ διήγησις, the third and highest interpretation (99). John Chrysostom, the most renowned representative of the rival Antiochene school, comments on the passage from the Epistle to the Galatians as follows:

> *Ἅτινα ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα.* Καταχρηστικῶς τὸν τύπον ἀλληγορίαν ἐκάλεσεν. Ὃ δὲ λέγει, τοῦτό ἐστιν· ἡ μὲν ἱστορία αὕτη, οὐ τοῦτο μόνον παραδηλοῖ, ὅπερ φαίνεται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλα τινὰ ἀναγορεύει· διὸ καὶ ἀλληγορία κέκληται.
> *« Now this is an allegory ». In a catachrestic way he called the typos « allegory ». What he means, goes as follows: this story does not only hint at what is obvious, but also designates other things: hence it is called an allegory* (100).

According to John, Paul's speaking of an ἀλληγορία instead of a τύπος is catachrestic. Modern scholars do not agree on this point: some claim that Paul indeed interprets the story of Genesis typologically (101), others call the interpretation allegorical (102), still others see the two aspects combined in it (103). Nor is there any consensus about the exegesis applied in the other New Testament passages (104); only the description of Adam as τύπος τοῦ μέλλονπος is almost unanimously considered as an example of « typology » (105), at least by those scholars who accept this term. That is to say, if Paul indeed presented a typological interpretation in the Epistle to the Galatians, he had to make a catachresis, since the term « typology » is a modern creation.

---

(99) Περὶ ἀρχῶν IV,2,6 (*SC* 268, CROUZEL-SIMONETTI).

(100) *In epist. ad Gal. IV,3* (*SC* 61,662), quoted in PÉPIN, *Mythe* p.492 n.13, and in *PGL* s.v. ἀλληγορία.

(101) Thus e.g. PÉPIN, *allégorie* p.268: « l'exégèse la plus typologique qui soit » and FREYTAG p.338.

(102) Thus e.g. BÜCHSEL, *ThWNT* s.v. ἀλληγορέω, p.260; and GERBER p.1213. GRANT, *History* p.31-2 only says that it is not a true allegory.

(103) Thus e.g. CROUZEL p.166: « la dimension « allégorique » (...) s'y manifeste en même temps que la « typologique ». »

(104) The passage from the first Epistle to the Corinthians is called a typology by GERBER p.1213 and GOPPELT p.251, a « lecture allégorique » by PÉPIN, *Mythe* pp.247-252 and an « enseignement moral », in which the τύποι are common « faits exemplaires » by GUINOT p.5. According to Guinot, Rom.5,14 is the only Pauline text in which τύπος is used as a technical-hermeneutic term.

In this confusion of tongues, the following points arrest the attention:

1) As an illustration of one and the same sort of exegesis, Origen refers to New Testament texts in which, if not different hermeneutic methods, then certainly a divergent terminology is employed (106).
2) John Chrysostom distinguishes between ἀλληγορία and τύπος, but his description of Paul's « true intentions » actually seems a definition of the rejected first concept.
3) Both look upon Paul as guarantor for their hermeneutic method, in John's case on condition that his use of words is corrected.
4) In their evaluation of the Pauline exegesis, modern studies are not in agreement, at least not where terminology is concerned.

In the evaluation of Gregory as an exegete, the same terms « typology » and « allegory » are nowadays generally used, mostly associated respectively with the Antiochene and the Alexandrian school or tradition. Before giving a *status quaestionis* of these judgements, and before stating my own opinion on Gregory's Bible exegesis, it seems necessary to give a rough sketch of the early Christian exegetical tradition – with the emphasis on the two mentioned « schools » – and to establish the terminology to be used.

---

(105) Although it is improbable that the word τύπος is a technical term here, cf. BAKER p.253 « The conclusion (sc. of a survey of the use of τύπος and related words in the Septuagint and the N.T.) is straightforward: the evidence of biblical terminology suggests the meaning 'example, pattern' for 'type' ».

(106) In 1Cor., τύπος is either the imperfect adumbration (if typological) or the warning model, synonym of ὑπόδειγμα (if moral); in Heb., these terms stand for exactly the reverse: ὑπόδειγμα is the imperfect copy of the τύπος, the heavenly model. And in Gal., Paul speaks of ἀλληγορούμενα.

A. Alexandrian and Antiochene exegesis

a) The common basis

A first point which one should keep in mind when studying early Christian exegesis is that the purpose was not to discover the original intention of the author or the « actual » meaning of the text. Historical-critical hermeneutics are foreign to its nature.

Another essential characteristic of early Christian exegesis is that it is fundamentally directed at the relation between the Old and the New Testament (107), as in the four quoted New Testament passages. The entire early Christian exegesis shares the idea that a correspondence exists between the events and prophecies of the Old Testament and those of the New Testament, that the latter is the fulfilment and surpassing of the former. It is in line with the Christian linear and soteriological conception of history.

For the interpretation of the Old Testament, this has far-reaching implications: « The typological method is based on the presupposition that the whole Old Testament looks beyond itself for its interpretation. (...) The Old Testament writers did not record past events because they were fascinated with the past as such; they wrote because the past events had present significance, and future significance as well » (108). The **essence** of these Christian hermeneutics is, in de Lubac's terms: « Elle va de l'histoire à l'histoire (...). Elle met en rapport des faits singuliers avec un autre fait singulier, des interventions divines déjà réelles avec une autre sorte d'intervention divine » (109). It is a matter of dynamic, horizontal hermeneutics.

According to the kinds of reality of which the Old Testament *figures* (τύποι) are the adumbrations, different **types** can be distinguished within this exegesis, of which examples can already be found in the New Testament: the *historical-christological* (e.g. Adam - Christ, cf. Rom.5,14), the *sacramental-ecclesiological* (e.g. Flood - baptism, cf. 1Pet. 3,20-21 (110)), the *eschatological* (e.g. Jerusalem - divine Jerusalem, cf. Heb.12,20-24).

---

(107) This is brought into connection with the two-fold controversy against the Jews (for evident reasons) and the Gnostics (who radically repudiated the Jewish Bible).

(108) GRANT, *History* p.55-6.

(109) DE LUBAC, *allégorie* p.41.

(110) With a quasi-technical formulation: ὃ καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀντίτυπον νῦν σῴζει βάπτισμα.

The common **name** for this exegesis is « typology », formed on the basis of the τύπος - ἀντίτυπος imagery, which is quite frequent in the sources. De Lubac prefers to speak of « allégorie chrétienne », probably as a result of his vision on the **origin** of this exegetical doctrine, for which he exclusively credits Paul, without accepting Hellenistic or Jewish influences (111).

The oldest Christian exegetes themselves had no fixed **terminology** to indicate this hermeneutic process: in the first centuries, τύπος, σύμβολον, μυστήριον, αἴνιγμα, εἰκών, παραβολή, were used interchangeably without any systematic distinction (112). Like the terminology, the hermeneutic practice itself was not clearly delineated either (113).

As is well-known, the later evolution and systematizing of Christian exegesis passed into two traditions or schools. Of both, I indicate the most significant hermeneutic stances, the influences which had their share in this, and the terminology used. My point of departure and of reference in this is the described traditional « typology », in which the *object* of interpretation (the τύπος) is an Old Testament event, and the *result* (the ἀντίτυπος, the deeper meaning), a New Testament / Christian event.

1) The Alexandrians (Clement and Origen)

In Clement and especially in Origen, these two aspects (object and result) are drastically extended. The New Testament now also counts as *object* for typological interpretation, and the attention shifts from the history to its representation: the text itself. This text is looked upon as entirely inspired, so that according to them, all words and linguistic phenomena must have an « actual » meaning: due to this, the number of τύποι increases, and in addition, the explanations become more detailed. **Hermeneutics** is no longer applied to an Old Testament history, but to a biblical narration.

The *result* can be different as well: the Bible text no longer merely points forward to a later historical event, but also contains a moral symbolism and a mystical representation of the spiritual life of the Christians (114). In this way, we arrive at a-historical (115), static, vertical hermeneutics. When considering the two-fold change *qua* object and result in Alexandrian hermeneutics, we observe that the historical typology is replaced by, or rather, turns into a special form of literary allegorism.

---

(111) DE LUBAC, *allégorie*.

(112) DANIÉLOU, *Message* pp.181-248 *passim* (within a survey of the typological exegesis of Justin, Irenaeus, Meliton, and Hippolytus). The term ἀλληγορία is said to be avoided by these authors, although in Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, ἀλληγορούμενα is used for an adumbration of an (ecclesiological) truth.

(113) According to GUINOT pp.4-8, the evolution towards an original and coherent *system* of interpretation was finished no sooner than in the fourth century, in the Antiochene school.

It would be impossible to speak of a fixed hermeneutic scheme in *Clement*'s writings. *Origen*, on the other hand, in the already mentioned fourth book of his Περὶ ἀρχῶν, theorizes about the different meanings of the Scripture. He distinguishes three (expressly based on Prv 22,20: ἀπόγραψαι αὐτὰ σεαυτῷ τρισσῶς), and calls these, explicitly by analogy with the Pauline anthropology (1 Thess. 5,23), somatic (literal), psychic (moral) and pneumatic (anagogic, and historical-typological, as appears from the quoted examples) (116). Still, in practice he usually only distinguishes between two: between letter and Spirit (after 2Cor. 3,6). It is highly important, especially for the Origen-reception, to note that he himself repeatedly indicates that each text does have a spiritual meaning in one way or another, but that some parts of a text are not to be taken literally. With this, he directs himself in particular at people who do not grasp the biblical imagery. Yet, some of his formulations on this subject can account for his opponents' reproach of his denial of historicity (117).

---

(114) In de Lubac's view, the moral interpretation is more important for Origen than the « dogmatic » (the typological) one: « Origène est en effet un moraliste, dont l'exégèse est constamment orientée vers la morale » (p.184). The anagogic interpretation, a transposition of the (Jewish) history on the life of the Christian soul, is based on « la conviction que l'Ecriture contient, sous la lettre, les plus hauts secrets de la vie spirituelle » (*Histoire* pp.187-192).
In Origen's own words: οὐ γὰρ νομιστέον τὰ ἱστορικὰ ἱστορικῶν εἶναι τύπους καὶ τὰ σωματικὰ σωματικῶν, ἀλλὰ τὰ σωματικὰ πνευματικῶν καὶ τὰ ἱστορικὰ νοητῶν (*Jo* 10,18, *PG* 14,337D), quoted by *PGL* s.v. τύπος; the quotation is derived from a discussion of Passover, and has no general hermeneutic pretences.

(115) By « a-historical », I mean » apart from historical relations », not » unhistorical. »

(116) Περὶ ἀρχῶν IV 2,4 (*SC* 268 CROUZEL-SIMONETTI): Ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ ἄνθρωπος συνέστηκεν ἐκ σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς καὶ πνεύματος, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ ἡ οἰκονομηθεῖσα ὑπὸ θεοῦ εἰς ἀνθρώπων σωτηρίαν δοθῆναι γραφή.

(117) E.g. Περὶ ἀρχῶν IV 2,5 (*SC* 268 CROUZEL-SIMONETTI): εἰσί τινες γραφαὶ τὸ σωματικὸν οὐδαμῶς ἔχουσαι, and IV 3,1 (*ibidem*): ἀναγεγραμμένα μὲν ὡς γεγονότα, οὐ γεγενημένα δὲ κατὰ λέξιν (in a discussion of Genesis).

It is fairly generally accepted that the Alexandrian school is **influenced** by the Greek (Platonic) and Jewish-Hellenistic traditions which were dominant in the city, especially by Philo.

Finally, where **terminology** is concerned: neither Clement nor Origen makes a systematic difference between τύπος and ἀλληγορία: they use both terms, just like εἰκών and αἴνιγμα, for both horizontal and vertical hermeneutics. From their choice of words, it does not at all appear that they were aware of an essential difference between « typology » and « allegory ».

2) The Antiochenes

The most important representatives of this tradition are Diodore of Tarsus (contemporary of Gregory), Theodore of Mopsuestia and John Chrysostom (both students of Diodore) and Theodoret of Cyrrhus (fifth century). John became one of the three orthodox « hierarchs », the others were to be considered as pioneers or supporters of Nestorianism.

Typology seems to have developed into a systematic **hermeneutic technique** only since the Antiochenes. The prevalent criteria for the acceptance of a τύπος–ἀντίτυπος relation are on the one hand a manifest correspondence or analogy (ἀπεικόνισμα, μίμησις, ὁμοιότης), on the other, a surpassing (ὑπεροχή) of the first by the second (118).

For them, the *object* of typological interpretation is again the biblical content (not the text), and the number of τύποι is restricted. Moreover, the historical reality of the biblical history is strongly emphasized. The prophetic dimension of the Old Testament text is stressed, against the allegorical one, so that the traditional « typology » turns into a special form of prophecy: John distinguishes a prophecy διὰ τύπων / πραγμάτων and a prophecy διὰ ῥημάτων.

According to the Antiochenes, the *result* of the interpretation, the fulfilment of the prophecy, can also be situated within the Old Testament history itself. Besides, the surpassing can be ontological as well: from particular to universal, from material to spiritual, from temporary to eternal (119). As for the result, the difference from Origen's πνευματικὴ ἐξήγησις is virtually non-existent in that case.

---

(118) The latter criterion is secondary, cf. BAKER p.262: the « 'increase' or 'progression' from the type to its antitype (...) is simply an aspect of the progression from Old Testament to New Testament and not a necessary characteristic of a type. The essence of a type is that it is exemplary, and it would be theoretically possible for something which is more advanced to be typical of something which is less advanced ». This can indeed be the case in e.g. Gregory's extended historical and sacramental typology (see p.254).

Nevertheless, the Antiochene « historical-grammatical » hermeneutics is usually considered as a reaction to the Alexandrian allegorism, whereby the **influence** of the Jewish exegetical tradition and / or of the pagan (Hellenistic and imperial) school tradition with its philological method and rhetoric is accepted (120).

The difference between the two schools is to be found in the approach to and appreciation of the text rather than in the kinds of reality which they see hidden in the Bible as « deeper sense ». The « higher » interpretation of the Antiochenes searches for an « überhistorische Bedeutung » (121), which does not affect the text itself, which they interpret historically. In their hermeneutics, a twofold sense of the text is out of the question; one should rather look for a higher relationship between different events. Their most important criticism of the « allegorists » is that on the one hand, they do not take the historical and literal meaning of the text seriously or even deny it, and that on the other, they postulate fanciful interpretations by wanting to detect a symbolical meaning in each and every part of the text.

This criticism is reflected in the **terminology** used. The Antiochenes avoid the use of the term ἀλληγορία for their own exegesis: this term is reserved for the pagan allegorical explanation and for the challenged Bible exegesis; this explains why Paul's « ἀλληγορούμενα » was designated as a catachresis (122). They call their own method θεωρία (as was also done by the Alexandrians: for them, it was a synonym of ἀλληγορία). The main difference is that the θεωρία implies a spiritual meaning without relinquishing the historicity; if this historical significance is actually dropped, the term ἀλληγορία is used (123). The discredit into which the Antiochenes brought this term led to the fact that others, such as Cyril of Alexandria, avoided using it.

---

(119) The « inferior », they call ἐν τύπῳ, τυπικῶς; the « superior », διαφερόντως, κυρίως καὶ ἀληθῶς, κυριώτερον, κατ᾽ ἀλήθειαν.

(120) This influence is not limited to the Antiochene school, though. cf. Schäublin, *Prägung* p.170: he stresses « daß die Antiochener keineswegs über ein 'grammatisches Monopol' verfügten; höchstens haben sie vielleicht konsequenter als andere 'Schulen' ihrer Exegese grammatische Grenzen gesetzt ».

(121) Schäublin, *Untersuchungen* pp.167-168. Perhaps it would be better to speak of « transhistorische Bedeutung ».

(122) Cf. supra p.238, quotation John Chrysostom. Compare also Diodore in *proem. Ps.118*: ἡ θεία γραφὴ τῆς ἀλληγορίας τὸ μὲν ὄνομα οἶδε, τὸ δὲ πρᾶγμα οὐκ οἶδεν (quoted in *PGL*. s.v. ἀλληγορία).

However, the equation of the Alexandrian exegesis with the denial of historicity is at the most only partially legitimate. Moreover, in practice, the « spiritual meaning » derived from the O.T. is similar. Without denying the actual differences in the approach of the two traditions, the « school controversy » between Alexandria and Antioch can partly be called « un faux débat » (124).

The Cappadocians did not form an exegetical school. The hermeneutic stances of Basil and his brother Gregory of Nyssa even diverge quite a lot: the former stands rather in the line of the Antiochenes, because of his suspicions of the ἀλληγορία, the latter practises it without reticence and is hence placed within the Alexandrian tradition (125). Gregory Nazianzen is usually situated somewhere in between.

B. Typology and allegorism

As will be clear from the above survey, neither the early Christians themselves nor the modern studies agree on the terminology for the hermeneutic method(s) in search of the « deeper meaning » of the Bible.

---

(123) Cf. again Diodore, *proem Pss*: τὴν ἀγωγὴν καὶ τὴν θεωρίαν τὴν ὑψηλοτέραν οὐκ ἀποκωλύσομεν. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐναντιοῦται ἡ ἱστορία τῇ ὑψηλοτέρα θεωρία (...) ἐκεῖνο δὲ μόνον χρὴ φυλάττεσθαι, μή ποτε ἀνατροπὴ τοῦ ὑποκειμένου ἡ θεωρία ὀφθῇ, ὅπερ οὐκέτι ἂν εἴη θεωρία ἀλλὰ ἀλληγορία. τὸ γὰρ ἄλλως ἀγορευόμενον παρὰ τὸ κείμενον οὐ θεωρία ἐστὶν ἀλλὰ ἀλληγορία (quoted in *PGL*, s.v. θεωρία).

(124) GUINOT p.8.

(125) It is remarkable that their appreciation of the term ἀλληγορία itself apparently diverges as well, and fits in with that of the respective schools: Basil distinguishes between (fair) ἀναγωγή and (foul) ἀλληγορία, which denies the literal meaning (*water is water*): οἱ προφάσει ἀναγωγῆς, καὶ νοημάτων ὑψηλοτέρων, εἰς ἀλληγορίας κατέφυγον (...). Τοὺς δὴ τοιούτους λόγους ὡς ὀνειράτων συγκρίσεις καὶ γραώδεις μύθους ἀποπεμψάμενοι τὸ ὕδωρ ὕδωρ νοήσωμεν (*Hexaem* 3,9 [*SC* 26 GIET]).
His brother explicitly posits that he does not attach any importance to terminological questions, and considers θεωρία, τροπολογία and ἀλληγορία as synonyms: τὴν διὰ τῆς ἀναγωγῆς θεωρίαν, εἴτε τροπολογίαν, εἴτε ἀλληγορίαν, εἴτε τι ἄλλο τις ὀνομάζειν ἐθέλοι, οὐδὲν περὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος διοισόμεθα (*hom. Cant. proem.*, quoted in *PGL* s.v. ἀναγωγή); see also ESPER pp.9-11.

On the one hand, there is the recent term *typology*. Usually, this term is related to the Christian view of history, which is linear and progressive, and connected with the double coming of Christ. Yet, especially in the discussion of the Antiochenes, it appeared that the term is also used for the interpretation which carries the argument onto the ontological plane, and is thus actually vertical and static. It has even been proposed that each Christian non-literal exegesis be called « typology » (126).

On the other hand, especially with regard to the Alexandrians, one also speaks of *allegorism* (127). In the context of early Christian exegesis, allegorical explanation does not imply that the allegorically interpreted text is intended as an allegory, or should be considered exclusively as an allegory, and therefore as non-historical. This actually *was* the opinion of the Antiochenes on the term ἀλληγορία, which apparently still influences contemporary scholars in their use of this term (128). In contrast with typology, the allegorical explanation is usually presented as symbolical, vertical, static and related to an opposition between a sensible and an intelligible world. However, it has also been proposed to call each Christian non-literal exegesis « allégorie chrétienne » (129).

---

(126) Pépin, *Mythe* p.501: « le terme de « typology » semble très préférable à celui, trop général, d'« allégorie » pour désigner la pratique proprement chrétienne de l'exégèse spirituelle. » With this, Pépin implicitly considers typology as a special form of « allegory ». The quotation is derived from the extensive « Appendice I L'allégorie et les allégories », which is added in the second edition (1976) of this standard work, as a kind of palinode after the criticism of the first edition (1958) in which he had made hardly any distinction between the Christian, the Jewish and the pagan « allegory ».

(127) It seems preferable to avoid the ambiguous term *allegory* and to use *allegorism* or expressions such as *allegorical explanation / interpretation / exegesis / reading*. The polysemy of ἀλληγορία, allegory, allégorie, Allegorie (allegorical means of expression *and* allegorical interpretation) is one of the reasons for the misunderstandings, in antiquity as well as nowadays.

(128) Thus for example Grant, *History* p.31-2, who does not want to look upon the passage from the Epistle to the Galatians as an « allegory » because « *he does not deny the reality of the Old Testament history* »; and Kennedy, *Rhetoric* p.247, about John Chrysostom: « As always, he avoids allegorical interpretation; it is characteristic of John to believe that things mean what they say. » Yet, allegorical explanation does not necessarily deny « that things mean what they say »: it only takes into account that things *mean more* than they say (see Grant himself, *Letter* p.122, about the same passage of Paul: « He could have said that the stories were allegories, for the term itself does not suggest that the stories are fictitious: it simply means that the obvious meaning is not the basic one »). As pointed out: the historical-critical pattern of thought should be abandoned.

Should we then, to avoid confusion, abandon both terms altogether and call the hermeneutic method in search of the « deeper meaning » of the Bible « spiritual exegesis »?

To me, however, it seems that if this course is taken, some real hermeneutic differences are passed over; moreover, « typological » and « allegorical » are the current terms. Of course, in order to be manageable, they have to be clearly defined, according to the already mentioned criteria: what is the *object* of interpretation, what is the *result*, what is the *relation* between both?

Concerning the *object*, Lausberg's definition is clear: « Verschieden von der Allegorie, deren Zweck die Textdeutung ist, ist die Typologie, die die Deutung der Wirklichkeit zum Ziele hat. (...) Die Typologie ist eine Semantik der Realitäten, die Allegorie eine Semantik der Worte » (130).

The event or character interpreted in typology refers to a later, historical event or character, firstly to Christ, secondly to the Christian history and eschatology: both *results* are already included in the New Testament Epistles (and have already been quoted). The moral (131) and « anagogic » interpretations of the Bible, which switch over from concrete to abstract, from historical to a-historical, from sensible to intelligible, should be called allegorical.

---

(129) Cf. supra p.241, de Lubac; see also GRANT, *Letter* p.137: « Actually 'typology' is only one form of allegorization »; GUZIE p.648 and n.2.

(130) LAUSBERG §901. Compare BAKER p.258: « Typology is not an exegesis or interpretation of a text but the study of relationships between events, persons and institutions recorded in biblical texts ». One might also appeal to the narratological difference between *narration* and *history*: the former admits of allegorical, the second of typological interpretation. Perhaps, this distinction (implicitly made by Baker) should be preferred to that of Lausberg, because the historicity of the interpreted history is left outside consideration here. The fact is that typology interprets *soteriological* rather than historical events. Compare DANIÉLOU, *Message* p.184: « Elle ne correspond ni à ce que nous appelons l'exégèse littérale (...) ni à ce que nous appelons l'exégèse allégorique (...). Elle concerne la relation historique de deux moments du dessein de Dieu. », and BAKER p.266: « The question may be raised whether Jonah or Job, for instance, must be historical in order to be typical. It may be suggested that although typology is essentially historical it is possible to have correspondences between an imaginary person and a real person ».

(131) Of course, it is not a question of the *use* of biblical histories as moral exempla here, as these may be founded on a literal interpretation as well.

The *relation* between the events or characters linked through typological interpretation is essentially soteriological; in the case of the allegorical interpretation, the relation between object and result is symbolical (thus possibly also soteriological).

When comparing the defined concepts with the hermeneutic methods of *Alexandrians and Antiochenes*, it is evident that there is no unequivocal correlation, but that they partially cross the interpretations of both schools. In their recognition of a spiritual meaning, both groups make historical (horizontal, typological) as well as a-historical (vertical, allegorical) connections. The former school sometimes does so without any concern for the literal historicity, the latter group holds on to historicity. Only through their turning to the text as symbol can the Alexandrians be said to form allegorical interpretations: for them, spiritual exegesis coincides with textual interpretation in that case. Conversely, the Antiochenes are more reticent and seek, through typology, a deeper meaning in the history itself: in their eyes, spiritual exegesis stands *next to* textual interpretation.

Still, some gaps remain: the *anagogic* interpretation of an *event* is typological *qua* object (and the Antiochenes speak of τύπος and not of ἀλληγορία), and allegorical *qua* result (and the Alexandrians speak of ἀλληγορία - or τύπος). With regard to the interpretation of the Bible, in which text and history are so closely knit, the distinction remains problematical (132). Furthermore, it does not seem to correspond with the differences in hermeneutics seen by the early Christian exegetes themselves. Hence, it would be quite artificial to draw a radical dividing line between the two exegetical forms.

---

(132) Cf. LAUSBERG §901: « Natürlich kann das typologische Denken auch auf die textlich überlieferte Geschichte angewandt werden: sie kann so zu einem Interpretationsprinzip werden und sich mit der Allegorie im Resultat decken. » SCHÄUBLIN, *Untersuchungen* p.167 n.45 does not agree with this « denn dem Typus bleibt doch unter allen Umständen die volle Wirklichleit erhalten »: thus, he departs - wrongly, I think - from a difference between typology and allegorism determined by historicity. Besides, I do not entirely agree with Lausberg either, because he considers the object of the interpretation as the only distinctive criterion.
In the case of the Bible, the difference between history and text is rendered even more difficult, because in the Christian view, both are the work of the same « author »: God « makes » (salvation) history and inspires the representation of this in textual form: eventually, history and text have the same soteriological meaning, cf. in Paul's ταῦτα δὲ τυπικῶς συνέβαινεν ἐκείνοις, ἐγράφη δὲ πρὸς νουθεσίαν ἡμῶν (1Cor.10,11).

When it comes to placing Gregory's exegesis, the simple division into typology (and thus Antiochene) and allegory (and thus Alexandrian) is inadequate. The following questions may guide us in placing him within the two school traditions:

- Does he interpret (especially) text or figures and events? And how detailed is the analysis he makes? Does he always look for a symbolical meaning?
- Does he (explicitly) hold on to historicity?
- Which terminology does he use and to what extent does he attach importance to this?

And for the difference between typological and allegorical interpretation:

- Which kind of spiritual meaning is he seeking in particular: christological, historical, sacramental, eschatological, moral, anagogic / gnostic?

4.2.2 Gregory's exegesis (133)

> Ὅμως δὲ μέσην χωροῦντες ἡμεῖς τῶν τε πάντῃ παχυτέρων τὴν διάνοιαν, καὶ τῶν ἄγαν θεωρητικῶν τε καὶ ἀνηγμένων, ἵνα μήτε παντελῶς ἀργοὶ καὶ ἀκίνητοι μένωμεν, μήτε περιεργότεροι τοῦ δέοντος ὦμεν, καὶ τῶν προκειμένων ἔκπτωτοι καὶ ἀλλότριοι (τὸ μὲν γὰρ Ἰουδαϊκόν πως καὶ ταπεινόν, τὸ δὲ ὀνειροκριτικόν, καὶ ὁμοίως ἀμφότερα κατεγνωσμένα)·...
>
> *But we, standing midway between those whose minds are utterly dense on the one side, and on the other those who are very contemplative and exalted, that we may neither remain quite idle and immovable, not yet be more busy than we ought, and fall short of and be estranged from our purpose - for the former course is Jewish and very low, and the latter is only fit for the dream-soothsayer, and both alike are to be condemned* (134).

---

(133) In accordance with the subject of this study, I shall deal especially with the exegesis of biblical histories (the πράγματα), and less with the *words* (the ῥήματα: laws, psalms, proverbs, prophecies). Yet, here as well, the dividing line cannot always be drawn precisely.

(134) Or.45,12 (*PG* 36.637C-D. translation BROWNE-SWALLOW p.427).

A. Status quaestionis

In the evaluations of Gregory's exegesis, the whole spectrum of typology and allegorism, Alexandrian and Antiochene influence can be found.

First of all, there are scholars who call him an *Origenist* (often, the *Philocalia* is referred to, which is said to be compiled by him and Basil (135)), but this label does not denote the same for everyone: some give no specifications at all, while for others, Origen's influence appears from the triple meaning which Gregory sees in the Bible, or from the way in which he employs the typological interpretation, or from his allegorical method (136).

In connection with this, he is also looked upon as an *allegorist*, without specific reference to Origen (137). He is regularly placed within the Alexandrian tradition because of this allegorism (138).

On the other hand, a number of scholars think that Gregory explicitly distances himself from Origen in his exegesis, and that he indeed adopts a middle course; they speak of a free way of dealing with the Bible, or an open and balanced mind (139). Some uncritical studies which by definition describe Gregory as a moderate-minded, pure and orthodox exegete, arrive at more or less the same point of view (140).

---

(135) Junod, *Réexamen* demonstrated convincingly, to my mind, that there are no serious grounds to ascribe the *Philocalia* to Gregory and Basil.

(136) Respectively Rousse pp.939–940; Michels p.17: « Wie Origenes hält er am Wortsinn fest, deutet aber die Tatsache der Heilsgeschichte moralisch und pneumatisch aus und zwar negativ und positiv »; Daniélou, *Message* p.253: « C'est de cette typologie origéniste qu'hériteront en Orient un Cyrille d'Alexandrie et un Grégoire de Nazianze, en Occident un Hilaire et un Jérôme »; and about the same Jerome, Grant, *History* p.97-8 says: « Thereafter he was unable to feel the allurement of the allegorical method, even as presented by Gregory Nazianzen, the great Origenist. No matter how ingenious the allegorization, Jerome had to insist upon the reality of the literal meaning. »

(137) Thus e.g. Donders pp.298-299: « Gregor huldigte - unter dem Einfluß seiner Zeit - der allegorischen Schriftauslegung. » Wyss, *Phyllobolia* p.171, speaks of a « gemäßigter Allegoriker »; Gerber discusses the exegesis of the Cappadocians pp.1223-1225; with regard to Gregory, he refers to the quoted fragment from or.45, but remarks that he nevertheless gives « nicht selten eine ausgedehnte allegorische Erklärung. »

(138) Thus e.g. Ackermann p.54: « Gregor huldigt mehr der allegorischen Auslegung, wie sie in der alexandrinischen Schule hauptsächlich geübt wurde, als der historisch-grammatischen Interpretation der Antiochenischen Schule »; Joosen-Waszink p.289 treat the Cappadocians as « spätere 'Alexandriner' ».

(139) In a study from 1979, in which he labels Gregory *qua* spirituality as « discepolo di Origene non meno di Gregorio di Nissa », Moreschini, *Origene* calls the examination of Gregory's exegesis « un compito che attende gli studi nazianzenici » (p.56); he has the impression here that Gregory did distance himself from Origen in this sphere. Some years

Finally, there are some scholars who look upon *typology* as the dominant hermeneutic direction in his exegesis: for Ruether, this is a reason to postulate an influence of the Antiochene tradition (141).

---

later, he is more affirmative: « Les critères de Grégoire révèlent un grand équilibre: il n'accepte pas une interprétation littérale, mais il est bien loin de l'exégèse de type origénien », and further on: « On sait, du reste, que l'interprétation que fait Grégoire de l'Écriture est assez libre: il tend à une interprétation de type origénien, mais exclut le triple sens de l'Écriture et parfois est plus enclin à une interprétation de type antiochien » (Moreschini-Gallay, *SC* 318 pp.48 and 61).

Also Winslow, *Exegesis* p.389, argues that Gregory, « despite the *Philocalia* », is not a follower of Origen's hermeneutics: he reveals « no one prevailing approach to the interpretation of scripture. Allegory is indeed used, and often, but so too we find typological and anagogical exegesis, as well as frequent examples of naive litteralism. » It is not clear to me exactly which distinctions Winslow makes among these four exegetical techniques.

Finally, Gallay is the only one since Donders (1921) who has published an article which dealt with the Bible in Gregory's œuvre. For his exegesis, he also departs from the quoted passage from or.45, which he considers as a kind of spiritual testament (it is derived from Gregory's last preserved oration). Some ten quotations, almost exclusively from the orations, and an analysis of or.37, lead to the conclusion that Gregory indeed follows the middle course: « Nous pouvons dire que Grégoire se préoccupe sérieusement de la recherche du sens littéral, qu'il entend ce sens littéral avec la largeur d'esprit nécessaire et qu'il y associe intimement le souci d'un enseignement spirituel. Cette tendence à découvrir un sens spirituel dans les textes sacrés ne surprend pas, car il admirait Origène (... *a reference to the Philocalia follows* ...). Grégoire ne suit pas Origène dans les excès de certaines de ses interprétations allégoriques » (Gallay, *Bible* pp.325-326).

(140) Plagnieux pp.37-48: « position pleine de sagesse et de mesure », « pleinement catholique »; Siotis pp.43-54: the traditional situation of Gregory of Nyssa fitting in with the « dangerous » Alexandria, Basil with Antioch and Gregory Nazianzen in a central position, with a pure and orthodox exegesis; Guignet pp.260-265: « le juste milieu », with less « profane influence » than Gregory of Nyssa; only the orations 37 and 45 are « de mauvais goût » and carry « la marque d'une de ces compositions sophistiques ». In Guignet's eyes, the pagan sophists rather than the Alexandrians are the evildoers.

(141) Ruether p.105: « it is fair to say that the allegorical use of Scripture is the exception in Gregory and the typological is the norm. This is interesting, since Gregory is commonly seen as the child of the Alexandrian school with its allegorical exegesis. (...) It would be well to recognize the degree to which he also makes use of the Antiochene tradition. » Her argumentation (pp.102-105) is based on a distinction between typo-

B. Gregory on hermeneutics

Only seldom does Gregory practise, at least in the preserved works, the exegesis as a purpose in itself: for instance, only one exegetical homily has been transmitted. Related to this, he only seldom explicitly expounds his hermeneutic stance. And if he does deal with it, he would do anything to strike his favourite *happy mean*, as in the passage quoted by way of introduction. Such expositions should not lead us into reaching any general conclusions. Moreover, such phrases are usually quoted as a separate entity, whereas the context is actually quite important: I come back to this on p.263. First, I deal with Gregory's vision of the Bible as salvation history (τύπος and ἀλήθεια), afterwards, with his view on the Bible as a text (γράμμα and πνεῦμα).

1) Τύπος and ἀλήθεια

(1) Relation between Old and New Testament

In his oration on the φιλοπτωχία, Gregory argues that the opposition poor-rich goes against God's intention for man. With a view to demonstrating this, he goes through the salvation history from Adam to Christ, with all kinds of divine interventions. The whole of these makes up the successive « testaments »: διαθήκην τὴν ἐν σκιᾷ, διαθήκην τὴν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ (142). This forms the clearest possible typification of the Christian vision on the continuity of the biblical history.

---

logy (past to present; dynamic) and allegorical explanation (concrete to abstract; static) which, as pointed out, does not at all coincide with that between Antiochene and Alexandrian tradition. Thus, the correct observation that « not only the Old Testament but the stories of the New Testament also can be taken as figurative dramas of the inner life of the soul » is of course no typical Antiochene typology, – if it can at all be described as typology (cf. supra p.241, where precisely this extension of the traditional « typology » is ascribed to the Alexandrians).
Guignet p.265 does Gregory too much credit by stating that « Grégoire a beaucoup contribué à faire triompher cette idée que l'Ancien Testament exprime τυπικῶς ce que le Nouveau exprime μυστικῶς. » Apart from the fact that the term μυστικῶς is poorly chosen with regard to the N.T., which precisely brings the fulfilment – ἀληθῶς – , this Pauline idea was really not in need of Gregory to triumph. Guignet's judgement does indicate that he too considered typology as Gregory's most important hermeneutic method.

(142) Or.14.27 (*PG* 35,893A).

The traditional image of the Mosaic law as shadow (Heb.10.1. also compare the quoted Heb.8,5) is frequent in Gregory. Thus in his *rough definitions*:

> Ἰουδαϊσμός ἐστιν, ὁ πρῶτος νόμος·
> Ὁ δεύτερος δέ, τοῦ πάθους **μυστήριον**.
> Ὁ μὲν **σκιώδης**, δαιμόνων ἀναιρέτης·
> Ὁ δὲ τρανός τε καὶ **λύτης αἰνιγμάτων**.
> *Judaism is the first law;*
> *and the second is the mystery of the passion.*
> *The first is like a shadow, and eradicates the demons;*
> *the second is clear and solves the riddles* (143).

In the baptismal oration too, the law is described – more or less in the manner of an oxymoron – as a light which is an adumbration of the truth:

> **φῶς δὲ τυπικὸν** καὶ σύμμετρον τοῖς ὑποδεχομένοις ὁ γραπτὸς νόμος, **σκιαγραφῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν** καὶ τὸ τοῦ μεγάλου φωτὸς **μυστήριον**.
> *And a Light typical and proportionate to those who were its subjects was the written law, adumbrating the truth and the sacrament of the great Light,...* (144).

The old covenant is thus σκιά, τύπος, αἴνιγμα, the new one ἀλήθεια, τελείωσις, μυστήριον (145). Yet there is no rift: both are part of a progressive soteriology:

---

(143) I,2,34, vv.185-188 (*PG* 37,959).

(144) Or.40,6 (*PG* 36,364D, translation Browne-Swallow p.361). Furthermore, compare e.g. II,1,45, vv.177-180 (*PG* 37,1366): νόμον (...) ὅν ἔν ποτε λαϊνέῃσι / Γράμματι **ἀτρεχίην** Χριστὸς **ὑποσκιάων** / Πλαξὶν ἄναξ ἐχάραξε, καὶ ὕστατον ἐν κραδίῃσιν / Ἡμετέραις, (cf.2Cor.3,3); or.4,67 (*PG* 35,588C-589A): τὸ μὲν τῇ **σκιαγραφίᾳ**, τὸ δὲ **τῇ τελειώσει τοῦ μυστηρίου** (...) νόμος **ἐτύπωσε** καὶ χάρις ἐπλήρωσε; and already supra I,1,6, v.69: cf. p.90 n.169: Οὕτω **σκιώδης** τηνικαῦτ᾽ ἦν καὶ νόμος. Concrete examples in which the New Testament commandments (the Sermon on the Mount) surpass the Old Testament ones (the Decalogue), for example in I,2,24, vv.213-224 (swearing is gradually forbidden) and in I,2,25, vv.306-313 (from interdiction of murder and adultery to interdiction of anger and lust).

(145) There appears to be an analogy between the relation of τύπος (σκιαγραφῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ἀτρεχίην ὑποσκιάων) and that of « inclusive » μῦθος (παραδεικνὺς τὴν ἀλήθειαν, cf.p.214) to ἀλήθεια. Παραδείκνυμι is indeed used as a synonym of σκιαγραφέω and ὑποσκιάω (e.g. or.45,11, *PG* 36,637A: **σκιαγραφίαν τινὰ καὶ προχάραγμα** τῶν ἀοράτων **παραδεικνὺς** τὰ ὁρώμενα, and or.29,20, *PG* 36,101B: τὰ γὰρ ἄνω **παραδείκνυται**), as σκιά and ὑπόδειγμα are synonyms in Heb.8,5, see p.238.

> Δεῦρ' ἄγε καὶ δισσοῖο νόμου λόγον ἐξερέεινε,
> Ὅς τε παλαιότερος, καὶ ὃς νέος ἐξεφαάνθη.
> Πρῶτα μὲν Ἑβραίοισιν, ἐπεὶ Θεὸν ὑψιμέδοντα
> Πρῶτοι καὶ γνώσαντο, ἔπειτα δὲ πείρασιν αἴης.
> Οὐ γὰρ μαρναμένοισι Θεὸς βροτὸν ἡγεμονεύει
> Δόγμασιν, ὥς τις ἄϊδρις ἐών, Λόγος ἴδρις ἁπάντων,
> Οὐδὲ παλιμβούλοισιν, ὃ καὶ θνητοῖσιν ὄνειδος.
> *Come then, enquire into the reason for the two Laws,*
> *the one older, the other revealed in its newness.*
> *At first law was for the Hebrews, as they were the first to recognise the God who rules on high, and later it extended to the ends of the earth.*
> *For God does not govern mortal man by decrees which are at variance, as if he did not know what he was doing, since the Word knows everything,*
> *nor does he rule by decrees betraying second thoughts which would be a reproach even to mortals* (146).

An equally traditional *christological* and historical typology from Old to New corresponds to this vision on the gradual disclosure of the entire law: Adam - Christ, the twelve patriarchs - the twelve apostles (147).

(2) Τύπος - ἀντίτυπος - μυστήριον

However, the progressive revelation is not concluded with the New Testament. Thus, the Trinity is revealed not in two, but in three phases, the third of which is placed in the period following that of the New Testament, even though the divinity of the Spirit is actually already foreshadowed in the Bible (148).

Not only on the dogmatic field is the fulfilment transferred to the area outside the Bible: Gregory does not look upon the Bible as a single, closed history. Jesus' exhortation in his farewell discourse, Ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν (John 14,31), is interpreted as a timeless call to ἀναγωγή (149); the prophecy of Hosea about the revival on the third day (Hos 6.1-2) is not only brought into connection with Easter but also with a miraculous cure of Gorgonia (150); the events in Alexandria under Lucius of Samosata are considered as εἰκών of the Assyrian invasion in Jerusalem (151). In this extended **historical** typology, the τύπος - ἀντίτυπος correspondence is transferred from O.T. - N.T. to Bible - present (152).

---

(146) I,1,9, vv.1-7 (*PG* 37,456-7, translation SYKES, *translation*).

(147) Adam turns up quite frequently (see e.g. or.41,4, quoted p.120); PALLA, *Ordinamento* pp.178-179 supposes that, within the *biblica*, the poems I,1,13 (enumeration of the patriarchs) and I,1,19 (the apostles) were originally intended as a diptych.

(148) Cf. I,1,3, vv.24-31 and or.31,25-27. A similar evolution goes for the Son, who is indistinctly adumbrated in the Old, and fully manifested in the New Testament.

In the case of the **sacramental** typology, which is also pursued to the present, we have a double correspondence: along with that of O.T. to N.T. (from τύπος to singly perfect ἀντίτυπος, the τελειότης), we get that of N.T. to the present (from τελειότης to μυστήριον). Just as the historical sacramental event of redemption (baptism, crucifixion) was already μυστικῶς present in Jewish history, thus it is μυστικῶς actualized in the present in sacrament and liturgy: τύπος and μυστήριον (the terms are sometimes used without any distinction, next to σύμβολον or εἰκών) are two complementary aspects of the same Christocentric symbolical thinking. Of course, Gregory is not unique in this (153), but his œuvre is strongly pervaded with it (154). By way of illustration of the sacramental typology, I quote a passage from the oration Εἰς τὰ φῶτα:

---

(149) Or.14.21 (*PG* 35.885A-B): τοῦτο μὲν οὖν ἤδη καὶ τοῖς ῥήμασιν αὐτοῖς μικροῦ σύμφωνον, οἷς ὁ Κύριος καὶ Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν διακελεύεται, τί λέγων; « Ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν » οὐ τοὺς τότε μαθητὰς μόνον ἐξ ἐκείνου μόνου τοῦ τόπου μετατιθείς, ὡς ἂν οἰηθείη τις, ἀλλ' ἀεὶ καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ μαθητὰς ἀπὸ γῆς καὶ τῶν περὶ γῆν εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἕλκων καὶ τὰ οὐράνια.

(150) Or.8.16 (*PG* 35.808C): Ὢ τοῦ « Πατάξει καὶ μοτώσει, καὶ ὑγιάσει, καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήσει », φέροντος μὲν εἰς μεῖζον καὶ **μυστικώτερον**, ὥσπερ οὖν ἤνεγκεν, οὐχ ἧττον δὲ τοῖς ταύτης ἁρμόζοντος πάθεσι!

(151) Or.25.12 (*PG* 35.1216B): πᾶσαν τῆς Ἀσσυρίων καταδρομῆς τὴν **εἰκόνα**, ἥν ποτε τὴν ἁγίαν Ἱερουσαλὴμ κατέδραμον.

(152) Ohly calls this « halbbiblische Typologie », cf. LINK p.28.

(153) Cf. SCHNEIDER, especially pp.156-158. She does not specifically deal with Gregory, but points to this symbolic thinking as a constant essential feature within patristic thinking.

(154) About the significance of this sacramental symbolical thinking in Gregory, see CASEL *passim* and MERSCH pp.441-452.
This actualization is especially remarkable in the panegyrics on the high days, which played an important role in Byzantine liturgy (thus, the text of the Greek liturgy of December 26, παράδοξον μυστήριον, goes back to or.39.13 [CASEL p.171]). See e.g. the introduction of the Theophany-oration: Χριστὸς γεννᾶται, δοξάσατε· Χριστὸς ἐξ οὐρανῶν, ἀπαντήσατε· Χριστὸς ἐπὶ γῆς, ὑψώθητε. (...) **Πάλιν** τὸ σκότος λύεται, πάλιν τὸ φῶς ὑφίσταται, **πάλιν** Αἴγυπτος σκότῳ κολάζεται, **πάλιν** Ἰσραὴλ στύλῳ φωτίζεται (or.38.1-2, *PG* 36.312A-313A).
The opening words of the next oration run as follows: **Πάλιν** Ἰησοῦς ὁ

> Ἐπεὶ δὲ βαπτίσματος ἡ πανήγυρις καὶ δεῖ μικρόν τι προσκακοπαθῆσαι τῷ δι' ἡμᾶς μορφωθέντι καὶ βαπτισθέντι καὶ σταυρωθέντι, φέρε τι περὶ διαφορᾶς βαπτισμάτων φιλοσοφήσωμεν, ἵν' ἀπέλθωμεν ἐντεῦθεν κεκαθαρμένοι. Ἐβάπτισε Μωϋσῆς, ἀλλ' ἐν ὕδατι· καὶ πρὸ τούτου, ἐν νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν θαλάσσῃ. **Τυπικῶς** δὲ τοῦτο ἦν, ὡς καὶ Παύλῳ δοκεῖ (1Cor.10.11, cf. p.237)· ἡ θάλασσα, τοῦ ὕδατος· ἡ νεφέλη, τοῦ Πνεύματος· τὸ μάννα, τοῦ τῆς ζωῆς ἄρτου (John 6,35)· τὸ πόμα, τοῦ θείου πόματος (John 6,56). Ἐβάπτισε καὶ Ἰωάννης, οὐκέτι μὲν Ἰουδαϊκῶς· οὐ γὰρ ἐν ὕδατι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς μετάνοιαν· οὔπω δὲ ὅλον πνευματικῶς· οὐ γὰρ προστίθησι τὸ « ἐν Πνεύματι ». Βαπτίζει καὶ Ἰησοῦς, ἀλλ' ἐν Πνεύματι. Τοῦτο ἡ **τελειότης**. (...) Οἶδα καὶ τέταρτον βάπτισμα, τὸ διὰ μαρτυρίου καὶ αἵματος, (...). Οἶδα καὶ πέμπτον ἔτι, τὸ τῶν δακρύων.
>
> *Now, since our Festival is of Baptism, and we must endure a little hardness with Him Who for our sake took form, and was baptized, and was crucified; let us speak about the different kinds of Baptism, that we may come out thence purified. Moses baptized but it was in water, and before that it was in the cloud and in the sea. This was typical as Paul saith; the Sea of the water, and the Cloud of the Spirit; the Manna, of the Bread of Life; the Drink, of the Divine Drink. John also baptized; but this was not like the baptism of the Jews, for it was not only in water, but also « unto repentance ». Still it was not wholly spiritual, for he does not add « And in the Spirit ». Jesus also baptized, but in the Spirit. This is the perfect Baptism. (...) I know also a Fourth Baptism - that by Martyrdom and blood, (...). Yes, and I know of a Fifth also, which is that of tears* (155).

The two-fold mysticism is phrased cogently in the Pentecost oration, in which Gregory searches a whole series of numerical symbols for the Πεντηκοστή; as the last in the list he mentions the τύπος of Pentecost:

ἐμὸς καὶ **πάλιν** μυστήριον (or.39,1, *PG* 36,336A). In the commentaries, it is interpreted that « ce discours se rattache ainsi au précédent » (Gallay in MORESCHINI-GALLAY, *SC 358* p.151; see also DÖRRIE, *Epiphanias*). It seems quite likely to me that πάλιν should here as well be understood in an actualizing way.

(155) Or.39.17 (*PG* 36.353C-356A, translation BROWNE-SWALLOW p.358). By considering the tears (of remorse) as a kind of baptism, Gregory does not restrict the χάρις to the sacraments, as WINSLOW, *Baptism* remarks.
Another example of sacramental typology: or.40,28 (*PG* 36,400A), in which he quotes the circumcision on the eighth day as an argument for the baptism of infants (that is to say, in emergencies): Καὶ τούτου λόγος ἡμῖν ἡ ὀκταήμερος περιτομή, **τυπική τις οὖσα σφραγίς**.

> Ὃ δὲ τῷ παρόντι καιρῷ χρησιμώτατον, ὅτι (...) τιμῶσι μὲν Ἑβραῖοι τὴν Πεντηκοστὴν ἡμέραν, τιμῶμεν δὲ καὶ ἡμεῖς· ὥσπερ ἐστί τινα καὶ ἄλλα τῶν Ἑβραϊκῶν, **τυπικῶς** μὲν παρ' ἐκείνοις τελούμενα, **μυστικῶς** δὲ ἡμῖν ἀποκαθιστάμενα.
> *But to come to an instance which is most useful to us in the present occasion, (...) the Hebrews honour the Day of Pentecost, and we also honour it; just as there are other rites of the Hebrews which we also observe; they were typically observed by them, and by us they are sacramentally reinstated* (156).

A third sort of typology which transcends the biblical chronological frame is the **eschatological** one (157). This type goes even further than the sacramental typology: the present (liturgical) act is no longer (merely) seen as a mystical actualization of a New Testament deed, but also as the adumbration of a heavenly event. Thus, Gregory calls the baptismal liturgy προχάραγμα, προοίμιον and μυστήριον of the heavenly liturgy (158); he knows an altar of which the present ones are only τύποι, to which he will make sacrifices which surpass the present ones just as the ἀλήθεια surpasses the shadows, an altar which has already been foretold by David (159). And eventually, also the Christian Easter is still τυπικῶς: hence, he can speak of the Jewish Pesach as being a τύπος of a τύπος (160).

---

(156) Or.41,4 (*PG* 36,436A, translation BROWNE-SWALLOW p.380).

(157) In Justin, Irenaeus and Hippolytus, this kind of typology still had a millenarian and thus immanent-historical character; in Origen (and also in Gregory) it is transcendent, cf. DANIÉLOU, *Message* p.253. Because it remains within the scope of soteriology, we can still speak of typology here.

(158) Or.40,46 (*PG* 36,425A): Ἡ στάσις, ἣν αὐτίκα στήσῃ μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα πρὸ τοῦ μεγάλου βήματος, τῆς ἐκεῖθεν δόξης ἐστὶ **προχάραγμα**. Ἡ ψαλμῳδία, μεθ' ἧς δεχθήσῃ, τῆς ἐκεῖθεν ὑμνῳδίας **προοίμιον**. Αἱ λαμπάδες, ἅσπερ ἀνάψεις, τῆς ἐκεῖθεν φωταγωγίας **μυστήριον**.

(159) Or.26,16 (*PG* 35,1248D-1249A): Ἀλλ' οἶδα καὶ ἄλλο θυσιαστήριον, **οὗ τύποι τὰ νῦν ὁρώμενα**· ἐφ' ὃ λαξευτήριον οὐκ ἀναβέβηκεν, οὐδὲ χείρ, οὐδὲ ἠκούσθη σίδηρος ἤ τι τῶν τεχνιτῶν καὶ ποικίλων, ἀλλ' ὅλον τοῦ νοῦ τὸ ἔργον καὶ διὰ θεωρίας ἡ ἀνάβασις. Τούτῳ παραστήσομαι, τούτῳ θύσω δεκτά, θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν καὶ ὁλοκαυτώματα, κρείττονα τῶν νῦν προσαγομένων, **ὅσῳ κρεῖττον σκιᾶς ἀλήθεια**· περὶ οὗ μοι δοκεῖ καὶ Δαβὶδ ὁ μέγας φιλοσοφεῖν, λέγων· « Καὶ εἰσελεύσομαι πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ εὐφραίνοντος τὴν πνευματικήν μου νεότητα » (Ps 42,4).

(160) Or.45,23 (*PG* 36,653C-656A): Μεταληψόμεθα δὲ τοῦ Πάσχα, νῦν μὲν **τυπικῶς** ἔτι, καὶ εἰ τοῦ παλαιοῦ γυμνότερον (τὸ γὰρ νομικὸν Πάσχα, τολμῶ καὶ λέγω, **τύπου τύπος ἦν ἀμυδρότερος**)· μικρὸν δὲ ὕστερον, τελεώτερον καὶ καθαρώτερον, ἡνίκα ἂν αὐτὸ πίνῃ καινὸν μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Λόγος ἐν

(3) *Conclusion*

For the greater part, Gregory keeps to the traditional typology in his approach to the biblical salvation history: the christological, the sacramental and the eschatological forms reach back to the N.T. (the above quoted Pauline and pseudo-Pauline passages appeared to be a source of inspiration for Gregory). The continuation of the historical typology in the present is an extension of this.

2) Γράμμα and πνεῦμα

A passage from the Πρὸς παρθένους παραινετικός shows how close the connection and how vague the dividing line is between the above discussed soteriological vision and the textual interpretation examined here:

> Ὅτ' ἦν νόμος, καὶ **σκιαί**, καὶ πρόσκαιροι λατρεῖαι (Heb.8,5 and 10,1),
> Τότ' εἶχε πρῶτα καὶ γάμος, ὡς ἔτι νηπιώδης (Gal.4,1)·
> Ὅτε δ' ὑπεξῆλθε τὸ **γράμμα**, τὸ **πνεῦμ'** ἀντεισήχθη (2Cor.3,6),...
> *In the period of the law, and the shadows, and the temporary liturgies,*
> *marriage occupied the first place then, since this fits in with a childlike disposition,*
> *but when the letter disappeared, and the spirit replaced it,...* (161).

(1) *κάμνομεν νοῆσαι καὶ μικρὸν βάθος*

In his indictment of illiterate and unprepared bishops, Gregory refutes the « fisherman argument » by referring to the difficult texts which have after all been written by the apostles and evangelists:

> Κἀκεῖνο δ' εἰπέ, πῶς ἀπαιδεύτους καλεῖς,
> ὧν τοιοῦτοι λόγοι τε καὶ συγγράμματα,
> ὧν κάμνομεν νοῆσαι καὶ μικρὸν βάθος,
> οἱ τοῖς λόγοις ἄνωθεν ἐντεθραμμένοι (1Tim.4.6),
> εἰς οὓς λόγος τοσοῦτος αὖθις καὶ πόνος,
> ὡς μεστὰ πάντα τυγχάνειν πονημάτων
> γλώσσης τε πάσης καὶ φρενὸς εὐμαθεστέρας,
> καρπὸν φερούσης ὕψος ἐξηγήσεων;

τῇ βασιλεία τοῦ Πατρός, ἀποκαλύπτων καὶ διδάσκων, **ἃ νῦν μετρίως παρέδειξε.**

(161) I,2,3, vv.27-29 (*PG* 37,635). As pointed out (p.242), Origen referred to this sentence from the second Epistle to the Corinthians when laying down his theory of the two-fold significance of the Scripture.

Furthermore, answer me this. Can you describe as untutored
the authors of writings
the tiniest profundity of which we must labor to elucidate,
we who have long been trained in letters?
On those writings so much study and labor have been expended
that the whole world is filled with commentaries
in every language, works of superior quality,
fruitful, the highest flights of exegesis (162).

In the poem Εἰς τὰ ἔμμετρα, then, he complains about the Scripture's openness to multiple interpretation, which led to the fact that various aberrations all (can) appeal to Bible texts (163). A correct interpretation is thus difficult but important. Which rules does Gregory apply?

(2) ἡ συνήθεια τῆς Γραφῆς: literal and figurative

A first condition is a correct comprehension of the text as such, for which Gregory applies a **philological method**: close attention to the *grammatical and stylistic singularities of the biblical language* (συνήθεια τῆς Γραφῆς) can help to avoid a wrong interpretation. Thus, he clarifies *anthropomorphic imagery* and *metaphors* by means of the principles of figurative expression (τῆς τροπῆς νόμοις) (164), common in the Scripture; he challenges the Apollinarian interpretation of the introductory words of the Gospel according to John (Ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο) by explaining that the frequent rhetorical device of the *synecdoche* is employed here (165):

---

(162) II,1,12, vv.230-237 (*PG* 37,1183, translation MEEHAN, *three poems* p.56, slightly adapted according to Meier's text: the Maurist text, translated by Meehan, gives λάθος in v.232).

(163) II,1,39, vv.12-21 (*PG* 37,1330-1): Εἰ γὰρ τοσαύτας αἱ Γραφαὶ δεδώκασι / Λαβὰς (...) / Κόσμου ῥαγέντος εἰς τόσας διαστάσεις, / Πάντων τ᾽ ἔρεισμα τῆς ἑαυτῶν ἐκτροπῆς / Τούτους ἐχόντων τοὺς λόγους συμπροστάτας.

(164) E.g. I,2,25, vv.371-391 (*PG* 37,838-40), against people who excuse their own outbursts of anger by referring to God's biblical wrath: Θεὸν δ᾽ ἀκούων ἐν Γραφαῖς χολούμενον, / ... / Μὴ τοῦτο ποιοῦ τοῦ πάθους παρήγορον / ... / Καλῶς ἄκουε, μὴ κακῶς, τοῦ πράγματος. / Πάσχει γὰρ οὐδὲν ὧν ἐγὼ πάσχω Θεός. / ... / **Πῶς οὐν τυποῦται ταῦτα; τῆς τροπῆς νόμοις**. Or.17,1 (*PG* 35,964B-965A) starts with a quotation from Jeremiah: « Τὴν κοιλίαν μου, τὴν κοιλίαν μου ἀλγῶ, καὶ τὰ αἰσθητήρια τῆς καρδίας μου μαιμάσσει », φησί που τῶν ἑαυτοῦ λόγων Ἱερεμίας, explained somewhat further as a metaphor, « as there are many in the Scripture »: κοιλίαν μὲν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν ὀνομάζων, **κατὰ τοὺς τῆς τροπῆς νόμους**. Οὕτω γὰρ εὑρίσκω πολλαχοῦ τῆς Γραφῆς.

(165) Ep.101,55-59: Ἀλλ᾽ ἀπατῶνται ὑπὸ τοῦ γράμματος καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τῇ σαρκὶ προστρέχουσι, **τὴν συνήθειαν τῆς Γραφῆς ἀγνοοῦντες**. Ἡμεῖς αὐ-

he goes in for *semantics* by « philosophizing » περὶ πραγμάτων καὶ ὀνομάτων καὶ μάλιστα παρὰ τῇ τῆς Γραφῆς συνηθείᾳ (*on things and names, with special reference to Biblical usage*) (166). Furthermore, he devotes some attention to *etymology* (e.g. of Πάσχα), points to *ἀπὸ κοινοῦ* constructions, speaks of the sometimes peculiar *verbal tenses* παρὰ τῇ συνηθείᾳ τῆς θείας Γραφῆς, takes *polysemy* into account (e.g. of the verb δύναμαι) (167) .

It is remarkable that these pronouncements on the correct grammatical or figurative interpretation of the material meaning occur nearly exclusively in polemical passages, mostly against persons who hold on too strictly to the literal meaning (168):

> Τοσαύτης οὖν οὔσης διαφορᾶς ἐν τοῖς ὀνόμασι καὶ τοῖς πράγμασι, πῶς οὕτω σὺ λίαν δουλεύεις τῷ γράμματι, καὶ γίνῃ μετὰ τῆς Ἰουδαϊκῆς σοφίας, καὶ συλλαβαῖς ἀκολουθεῖς, ἀφεὶς τὰ πράγματα; *There really is a great deal of diversity inherent in names and things, so why are you so dreadfully servile to the letter, so much the partisan of Jewish lore, following the syllables while you let the facts go?* (169).

τοὺς καὶ τοῦτο διδάξομεν. (...) Ἀγνοοῦσι γὰρ οἱ ταῦτα λέγοντες ὅτι **συνεκδοχικῶς** τὰ τοιαῦτα ὀνομάζεται, ἀπὸ μέρους τοῦ παντὸς δηλουμένου.

(166) Or.31,21-23. The occasion for this is the (already discussed) problem of the divinity of the Spirit, which is not openly expressed in the Bible: Εἰ δὲ τὸ μὴ λίαν σαφῶς γεγράφθαι Θεὸν μηδὲ πολλάκις ὀνομαστί, ὥσπερ τὸν Πατέρα προτερον καὶ τὸν Υἱὸν ὕστερον, αἴτιόν σοι γίνεται βλασφημίας, καὶ τῆς περιττῆς ταύτης γλωσσαλγίας καὶ ἀσεβείας, ἡμεῖς σοι λύσομεν ταύτην τὴν βλάβην, μικρὰ **περὶ πραγμάτων καὶ ὀνομάτων καὶ μάλιστα παρὰ τῇ τῆς Γραφῆς συνηθείᾳ φιλοσοφήσαντες**. Τῶν πραγμάτων τὰ μὲν οὐκ ἔστι, λέγεται δέ· τὰ δὲ ὄντα οὐ λέγεται· τὰ δὲ οὔτε ἔστιν, οὔτε λέγεται· τὰ δὲ ἄμφω, καὶ ἔστι, καὶ λέγεται. Τούτων ἀπαιτεῖς με τὰς ἀποδείξεις; Παρασχεῖν ἕτοιμος (§§21-2, *PG* 36,157A).

(167) Respectively or.30,18: or.30,12: or.29,5 (cf. GALLAY, *Bible* p.324: the cause is the sometimes awkward Greek translation of the Hebrew conjugation which works with aspect but not with tense, but this, Gregory does not say / know, - an inept translation would imply a lack of inspiration of the Septuagint); or.30,10.

(168) I use « literal » here in contrast with « figurative », not with « spiritual ». GALLAY, *Bible* pp.322-325, does not distinguish sufficiently between the opposites literal-figurative and material-spiritual when he quotes some of the above philological passages to demonstrate that Gregory indeed took an exegetical middle course (or.45,12): with this middle course. Gregory clearly had in mind the middle between material and spiritual meaning.

(169) Or.31,24 (*PG* 36,160B, translation Wickham-Williams in NORRIS, *Faith* p.292).

(3) ἀπὸ τοῦ γράμματος ἐπὶ τὸ πνεῦμα: literal and spiritual

The philological method is necessary for the comprehension of the material significance of the text (σῶμα or γράμμα), but for Gregory, this is certainly not the only meaning: he sees also a spiritual significance (πνεῦμα).

Thus, Gregory repeatedly says about the Mosaic law that it has a **double meaning**: νομοθεσίαν διπλῆν, τὴν μὲν ἐν γράμματι, τὴν δὲ ἐν πνεύματι (170). This goes for the Old Testament law, but also for the evangelical message: Gregory's interpretation of Matt.19,12 (Jesus' words about the eunuchs for the Kingdom of heaven) runs as follows:

> Δοκεῖ μοι τῶν σωμάτων ἀποστὰς ὁ λόγος **τυποῦν διὰ τῶν σωμάτων τὰ ὑψηλότερα**. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ μέχρι τῶν σωματικῶν εὐνούχων στῆσαι τὸν λόγον, τυχὸν μικρόν τε καὶ λίαν ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀνάξιον λόγου· δεῖ δὲ ἡμᾶς ἐπινοῆσαί τι **τοῦ Πνεύματος ἄξιον**. *I think that the discourse would sever itself from the body, and represent higher things by bodily figures; for to stop the meaning at bodily eunuchs would be small and very weak, and unworthy of the Word; and we must understand in addition something worthy of the Spirit* (171).

This text clearly reveals a hierarchy from material to spiritual meaning. Not only in the ῥήματα does Gregory look for this stratification; he does so in the entire Bible. In his ἀπολογητικός, he mentions an old Jewish prohibition against allowing every book of the Bible to be read by everyone, because only at a ripe age is one able to discover the mystical beauty that is hidden behind sometimes ordinary exteriors:

> ὅτι μηδὲ πᾶσαν εὐθέως εἶναι παντὶ ληπτὴν καὶ τὰ μέγιστα ἂν τοὺς πολλοὺς κακῶσαι τῷ φαινομένῳ τὴν βαθυτέραν, ἀλλὰ τὰς μὲν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἀνεῖσθαι πᾶσι καὶ εἶναι κοινάς, **ὧν καὶ τὸ σωματικὸν οὐκ ἀδόκιμον**, τὰς δὲ μὴ ἄλλοις ἢ τοῖς ὑπὲρ εἰκοστὸν καὶ πέμπτον γεγονόσιν ἔτος πιστεύεσθαι, **ὅσαι δι' εὐτελοῦς τοῦ ἐνδύματος τὸ μυστικὸν κάλλος περικαλύπτουσιν**, ἆθλον φιλοπονίας καὶ λαμπροῦ βίου μόνοις τοῖς κεκαθαρμένοις τὸν νοῦν ὑπαστράπτον καὶ φανταζόμενον, ὡς μόλις δυναμένης τῆς ἡλικίας ταύτης **ὑπὲρ τὸ**

---

(170) Or.6,17 (*PG* 35,744C); compare I,1,9B vv.31-32: δῶκε νόμον πλαξὶν δὲ χαράξατο ἀμφοτέρωθεν / **κρυπτόν τ' ἀμφάδιόν τε**. and or.43,72 (*PG* 36,593B): Μωϋσῆς (...) νομοθετήσας **τὸν διπλοῦν νόμον**, τόν τε τοῦ γράμματος ἔξωθεν καὶ ὅσος ἔνδοθεν.

(171) Or.37,20 (*PG* 36,305B, translation Browne-Swallow p.343)

> **σῶμα** γενέσθαι καὶ **ἀναβῆναι καλῶς ἐπὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἀπὸ τοῦ γράμματος.**
> *since the whole of it* (i.e. the Scripture) *is not at once intelligible to everyone, and its more recondite parts would, by their apparent meaning, do a very great injury to most people. Some portions therefore, whose exterior is unexceptionable, are from the first permitted and common to all; while others are only entrusted to those who have attained their twenty-fifth year, viz., such as hide their mystical beauty under a mean-looking cloak, to be the reward of diligence and an illustrious life; flashing forth and presenting itself only to those whose mind has been purified, on the ground that even this age can hardly be superior to the body, and properly rise from the letter to the spirit* (172).

Gregory regrets that nothing similar exists in the customs of the Christians: without the least instruction (πρὶν Καινῆς καὶ Παλαιᾶς χαρακτῆρα γνωρίσαι, compare the paragraph about the συνήθεια τῆς Γραφῆς), without κάθαρσις (purification, asceticism), the Christians consider themselves as theologians:

> εὐθὺς ἐσμὲν σοφοὶ καὶ διδάσκαλοι καὶ ὑψηλοὶ τὰ θεῖα καὶ γραμματέων τὰ πρῶτα καὶ νομικῶν, καὶ χειροτονοῦμεν ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς οὐρανίους καὶ καλεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ῥαββὶ ζητοῦμεν, καὶ **οὐδαμοῦ τὸ γράμμα, καὶ πάντα δεῖ νοηθῆναι πνευματικῶς,** καὶ λῆρος πλατὺς τὰ ὀνείρατα, καὶ ἀγανακτοίημεν ἄν, εἰ μὴ σφόδρα ἐπαινοίμεθα.
> *we are at once wise teachers, of high estimation in Divine things, the first of scribes and lawyers; we ordain ourselves men of heaven and seek to be called Rabbi by men; and « the letter is worth nothing, and everything must be taken according to the spirit » and « pure nonsense, these reveries », and we would be angry were we not praised to the skies* (173).

---

(172) Or.2,48 (*PG* 35.456C-457A, translation Browne-Swallow, slightly adapted according to Bernardi's Greek text).

(173) Or.2,49 (*PG* 35.457C-460A, translation partly from Browne-Swallow p.215). The interpretation of the conclusion of this passage (from οὐδαμοῦ on, for which I gave my own translation) is problematic. Neither the Maurists nor their forerunners give any plausible interpretations: according to Bernardi, Gregory puts the first part into the mouth of the criticized « teachers », and then speaks himself to reprimand them: « 'la lettre ne mérite aucune considération: tout doit être compris spirituellement' - et toutes ces rêveries qui ne sont que pures balivernes - » (Bernardi, *SC 247* p.155). In my opinion, both statements are put into the mouths of would-be exegetes (the whole context is ironical), who take opposite views: some refuse to take anything literally, others despise every spiritual meaning as ὀνείρατα (compare or.45,12: ὀνειροκριτικόν on exaggerated allegorical explanation).

The Bible text thus consists of γράμμα and πνεῦμα (in the preceding text « corporeal - possibly even vulgar - frame » and « mystical beauty »): this is implicitly a plea for allegorical explanation, - without completely abandoning the letter - but on the understanding that some preparation is required. This preparation does not only consist of study, which is necessary, among other things for the philological method, but also of κάθαρσις; and ultimately, a full insight into the spiritual meaning of the text is a favour of God, and thus reserved for the happy few (174).

It is appropriate here to come back to the passage about the Mosaic law, which precedes the one about the exegetical middle course.

> Πάντα μὲν οὖν τὸν νόμον, σκιὰν εἶναι τῶν μελλόντων καὶ νοουμένων, ὁ θεῖος Ἀπόστολος πρὸ ἡμῶν ἀπεφήνατο (Col.2,17. Heb.10,1). Καὶ ὁ χρηματίσας πρὸ τούτου τῷ Μωϋσεῖ Θεός, ἡνίκα περὶ τούτων (sc. about Pesach) ἐνομοθέτει· « *Ὅρα* » γάρ, φησί, « *ποιήσεις πάντα κατὰ τὸν τύπον τὸν δειχθέντα σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει·* » (Ex 25.40. Heb.8,5) **σκιαγραφίαν τινὰ καὶ προχάραγμα** τῶν ἀοράτων **παραδεικνὺς** τὰ ὁρώμενα. Καὶ πείθομαι, μηδὲν εἰκῇ, μηδὲ ἀλογίστως, μηδὲ χαμερπῶς τούτων διατετάχθαι, μηδὲ ἀναξίως τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ νομοθεσίας, καὶ τῆς Μωϋσέως ὑπουργίας· εἰ καὶ **χαλεπὸν ἑκάστη τῶν σκιῶν, ἑκάστην ἐφευρεῖν θεωρίαν** εἰς λεπτὸν καταβαίνοντα. (...)· καὶ μόνοις εἶναι **θεωρητὰ** τοῖς κατὰ Μωϋσέα τὴν ἀρετήν, ἢ ὅτι ἐγγυτάτω τῆς ἐκείνου παιδεύσεως.
> *But before our time the Holy Apostle declared that the Law was but a shadow of things to come and which are conceived by thought. And God too, who in still older times gave oracles to Moses, said when giving laws concerning these things*(sc. about Pesach), *See thou make all things according to the pattern shewed thee in the Mount, when He shewed him the visible things as an adumbration of and design for the things that are invisible. And I am persuaded that none of these things has been ordered in vain, none without a reason, none in a grovelling manner or unworthy of the legislation of God and the ministry of Moses, even though it be difficult in each type to find a theory descending to the most delicate details* (...), *and though these are only to be understood by those who rank with Moses in virtue, or have made the nearest approach to his learning.*

---

(174) Cf. or.28,2 (*PG* 36,28D-29A): βούλεται γὰρ τούτων ἀποχωρήσας ὁ λόγος οὕτω πλαξὶ στερραῖς καὶ λιθίναις ἐγγράφεσθαι, καὶ ταύταις **ἀμφοτέρωθεν, διά τε τὸ φαινόμενον τοῦ νόμου καὶ τὸ κρυπτόμενον· τὸ μὲν τοῖς πολλοῖς καὶ κάτω μένουσι, τὸ δὲ τοῖς ὀλίγοις καὶ ἄνω φθάνουσιν.**

> (This is followed by the description of different degrees of κάθαρσις which determine to what extent one can attain this θεωρία; at the lowest level, we find the *unworthy persons, with a bestial nature*: ὅσοι θηριώδεις τὸν τρόπον, καὶ θείων μυστηρίων ἀνάξιοι) (175) .

The addition of καὶ νοουμένων in the first sentence is significant: the apostle does not say this (still, see τῶν ἐπουρανίων in Heb.8,5). In this way, Gregory puts two essentially different approaches of the Jewish law next to one another: the historical-typological one (σκιὰν τῶν μελλόντων, cf. supra: relation between Old and New Testament) and the a-historical-allegorizing one, which is the vision into which he enters at length in this passage. In this, the progressive revelation of truth is replaced by a hierarchy according to degrees of perfection: already Moses was acquainted with the truth, while the unworthy persons are still not aware of it now. Both this gnostic vision and the recognition of the difficulty of a detailed θεωρία are typical characteristics of Origen's mode of thought (176).

What about Origen's famous **threefold meaning** of the Scripture? In Moreschini's view, Gregory rejects this (cf. supra n.139). Still, we cannot find any direct indications of this in his œuvre. On the contrary, we find that Gregory twice quotes the proverb upon which Origen based his theory of the three meanings (Prv 22,20: καὶ σὺ δὲ ἀπόγραψαι αὐτὰ σεαυτῷ τρισσῶς / εἰς βουλὴν καὶ γνῶσιν ἐπὶ τὸ πλάτος τῆς καρδίας σου): once in connection with the θεωρία (contemplation), whereby he distinguishes three kinds of λόγος, for an increasingly limited audience (177); a second time with regard to Basil's exegesis, which spurred him on not to acquiesce in the interpretation of the letter, but to look for an ever deeper meaning (178). Despite the fact that, in these passages, neither Origen's name, nor his three terms (somatic, psychic and pneumatic (179)) are mentioned, I could hardly imagine that the doctrine of the three meanings is not suggested here. The fact that Gregory does not apply this distinction systematically does not necessarily mean that he refutes it: similarly in the case of Origen himself, eventually only γράμμα and πνεῦμα were consistently distinguished.

---

(175) Or.45,11 (*PG* 36,637A-B, translation BROWNE-SWALLOW p.426).

(176) Cf. respectively DANIÉLOU, *Message* pp.262-263 and HARL p.359.

(177) Or.32,24 (*PG* 36,201B): Ὁ μέν τις πλουτεῖ θεωρίᾳ καὶ ὑπὲρ τοὺς πολλοὺς αἴρεται καὶ **πνευματικὰ συγκρίνει πνευματικοῖς**, καὶ ἀπογράφεται **τρισσῶς** ἐπὶ « τὸ πλάτος τῆς καρδίας » τὸν πάντας οἰκοδομοῦντα λόγον, καὶ τὸν πολλοὺς καὶ τὸν τινὰς ἀντὶ πλειόνων ἢ πάντων.

(178) Or.43,67 (*PG* 36,585B): Ὅταν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐξηγήσεσιν, ἃς τοῖς μικρὰ βλέπουσιν ἀναπτύσσει, **τρισσῶς ἐν ταῖς στερραῖς ἑαυτοῦ πλαξὶ τῆς καρδίας ἀπογραψάμενος**, πείθομαι **μὴ μέχρι τοῦ γράμματος ἵστασθαι**, μηδὲ βλέπειν τὰ ἄνω μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ περαιτέρω διαβαίνειν καὶ εἰς βάθος ἔτι χωρεῖν ἐκ βάθους, ἄβυσσον ἀβύσσῳ προσκαλούμενος καὶ φωτὶ φῶς εὑρίσκων, μέχρις ἂν φθάσω πρὸς τὸ ἀκρότατον. In his commentary on this passage,

(4) Allegorical explanation of Bible vs. myths

In the text about the Jewish use (see p.261), mention was made of biblical texts ὅσαι δι' εὐτελοῦς τοῦ ἐνδύματος τὸ μυστικὸν κάλλος περικαλύπτουσιν. Now, this was exactly what Gregory reproached the pagan myths for: the allegorical explanation serves as an extenuation of the scandalous cloak. It seems rather inconsistent, then, to make use of the allegorical method to interpret the Bible.

In the two texts which attack the allegorical explanation of myths most viciously, Gregory himself discusses this problem (180). He admits that the Bible also contains texts with a double meaning (εἰσὶ καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν κατ' ἐπίκρυψιν λόγοι τινές, οὐκ ἀρνήσομαι = Ἔστι καὶ ἡμετέροισι διπλοῦς λόγος). Yet deeper meaning and phrasing are both of the same quality (χαράγματος ἠγαθέοιο ἄμφω... Ἀλλ' ἔμπης μύθοισιν ἐμοῖς καὶ σῶμα φαεινόν, / Ψυχὴν ἀμφὶς ἔχον θεοειδέα διπλόον εἷμα) or the phrasing is at least not pernicious for the common reader (οὐ φαύλῃ τῇ ἐσθῆτι περικαλύπτεται. Δεῖ γάρ... ἢ τὸ κάλλιστον πάντως ἔχειν ἢ μὴ τὸ αἴσχιστον = Αἶσχος δ' οὐδὲν ἔπεστιν, ὅ μοι Θεὸν ἀμφικαλύπτει. The hidden sense is reserved for the small group of σοφοί (ἵνα τὸ μὲν τοὺς σοφωτέρους εὐφραίνῃ, τὸ δὲ μὴ βλάπτῃ τοὺς πλείονας = ὁ μὲν παύροισιν, ὁ δὲ πλεόνεσσι θεητός). The purpose of this kind of presentation is to incite to mental exertion, so that the acquired knowledge lasts longer (Οἴομαι, ὥς κεν ἔχωσι σοφοὶ πλέον, ἠὲ λαβόντες / Μόχθῳ κατίσχωσι. Τὸ δ' οὐ σχετὸν, ὅττι τάχιστον). On

---

Boulenger p.cx explains « littérale, morale, allégorique », with a cautious reference to Origen.

(179) Which does not signify that he does not know the three sorts of people, as appears from I,2,34, vv.242-244 (*PG* 37,963): Ὁ ψυχικὸς δ' ἄνθρωπος, οὐδέπω καλός· / Ὁ σαρκικὸς δὲ, καὶ λίαν πάθους φίλος· / Ὁ πνευματικὸς δ', οὐ μακρὰν τοῦ πνεύματος.

(180) Or.4,118-119 (*PG* 35,657B-660A) and II,2,7, vv.138-146 (*PG* 37,1561-2). The argumentation in the two texts is highly similar, as appears from the following quotations.

the other hand, there are the myths, of which both aspects are baleful (ὑμῖν δὲ οὔτε τὸ νοούμενον ἀξιόπιστον καὶ τὸ προβεβλημένον ὀλέθριον).

Hence, it is clear that Gregory does not challenge the allegorical method as such, since he concedes that there are indeed texts with a double meaning. His reproach of the myths comes down to on the one hand the scandalous and injurious nature of the presentation, and on the other, the (theological) untruth of the « actual meaning ».

Within the two polemical texts, the logic is balanced. The inconsistency comes in when one compares these texts with the pronouncement of or.2, where he admits in identical terms (περικαλύπτουσιν) that certain Bible texts should be kept away from young persons because of their harmful presentation. The fundamental criticism of τὸ νοούμενον of the Greek myths does persist though: the Bible always has a μυστικὸν κάλλος.

More interesting than the question of whether the repudiation of the allegorical explanation of myths is paradoxical or not, seems the observation of the *absence* of an argument: Gregory does not posit that the allegorical explanation of the Bible be applied to a *historical* book. The myths, which are assumed to be fictitious stories both by Gregory and by the pagan theologians, could be replaced by innocent stories or direct statements about the deity, which cannot be done with historical events. Yet Gregory does not use this historicity as an argument (just as the fictional nature of the Greek myths is no point of criticism, for that matter, cf. p.229). With regard to defining the *object* which he interprets, this seems to me to be of fundamental significance. He considers (here at least) the Bible as a *text* which has to be deciphered. Accordingly, in this controversy he also does not say that the literal meaning is maintained in the interpretation of the Bible, whereas it is rejected in the allegorical explanation of myths.

According to de Lubac, among others, precisely these two elements (interpretation of *history* and adhering to the *literal historical meaning*) form the essential characteristics of the « allegorie chrétienne », which distinguish it sharply from the pagan allegorism. Nothing points to the fact that Gregory would have been aware of this distinction (except perhaps the use of the term ἀλληγορία): he does not contest that interpreters of Homer and Bible exegetes employ the same hermeneutic technique.

(5) Conclusion

Unquestionably, Gregory considers the Bible as a text with several, hierarchic meanings. In a philological manner, he devotes attention to the correct conception of the text. He shares this attention with the Antiochenes, but not exclusively with them. He acquired his technical arsenal of concepts during his rhetorical education.

The truly important opposition is not the one between literal and figurative (which remains on the level of the material, *somatic* meaning), but that between literal and spiritual, γράμμα and πνεῦμα, ἀμφάδιον and κρυπτόν. Here, the traditional historical typology is abandoned. The spiritual meaning, or meanings - he does not preclude the doctrine of the three meanings - requires a higher degree of κάθαρσις, and is accessible only to a minority.

The literal meaning is sometimes a « vulgar cloak »; Gregory does not state anything specifically on the question of whether it should always be considered as historical. He does repudiate the viewpoint that « the letter is worth nothing ». Allegorism does not exclude historical interpretation. Yet, in his defence of the allegorical explanation of the Bible against that of myths, he emphasizes only that the literal meaning is of a certain beauty or at least is harmless, not that it is *historically true*.

For this allegorism, Gregory does not dispose of a fixed terminology: he uses expressions with on the one hand γράμμα or σῶμα and on the other πνεῦμα, calls the activity ἀναγωγή (181) or θεωρία, at times also speaks of τύπος or τυπόω, even though these last terms are used especially in historical typology. The term τροπολογία is not found in Gregory; with τροπή, he simply means imagery. It is remarkable that he never uses ἀλληγορία or related terms for the allegorical explanation of the Bible, but does so (twice) for the allegorical explanation of myths (182). The term had apparently fallen into discredit already (183). On the other hand, the terms ἀλληγορία and θεωρία are not opposed, as in the Antiochene tradition: the latter term too, he uses for the disputed allegorical explanation of myths (184).

---

(181) See e.g. or.45,16 (*PG* 36,645B): χρονικῶς τε καὶ ἀναγωγικῶς.

(182) Or.4,115 (*PG* 35,653C): ἀλληγορήματα καὶ τερατεύματα and or.4,119 (*PG* 35,657D): ληρήσεις καὶ ἀλληγορήσεις.

(183) But, as indicated already, the use of it was also avoided by the early Apologists (cf. supra n.112).

(184) E.g. or.4,115 and 117 (*PG* 35,656C): θεωρίας ὑπερνεφοῦς.

C. Gregory as an exegete

Gregory's expositions show that he considers both the historical typology and the a-historical allegorical explanation as legitimate approaches of the biblical events and text. Below, I illustrate how he puts this into practice. It is not my intention to find out his possibly original position in the reception history of some specific scriptural passage or other.

I first discuss the relatively rare cases in which he provides an extensive exegesis of certain episodes or pericopes: sometimes, this forms the subject of the argument, yet it can also be a means to support the argument. After that, I quote some oblique remarks on casually quoted Bible quotations or allusions. Finally, I also touch upon Gregory's interpretation of parables.

1) Extensive interpretations

(1) Exegesis of pericopes forming the subject of the argument

I,2,34, vv.189-221

In this part of the Ὅροι παχυμερεῖς, Gregory gives a survey of the most important episodes in Jesus' life (185). The soteriological key-note is set in the first verse:

> Χριστοῦ δ᾽ ἐνανθρώπησις, ἄλλη μου πλάσις.
> *Christ's incarnation is another creation of me.*

This is followed by the description of the meaning from crib to cross, in lapidary form:

> Ἐκ μὲν γυναικὸς ἦλθεν, εἰς Εὔας χάριν·
> Ἐκ παρθένου δέ·(...)
>   Ἡ δ᾽ ἀπογραφὴ
> Τῆς θείας αὖθις ἐγγραφῆς εἶχε **τύπον**.
> Ἡ σπαργάνωσις, ἀντὶ τῆς γυμνώσεως.
> Φόνος δὲ παίδων, νηπίων ἄρσις **τύπων**.
> Ἀστὴρ τρέχων δέ, προσκύνησις κτίσεως.
> *He arose from a woman, to bring mercy to Eve:*
> *but from a virgin; (...)*
>   *The census*
> *was a figure of the registration in the divine records.*
> *The wrapping in clothes: because of the nakedness.*

---

(185) Thus also in or.2,24-25.

> *The Massacre of the Innocents: the removal of the childlike forms.*
> *The course of the star: the worship by the Creation* (186).

He carries on in this manner for over twenty verses and episodes: the worship of the sages symbolizes the conversion of the heathen, the wood of the cross replaces the wood of the tree (of Eden); the passion especially is explained in great detail (vv.204-220). The different interpretations alternate: historical typology from O.T. to N.T. (Eve - Mary; nakedness - clothes); eschatological typology from N.T. to the Last Judgement (ἀπογραφή - ἐγγραφή); a remarkable positive allegorical explanation of the Massacre of the Innocents as a symbol of the surpassing of the O.T. by the N.T.; cosmic allegorical explanation. The exegetical techniques vary, but all aim at one and the same purpose: emphasizing the soteriological meaning of the incarnation.

Or.37, about Matt.19,1-12

The only preserved exegetical homily deals with Jesus' answer to the Pharisees' question about divorce. Because of the nature of the pericope, Gregory's commentary is mainly moralizing (with a notably severe rejection of Roman law in this matter and of the double moral standard (187)). As usual, he explains the text verse by verse. In this way, he can seize upon the first verse (ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου) to emphasize the difference between γράμμα and πνεῦμα once more, and to insert a christological digression:

> Εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν μεθίσταται, ἵνα πείσῃ τοῦ γράμματος ἐξαναστάντας ἀκολουθῆσαι τῷ πνεύματι. (...) Μεταβαίνει τόπον ἐκ τόπου ὁ μηδενὶ τόπῳ χωρούμενος, ὁ ἄχρονος, ὁ ἀσώματος, ὁ ἀπερίληπτος. *He removeth to Judea in order that He may persuade people to rise up from the Letter and to follow the Spirit. (...) He removeth from place to place, Who is not contained in any place; the timeless, the bodiless, the uncircumscript* (188).

A truly allegorical explanation is given only when the eunuchs are discussed (§§16-21), cf. p.261: Δοκεῖ μοι τῶν σωμάτων ἀποστὰς ὁ λόγος τυποῦν διὰ τῶν σωμάτων τὰ ὑψηλότερα (189). Yet it is a matter of the explanation of ῥήματα here, of which the evangelist himself already indicated that not everyone can understand them just like that (Matt.19,12: ὁ δυνάμενος χωρεῖν χωρείτω).

---

(186) I,2,34, vv.189, 192-198 (*PG* 37,959).

(187) About this emphasizing of the equality of man and woman in marriage - which is exceptional in Gregory as well - see ETTLINGER, *Dignity*.

(188) Or.37,2 (*PG* 36,284C, translation BROWNE-SWALLOW p.338).

Or.41,15-17, about Acts 2,1-13

In this concluding passage of the Pentecost oration, the subject of discussion is not ῥήματα but πράγματα, an incident: the glossolalia. Gregory deals with two problems in this text. A first is Acts 2,6 (ἤκουον εἷς ἕκαστος τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ λαλούντων αὐτῶν). The correct literal meaning of the text is problematical, which he connects with the possibilities of punctuation:

> Ἤκουον δέ. Μικρὸν ἐνταῦθα ἐπίσχες, καὶ διαπόρησον, πῶς διαιρήσεις τὸν λόγον. Ἔχει γάρ τι ἀμφίβολον ἡ λέξις, τῇ στιγμῇ διαιρούμενον.
> *But they heard. Here stop a little and raise a question, how you are to divide the words? For the expression has an ambiguity, which is to be determined by the punctuation* (190).

Either they each heard their own language, through a sort of simultaneous translation process (191), or else the apostles indeed spoke different languages. Gregory prefers the polyglot over the acoustic miracle, since the apostles were accused of drunkenness in Acts 2,13.

What matters here is the philological-grammatical approach to the text: the syntactic ambiguity is resolved by the context. The historicity of the literal meaning is beyond all doubt, and it is the only one which is discussed.

The second problem is of a historical nature, and arises as a result of the phrase « the Jews from every nation under heaven »:

> ἄξιον ἰδεῖν τίνες τε ἦσαν οὗτοι καὶ τῆς ποίας αἰχμαλωσίας.
> *it is worthwhile to see who these were and of what captivity.*

After eliminating the Egyptian, the Babylonian and the Roman Captivities (the last of which was still to come), Gregory opts for the one under Antiochus. Yet, apparently this is of no great importance to him:

---

(189) KERTSCH, *esegesi*, places Gregory's interpretation of the different kinds of eunuchs « nella tradizione origenistica » (p.110), and stresses « il colorito fortemente alessandrino » (p.111).

(190) Or.41,15 (*PG* 36,449B, translation BROWNE-SWALLOW p.384).

(191) Gregory's formulation of this (*ibidem*) is quite noteworthy: Ἆρα γὰρ ἤκουον ταῖς ἑαυτῶν διαλέκτοις ἕκαστος, ὡς φέρε εἰπεῖν, μίαν μὲν ἐξηχεῖσθαι φωνήν, πολλὰς δὲ ἀκούεσθαι, οὕτω **κτυπουμένου τοῦ ἀέρος** καί, ἵν' εἴπω σαφέστερον, τῆς φωνῆς φωνῶν γινομένων.

> Εἰ δὲ τις ταύτην μὲν οὐ προσίεται τὴν ἐξήγησιν, ὡς περιεργοτέραν (...), ζητεῖ δὲ τὴν πιθανωτέραν...
> *But if any does not accept this explanation, as being too elaborate (...), and is looking for a more reliable...* (192).

Gregory concludes this exclusively grammatical-historical exegesis by mentioning that it was intended for the inquisitive part of his audience, τοῖς φιλομαθέσιν.

Or.45,10-21, about Ex 12

This exegesis of the Jewish law concerning the Passover is meant for the same inquiring minds: τοῖς φιλομαθέσι καὶ φιλοκάλοις (§10).

Gregory starts with etymology: the Hebrew word Φάσκα means διάβασις,

> **ἱστορικῶς** μέν, διὰ τὴν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου πρὸς τὴν Χαναναίαν φυγὴν καὶ μετανάστασιν· **πνευματικῶς** δέ, διὰ τὴν ἐκ τῶν κάτω πρὸς τὰ ἄνω (...) πρόοδον καὶ ἀνάβασιν.
> *Historically, from their flight and migration from Egypt into the Land of Canaan; spiritually, from the progress and ascent from things below to things above* (193).

The word has been Hellenized through metathesis to Πάσχα, and was connected with the passion of Christ, he continues.

This is followed by the passages already discussed about the general meaning of the Jewish law (σκιὰν τῶν μελλόντων καὶ νοουμένων, cf. p.263) and Gregory's exegetical « middle course » (p.249). After a situation of the law in the οἰκονομία (a cautious intermediate step), the prescriptions about eating the passover lamb are analysed in detail. For this, he uses numerical symbols

---

(192) Or.41,17 (*PG* 36,452B, translation Browne-Swallow p.385). Ettlinger, *Personality* pp.113-114 remarks on this relativizing explanation that « This is an approach taken by few ancient exegetes. » In Gregory, this approach can also be found in other passages: in or.30,16 (*PG* 36,124C), he reports an attempt at interpreting Mark 13,32. And if he has not convinced his audience yet, he is prepared to give it another try: Εἰ μὲν οὖν οὗτος αὐτάρκης ὁ λόγος, ἐνταῦθα στησόμεθα, καὶ μηδὲν πλέον ἐπιζητείσθω· εἰ δὲ μή, τό γε δεύτερον,...

(193) Or.45,10 (*PG* 36,636B, translation Browne-Swallow p.426).

(e.g. five = senses) (194), the usual christological typology (e.g. prohibition against breaking a bone of the lamb, Ex 12,10 and 46 = κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν John 19,33) (195), ecclesiological typology (e.g. prohibition against taking any of the flesh outside the house. Ex 12,46 = prohibition against the profanation of our mysteries) (196), many moral allegorical explanations (e.g. Egypt = our sinfulness) (197), and especially many anagogic allegorical explanations (e.g. the doorposts smeared with blood, Ex 12,7 = πρᾶξις καὶ λόγος, εἴτουν ἕξις καὶ ἐνέργεια) (198). This spiritual meaning is explicitly designated as the law's purpose:

> Ἄξιον δὲ μηδὲ τὸν τῆς βρώσεως τρόπον παραδραμεῖν, ὅτι μηδὲ ὁ νόμος, ἄχρι καὶ τούτου, **τὴν θεωρίαν φιλοπονῶν ἐν τῷ γράμματι**.
> *Nor would it be right for us to pass over the manner of this eating either, for the Law does not do so, but carries its mystical labour even to this point in the literal enactment* (199).

---

(194) §14 (*PG* 36,641C): Τῇ δεκάτῃ δὲ τοῦ μηνός· οὗτος γὰρ ἀριθμῶν πληρέστατος, ἐκ μονάδων πρώτη μονὰς τελεία, καὶ γεννητικὴ τελειότητος. Διατηρεῖται δὲ εἰς **πέμπτην** ἡμέραν, ἴσως ὅτι καθαρτικὸν αἰσθήσεων τὸ ἐμὸν θῦμα, ἐξ ὧν τὸ πταίειν, καὶ περὶ ἃς ὁ πόλεμος, εἰσδεχομένας τὸ κέντρον τῆς ἁμαρτίας.
§15 (*PG* 36,641C): **επταήμερος** (οὗτος γὰρ **μυστικώτατος ἀριθμῶν**).

(195) §16 (*PG* 36.645B): ἐῶ γὰρ λέγειν, ὅτι μηδὲ, **κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν**, τοῦ Ἰησοῦ συνετρίβη, καί τοί γε τοῦ θανάτου τοῖς σταυρωταῖς ἐπισπευδομένου, διὰ τὸ Σάββατον. Gregory passes over it, probably because this « fulfilment » is already indicated in the Gospel itself (John 19,36).

(196) §16 (*PG* 36,645A-B): Οὐκ ἐξοίσομεν δὲ οὐδὲν, οὐδὲ εἰς τὸ πρωῒ καταλείψομεν· ὅτι μηδὲ ἐκφορὰ τοῖς ἔξω τὰ πολλὰ τῶν ἡμετέρων μυστηρίων, μηδὲ ὑπὲρ τὴν νύκτα ταύτην ἔστι τις κάθαρσις.

(197) §15 (*PG* 36,644A): Ἐντεῦθεν Αἴγυπτον φεύγομεν, τὴν σκυθρωπὴν καὶ διώκτριαν ἁμαρτίαν, καὶ Φαραὼ τὸν ἀόρατον τύραννον.

(198) §15 (*PG* 36,644B): Ἐντεῦθεν ὁ ἀμνὸς σφαγιάζεται, καὶ σφραγίζονται τῷ τιμίῳ αἵματι πρᾶξις καὶ λόγος, εἴτουν ἕξις καὶ ἐνέργεια, αἱ τῶν ἡμετέρων θυρῶν παραστάτιδες, λέγω δὴ τῶν τοῦ νοῦ κινημάτων τε καὶ δογμάτων, καλῶς ἀνοιγομένων καὶ κλειομένων ἐκ θεωρίας. Compare or.16,11 (*PG* 35,948D): χρῖσαι τὰς τοῦ νοῦ φλιὰς ἄμεινον, θεωρίαν καὶ πρᾶξιν, τῇ μεγάλῃ καὶ σωτηρίῳ σφραγῖδι, τῷ τῆς Καινῆς Διαθήκης αἵματι. RUETHER p.104 quotes this passage - wrongly, I think - as an example of *typology*. Another example of spiritual allegorical explanation: the interpretation of the girding of the loins (Ex 12,11): Ζητῶ, τί κοινὸν ὀσφύϊ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ; (...) Μήποτε ὡς τοῦ θεωρητικοῦ τὸ ἐπιθυμητικὸν περισφίγγοντος, καὶ οὐκ ἐῶντος ἀλλαχοῦ φέρεσθαι; (§18, *PG* 36,649A).

(199) Or.45.17 (*PG* 36,645C, translation BROWNE-SWALLOW p.429). Thus, the Jewish law also becomes a Christian possession: Εἰσηγοῦμαι τι καὶ τῶν οὐκ ἐμῶν, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ λίαν ἐμῶν, ἂν **πνευματικῶς** θεωρῇς (§20, *PG* 36,652A).

The exegesis is concluded with a moral exhortation with images from Exodus, and a recapitulation: *that* is the mystery of Easter (200).

This entire chapter from Exodus is explained down to the smallest detail, without any attention for the literal meaning. Sometimes, this even seems to be rejected, for example with regard to the unleavened bread (201). Furthermore, it is remarkable that typological and allegorical interpretation are used alternately, sometimes concerning the same detail (202). The whole exegesis seems directed in particular at parenetic usefulness.

(2) Exegesis of biblical passages supporting the argument

I,1,8, vv.97-122 and or.38,12 (203), about Gn 2-3

In both texts, Gregory tells the Eden story (204). In the poem περὶ ψυχῆς this is incorporated into a treatment of the origin of sinfulness, in the oration εἰς τὰ Θεοφάνια into a survey of salvation history as introduction to the discussion of the incarnation. With regard to a few details, an interpreting description is added, similar in both texts, but usually somewhat more discreet in the prose version. In this way, the following items are explained allegorically:

---

(200) §21 (*PG* 36,652C-D): Ἂν οὕτω ποιῇς, καὶ οὕτως ἐξέλθῃς Αἴγυπτον, εὖ οἶδα, στύλῳ πυρὸς καὶ νεφέλης ὁδηγηθήσῃ νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας. (...) τἄλλα τε ὅσα ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ σὺν τούτοις ἱστόρηται, ἵνα μὴ μακρὸν ἀποτείνω λόγον, παρὰ Θεοῦ σοι δοθήσεται. Τοιαύτην ἑορτὴν ἑορτάζεις σήμερον· τοιοῦτον ἑστιᾷ τὸ ἐπὶ σοὶ τοῦ γεννηθέντος γενέθλιον, καὶ τοῦ παθόντος ἐπιτάφιον· τοιοῦτόν σοι τὸ τοῦ Πάσχα **μυστήριον.** Ταῦτα ὁ νόμος ὑπέγραφε· ταῦτα Χριστὸς ἐτελείωσεν, **ὁ τοῦ γράμματος καταλυτής, ὁ τελειωτὴς τοῦ Πνεύματος.**

(201) §15 (*PG* 36,644C): Ἐντεῦθεν ἄρσις τῆς ζύμης ἑπταήμερος (...), τῆς παλαιᾶς καὶ ὀξώδους κακίας (οὐ γὰρ τῆς ἀρτοποιοῦ τε καὶ ζωτικῆς)· ἵνα μηδὲν Αἰγύπτιον ἐπισιτιζώμεθα φύραμα, καὶ λείψανον Φαρισαϊκῆς καὶ ἀθέου διδασκαλίας. Cf. DEVOLDER p.149 n.117 about the whole passage: » Il nous montre aussi par le ton adopté, qu'il ne faut pas prendre au pied de la lettre le « côté légendaire » des saintes Ecritures. «

(202) Thus e.g. §16 (*PG* 36,645B), the spiritual explanation about the prohibition against breaking the bones: Ὅσον δὲ ὀστῶδες καὶ ἄβρωτον, καὶ ἡμῖν δυσθεώρητον, οὐδὲ συντριβήσεται, κακῶς διαιρούμενον καὶ νοούμενον. For the typological one, cf. n.195.
Gregory does actually use different hermeneutic techniques; BERNARDI, *Prédication* p.248 does not distinguish between these: « Toute cette exégèse est conduite par l'application méthodique de l'interprétation allégorique, ou plus exactement typologique. »

(203) *PG* 37,454-6 (translation SYKES, *translation*) and *PG* 36,324 (translation BROWNE-SWALLOW p.348).

(204) About Gregory's general interpretation of the creation of man, and the causes and results of his fall (i.e. about his overall interpretation of Gn 2-3), see especially the excellent study by ALTHAUS, more specifically pp.42-122; further also SZYMUSIAK, *péché* and ELLVERSON pp.17-73.

1. the garden itself: heavenly life?

> Ζωὴ δ' οὐρανίη **πέλεται** παράδεισος **ἔμοιγε** (v.105)
> *The life of heaven is, I think, paradise.*
>
> > Τοῦτον ἔθετο μὲν ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ, **ὅστις ποτὲ ἦν** ὁ παράδεισος οὗτος,
> > *This being He placed in Paradise, whatever the Paradise may have been,*

2. man as γεωργός: of divine words and thoughts?

> Τοῦ ῥά μιν ἐντὸς ἔθηκε λόγων δρηστῆρα γεωργόν. (v.106)
> *Here the Son set him as a labouring farmer to perform divine commands.*
>
> > φυτῶν ἀθανάτων γεωργόν, θείων ἐννοιῶν **ἴσως**, τῶν τε ἁπλουστέρων καὶ τῶν τελεωτέρων,...
> > *to till the immortal plants, by which is meant perhaps the Divine Conceptions, both the simpler and the more perfect.*

3. the forbidden tree: (untimely) θεωρία?

> > θεωρία γὰρ ἦν τὸ φυτόν, **ὡς ἡ ἐμὴ θεωρία** (205), ἧς μόνοις ἐπιβαίνειν ἀσφαλὲς τοῖς τὴν ἕξιν τελεωτέροις (206).
> > *for the tree was, according to my theory, Contemplation, upon which it is only safe for those who have reached maturity of habit to enter.*

4. coats of skins = σὰρξ βαρεῖα: mortality? « corporeality »? (207)

> Ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ (...)
> Γεύσατο μὲν καρποῖο πρόωρος ἡδυβόροιο,

---

(205) Compare, with reference to an unmentioned source, II,1,88, vv.170-173 (*PG* 37.1442): Ξύλῳ πάλιν πρόσελθε / Ζωῆς ἀεὶ μενούσης. / **Ἡ δ' ἔστιν, ὡς ἀνεῦρον.** / Γνῶσις Θεοῦ μεγίστου.

(206) I opted for the Maurists text here (Moreschini gives μόνης... τοὺς ... τελεωτέρους).

(207) The first explanation is that of Methodius, the second, that of Philo (cf. Pépin, *allégorie* pp.153-154) and probably of Origen (cf. Moreschini in Moreschini-Gallay, *SC 358* p.130 n.2). Gregory seems to be in doubt.
Gallay, *Bible* p.326 thinks that Gregory certainly does not mean that man took corporal forms only after the transgression, and thinks that he distances himself from Origen's allegorical explanation here. Yet, even then, this does not make a hermeneutic, but only a dogmatic difference.

> Δερματίνους δὲ χιτῶνας ἐφέσσατο σάρκα βαρεῖαν
> Νεκροφόρος (θανάτῳ γὰρ ἁμαρτάδα Χριστὸς ἔκερσεν). (vv.112-116)
> *But when (...) he tasted prematurely the sweet flavoured fruit*
> *and clothed his now heavy flesh in coats of skin,*
> *becoming his own corpse-bearer (for Christ cut short the course of sin by death),*
>
> > καὶ τοὺς δερματίνους ἀμφιέννυται χιτῶνας, **ἴσως** τὴν παχυτέραν σάρκα, καὶ θνητὴν, καὶ ἀντίτυπον·
> > *and put on the coats of skins, that is, perhaps, the coarser flesh, both mortal and contradictory.*

Yet, next to the – remarkably careful – allegorical explanations, there is also a typological side to the description: in an intermediate sentence, Gregory bemoans his own weakness, which is the ontological repetition of the first man's failing: φεῦ τῆς ἐμῆς ἀσθενείας· ἐμὴ γὰρ τοῦ προπάτορος (*alas for my weakness! - for that of my first father was mine*) (208).

Or.2,106-110 (209), about Jonah

Near the end of his ἀπολογητικός, Gregory sums up the reasons for his return from Pontus, where he took refuge after his ordination. One of these, the most important one, is the lesson he derived from « one of the old stories », namely the history of Jonah. He starts by summarizing this story, after which he refers to the traditional Jonah – Christ typology (τριημέρῳ ταφῇ, **τύπον** ἐχούσῃ **μυστηρίου μείζονος**, cf. Matt.12,39-40). Yet, from §107 on, he gives the exegesis of an expert (τινος σοφοῦ περὶ ταῦτα ἀνδρός), most probably Origen (210). This exegesis has to elucidate the absurd aspects of the story (τῷ φαινομένῳ τῆς ἱστορίας ἀτόπῳ), that is, on the one hand that Jonah would not know God's true intention, the redemption of Nineveh, and on the other that he would consider fleeing from God as possible. Gregory elaborately demonstrates the improbability of this, and then presents the allegorical explanation of his source: because Jonah sensed that owing to him, the προφητικὴ χάρις was transferred by God to the heathen, he tried to postpone his mission to preach to Nineveh;

---

(208) Cf. ALTHAUS p.109: « Damit gewinnt die erste Sünde paradigmatischen oder genauer: *typologischen* Charakter, d.h. jede spätere Sünde gleicht der ersten Sünde wie das Abbild dem Urbild. »

(209) *PG* 35,505-8.

(210) Cf. DUVAL pp.369-374. Origen's commentary to the book of Jonah is lost, so that we cannot say anything with absolute certainty. The scholiasts unanimously think of Origen in this respect.

the allegorical explanation of the flight from Joppa (Jon 1,3) makes use of, among other things, etymology and metaphor:

> καὶ τὴν κατασκοπὴν τῆς χαρᾶς ἀφεὶς – τοῦτο γὰρ Ἑβραίοις ἡ Ἰόππη δύναται –, τὸ παλαιὸν ὕψος λέγω καὶ τὸ ἀξίωμα, εἰς τὸ τῆς λύπης ἑαυτὸν ἔρριψε πέλαγος·
> *accordingly he left the watchtower of joy, for this is the meaning of Joppa in Hebrew, I mean his former dignity and reputation, and flung himself into the deep of sorrow* (211).

The moral of the story is that if Jonah eventually accepted even such a painful assignment, Gregory has no reason to keep declining the priestly office.

The allegorical explanation of the flight over sea and everything involved in this (including the three days in the whale), clearly departs here from a repudiation of the literal meaning of this part of the story (212). And Gregory explicitly signals that he follows this explanation (καὶ ἐγὼ πείθομαι). Yet this does not restrain him from summing up the events at sea twice without any allegorical explanation (§§106 and 109: ὑπὸ κήτους καταπίνεται... καί, τὸ θαῦμα, Χριστῷ τριήμερος συνεκδίδοται). As far as we know, nothing came of his subsequent promise to come back to the exegesis of this story later on.

Or.30,2-16

In this main part of the theological oration about the Son, Gregory explains ten - primarily New Testament - passages about the relation between Father and Son, which were used by the Arians as arguments against the ὁμοουσία. Exegesis thus serves dogmatics here, and is also determined by it. In particular the coexistence of two natures in one person, which is accepted by Gregory (213), should « save » a number of pericopes. Besides, now and then he also takes a grammatical approach (cf. the already mentioned polysemy of δύναμαι, §10). Because the discussed passages are exclusively ῥήματα, I shall not pursue this matter further here.

2) Oblique interpretations

Frequently, Gregory adds a brief exegetical remark when incorporating a Bible quotation or episode. He gives historical-typological as well as allegorical explanations: both forms of hermeneutics also occurred in his explicit theoretical pronouncements and in his extensive interpretations of biblical passages.

---

(211) Or.2,109 (*PG* 35,508B, translation Browne-Swallow p.226).
(212) Cf. expressly Condamin.
(213) Cf. Wesche pp.88-97.

(1) *Historical typology*

The explicit typological interpretations are relatively rare. There is one episode, though, which repeatedly receives the traditional christological, more specifically staurological, interpretation: the victory of Moses and Joshua over Amalek (Ex 17,8-13): Moses' upraised arms are a τύπος of the cross:

> Τίς νικήσει τοῦτον Μωυσῆς ἐκτείνας τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους, ἵν' ὁ σταυρὸς ἰσχύσῃ **τυπούμενος καὶ προμηνυόμενος**;
> *What Moses is to conquer him by stretching out his hands upon the mount, in order that the cross, thus typified and prefigured, may prevail?*

or

> Τίνα κατεπολέμησας Ἀμαλὴκ εὐχῇ καὶ χειρῶν ἐκτάσει καὶ τῷ σταυρῷ **προτυπουμένῳ** πόρρωθεν **μυστικῶς**...
> *What Amalek have you conquered by your prayer and by stretching out your hands, and by mystically typifying the cross long beforehand...* (214).

In the second theological oration. Gregory goes through a series of biblical exempla which are intended to demonstrate that one cannot fully know God's nature. Among these. Jacob is mentioned; of two episodes Gregory explains. one is typological. the other allegorical:

> Ἰακὼβ δὲ (...) στήλην ἀλείφει (Gen.28,18) **μυστικῶς - ἴσως** ἵνα τὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀλειφέντα λίθον **παραδηλώσῃ** (Matt.21,42 and Luke 4,18) - (...) καὶ ὡς ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ θεῷ προσπαλαίει (Gen.32,25-29) - **ἥτις ποτέ ἐστιν** ἡ πάλη θεοῦ πρὸς ἄνθρωπον, **ἢ τάχα** τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ἀρετῆς πρὸς θεὸν ἀντεξέτασις.
> *His* (i.e. Jacob's) *anointing a pillar had a hidden meaning perhaps, a revelation of the rock anointed for our sakes. (...) He wrestled as man with God - whatever « wrestling » between God and man may be (the comparison of human excellence with God, perhaps?)* (215).

---

(214) Respectively or.2.88 (*PG* 35.492B, translation ARMSTRONG p.26) and 32,16 (*PG* 36.192C). Further examples: or.11,2 (*PG* 35.833B, ἐκτάσει χειρῶν, καὶ **τύπῳ μυστηρίου** μείζονος); or.12,2 (*PG* 35.845A. τῷ σταυρῷ, πόρρωθεν **σκιαγραφουμένῳ καὶ τυπουμένῳ**); or.13,2; or.18.14; or.45.21.

(215) Or.28.18 (*PG* 36,49B: translation Wickham-Williams in MEEHAN, *Faith* p.234). Also see or.43,71 (*PG* 36,592C): Ἐπαινῶ τὴν Ἰακὼβ κλίμακα καὶ τὴν στήλην ἣν ἤλειψε τῷ Θεῷ καὶ τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν πάλην, **ἥτις πο-**

(2) Allegorism

What is striking in the above passage is the caution with which Gregory presents his explanation. This also appeared from his interpretation of the story of Eden (ἴσως, ὡς ἡ ἐμὴ θεωρία, ὅστις ποτὲ ἦν). This (seeming? (216)) uncertainty is quite frequent, especially in the case of the allegorical interpretations. To my mind, this points on the one hand to a rather undogmatic stance where the interpretation of the Bible is concerned (the passage is didactically useful, whatever it actually signifies), and on the other to an almost evident dissatisfaction with the (mere) literal historical meaning (the passage must certainly have a deeper meaning). In some cases, the literal meaning seems repudiated in this way (« whatever this struggle of God against man actually *is* », in the preceding quotation).

In the eulogy on Athanasius, Gregory compares the bishop's arrival in Alexandria on a foal with that of Jesus in Jerusalem. The addition makes clear that he looks for a symbolical meaning in the Gospel *text*:

> Πῶλος μὲν ἦγεν αὐτὸν καὶ μή μοι τῆς ἀπονοίας μέμψησθε, ὡς μικροῦ τὸν ἐμὸν Ἰησοῦν ὁ πῶλος ἐκεῖνος – εἴτ' οὖν ὁ ἐξ ἐθνῶν λαός, ὃν εὖ ποιῶν ἐπιβαίνει, τῶν τῆς ἀγνοίας δεσμῶν λυόμενον, **εἴτε τι ἄλλο βούλεται παραδηλοῦν ὁ λόγος**·
> *He rode upon a colt, almost, blame me not for folly, as my Jesus did upon that other colt, whether it were the people of the Gentiles, whom He mounts in kindness, by setting it free from the bonds of ignorance, or something else, which the Scripture sets forth* (217).

With the same prudence, Gregory indirectly mentions some allegorical (anagogic) explanations of David's dance at the ark

---

τὲ ἦν – οἶμαι δὲ τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου μέτρου πρὸς τὸ θεῖον ὕψος ἀντιπαρέκτασις καὶ ἀντίθεσις.

(216) In any case, this prudence on the exegetical plane is in marked contrast with the apodeictic way in which Gregory takes a stand on dogmatic questions. Hence, I do not think that it betokens rhetorically feigned uncertainty.

(217) Or.21,29 (*PG* 35,1116C, translation Browne-Swallow p.278). Cf. Mark 11,1-8 and Luke 19,29-35 πῶλον δεδεμένον (...) λύσατε. John 12,14-16 speaks of an ὀνάριον, Matt.21,2-7 of a foal and a she-ass (ὄνος); John and Matt. refer to the prophecy in Zch 9.9. The interpretation of the riding animal as either the Jewish people or the heathen (or – in the exegesis of Matthew – both) is traditional, cf. I. Opelt, *RLAC* 6 s.v. « Esel » pp.585-586.

(2Rg 6,5: a μυστήριον of the climb towards God) (218) and of God's back, visible from the rock (Ex 33,20-23: God's greatness in creation, attainable through the incarnate Logos) (219).

3) Interpretation of parables

In the προσφώνησις of the funeral oration for Caesarius, Gregory uses a rabbinical expression from the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. The precise meaning is – again – left undecided:

> Σὺ δὲ ἡμῖν οὐρανοὺς ἐμβατεύοις, ὦ θεία καὶ ἱερὰ κεφαλή, καὶ ἐν κόλποις Ἀβραάμ (Luke 16,22), **οἵτινες δή οὗτοί εἰσιν**, ἀναπαύσαιο.
> *But you, sacred and holy soul, may you enter heaven, may you rest in Abraham's bosom – whatever may be the meaning of this* (220).

The way in which he uses an image from a parable here (we may assume that Gregory derived « Abraham's bosom » from Luke's Gospel) without explaining it, is representative of Gregory's general treatment of the parables. In the poems, the parables are solely quoted as exempla, with the exception of the *biblica* I,1,24-26. Yet, in these enumerations, no interpretation is given either. In prose, we have a similar situation, even though here, an example can be given of an explicit exegesis: the parable of the **labourers in the vineyard** (Matt.20,1-16).

In the baptismal oration, Gregory has this parable quoted by people who want to postpone their baptism as long as possible

---

(218) Or.5,35 (*PG* 35,709C-712A): Εἰ καὶ ὀρχήσασθαι δεῖ σε, ὡς πανηγυριστὴν καὶ φιλέορτον, ὄρχησαι μέν, ἀλλὰ μὴ τὴν Ἡρωδιάδος ὄρχησιν τῆς ἀσχήμονος, ἧς ἔργον Βαπτιστοῦ θάνατος· ἀλλὰ τὴν Δαβὶδ ἐπὶ τῇ καταπαύσει τῆς κιβωτοῦ, **ἣν ἡγοῦμαι** τῆς εὐκινήτου καὶ πολυστρόφου **κατὰ Θεὸν πορείας εἶναι μυστήριον**.

(219) Or.28,3 (*PG* 36,29A): Ἐπεὶ δὲ προσέβλεψα, μόλις εἶδον Θεοῦ τὰ ὀπίσθια· καὶ τοῦτο τῇ πέτρᾳ σκεπασθείς, τῷ σαρκωθέντι δι' ἡμᾶς Λόγῳ· καὶ μικρὸν διακύψας, οὐ τὴν πρώτην τε καὶ ἀκήρατον φύσιν, (...) ἀλλ' ὅση τελευταία καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάνουσα. **Ἡ δέ ἐστιν, ὅσα ἐμὲ γινώσκειν**, ἡ ἐν τοῖς κτίσμασι καὶ τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ προβεβλημένοις καὶ διοικουμένοις μεγαλειότης (...). **Ταῦτα γὰρ Θεοῦ τὰ ὀπίσθια**. In or.32,16 (*PG* 36,192B), he does not provide any explanation for the same words from the Biblical text, but keeps to *whatever it is*: Καὶ Μωϋσῆς μόλις εἶδε Θεοῦ τὰ ὀπίσθια διὰ τῆς πέτρας – **ἅτινα ταῦτά ἐστι, καὶ ἥτις ἡ πέτρα**.
The list of explicit allegorizing explanations in Gregory's œuvre is far from complete: see e.g. ep.232,2 for Cana: τὸ γενέσθαι οἶνον τὸ ὕδωρ (τὸ δέ ἐστι πάντα μεταποιεῖσθαι πρὸς τὸ βέλτιον).

(220) Or.7,17 (*PG* 35,776B, translation McCAULEY p.17).

(so as to be able to sin in the meantime), but Gregory rejects this exegesis:

> « Οὐδὲ γὰρ τοῖς ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνι προκεκμηκόσιν ὑπῆρξέ τι πλέον, ἴσου τοῦ μισθοῦ δοθέντος καὶ τοῖς τελευταίοις. » (= a fictitious objection; Gregory's answer:) Ἀλλὰ δεῦρο καὶ **τὴν παραβολὴν ἑρμηνεύθητι**, ὡς ἂν μὴ βλάπτῃ τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐξ ἀπειρίας. Πρῶτον μὲν οὐ περὶ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἐνταῦθα ὁ λόγος, ἀλλὰ περὶ τῶν κατὰ διαφόρους καιροὺς πιστευόντων καὶ εἰς τὸν καλὸν ἀμπελῶνα εἰσερχομένων, τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν. (...) Ἔπειτα εἰ καὶ τῷ μέτρῳ τοῦ μόχθου πλεῖον εἰσήνεγκαν οἱ προεισελθόντες, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ καὶ τῷ μέτρῳ τῆς προαιρέσεως.
>
> *« For the labourers in the vineyard who had worked the longest time gained nothing thereby, for equal wages were given to the very last. » (...) But come hither and listen to the interpretation of the parable, that you may not be injured by Scripture for want of information. First of all, there is no question here of baptism, but of those who believe at different times and enter the good vineyard of the Church. (...) And then, although they who entered first contributed more to the measure of the labour yet they did not contribute more to the measure of the purpose* (221).

Gregory's exegesis, which rejects any connection with baptism and emphasizes the προαίρεσις, is that of Origen (222). The same parable is used three times as a metaphorical exemplum in Gregory's poems: twice for Gregory the elder, who became a Christian only late in life (223), and once in I,1,27:

> Ἐς μεγάλην δὲ Θεοῖο καλὴν ἐριθηλέ' ἀλωήν,
> Ἠῷος μὲν ἔβην, καὶ πλείονα μόχθον ἀνέτλην·
> Μισθὸν δ' ὑστατίοισιν ἴσον, καὶ κῦδος ἔχοιμι.
> Τίς φθόνος, εἰ μόχθοισι πόθον Θεὸς ἀντιφερίζει;
> *Into the large, good, abundant vineyard of God*
> *I have entered in the morning, and have thus put in greater efforts;*
> *yet let me earn the same wage and renown as those who came last.*

---

(221) Or.40,20 (*PG* 36,384D-385A, translation BROWNE-SWALLOW p.366). This passage is followed by a remarkable reversal of the argument: the first only went to work after a deliberation upon the wages: hence, their confidence was less great; moreover they were apparently filled with envy: they may count themselves fortunate to receive any pay at all! And to make the repudiation complete: even if the parable were to deal with the subject of baptism, it is still better to be baptized first (§21, *PG* 36,385C: Εἰ δὲ καὶ τὴν τοῦ λουτροῦ δύναμιν ἡ παραβολὴ **σκιογραφεῖ, κατὰ τὴν σὴν ἐξήγησιν** (...)).

(222) MÜHLENBERG p.22.

(223) II,1,45, vv.219-220 and ept.60, vv.3-4 (both first verses are identical).

> *Why be envious, if God equates the yearning with the achievements?* (224).

It turns out that Gregory's exegesis of the parable (the *Eigenbedeutung*) coincides with the exemplary use of it (the *Ernstbedeutung*).

This is probably also the case for the parable of **the good Samaritan**, even though Gregory phrases his interpretation of it in highly cautious and indirect terms. In the autobiographical poem Περὶ τῶν καθ' ἑαυτόν, he gives an account of all his misfortune, after which he relates this parable with exceptional elaboration (in more than ten verses), and concludes:

> τέρας μέγα, πῶς Σαμαρείτης
> Τόνδ' ἐσιδὼν ἐλέησεν, ὃν οὐκ ἐλέησαν ἄριστοι!
> Οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ σάφα οἶδα τί κεύθεται **εἰκόνι** τῇδε,
> Οἷα Θεὸς σοφίῃ **μυστήρια ἀμφικαλύπτει**.
> *What a great portent! How was it that the Samaritan*
> *seeing him had pity, when the great ones failed to pity?*
> *I do not clearly understand what is hidden in this similitude:*
> *such mysteries does God in His wisdom conceal* (225).

The terminology used suggests that Gregory takes it for granted that the parable has an allegorical meaning. Yet, he does not know what precisely the meaning is, he says. Upon this, he paraphrases the parable again in a metaphorical (allegorical) exemplum of thirteen verses:

> Τοιοῖσδ' ἐγὼ ἀντεβόλησα
> Πήμασιν· καί μ' ἐδάϊξεν ὁμῶς ψυχῇσι μεγαίρων
> Ληϊστὴς βιότου κεδνῆς καταβάντα πόληος,
> Καὶ Χριστοῦ μ' ἀπέδυσε χάριν, καὶ γυμνὸν ἔθηκεν,
> Ὥσπερ Ἀδὰμ τοπρόσθε χοὸς καὶ πτώσιος ἀρχήν,
> Ὃν γεῦσις καθέηκεν ἐπὶ χθόνα, τῆς γένος ἦεν.
> Ἀλλά μ', Ἄναξ, ἐλέαιρε, καὶ ἐκ θανάτοιο σάωσον,
> Ὃν λεῖψαν ἱερῆες, ἐπεὶ μογέοντ' ἐνόησαν.
> Ἕλκεά τ' εὖ κατάδησον, ἄγων ἐπὶ πάνδοχον οἶκον,
> Αὖθις δ' εἰς ἱερὴν πέμποις πόλιν ἀρτεμέοντα,
> Ἔμπεδον ἔνθα μένοιμι, κακοὺς δ' ἀπὸ φῶρας ἐρύκοις,
> Καὶ τρίβον ἀργαλέην, καὶ τραύματα, καὶ παροδίτας
> Νηλέα θυμὸν ἔχοντας, ἐπ' εὐσεβίῃ κομόωντας.

---

(224) I,1,27, vv.32-35 (*PG* 37,501).

(225) II,1,1, vv.376-379 (*PG* 37,998, translation MEEHAN, *three poems* p.37).

The misfortunes I encountered were like that too.
Me too that robber who hates souls ill-used,
as I travelled from the noble city and its way of life.
He stripped me of the grace of Christ and left me naked,
as once he did to Adam, the origin of flesh and fall,
who by a taste was cast down to the earth whence he had sprung.
O King, have pity on me. Save me from death.
The priests abandoned me when they saw me in sore straits.
Bind up well my wounds, and lead me to the universal inn,
whence you can restore me once more intact to the holy city.
There let me remain forever, while you ward off wicked thieves,
the hardships of the road, wounds and wayfarers
of pitiless spirit who preen themselves on their piety (226).

This paraphrase at least reveals Gregory's acquaintance with the allegorical, more specifically christological, explanation of the parable which can be found in Origen and, for example, also in Gregory of Nyssa: the Samaritan symbolizes Christ, who comes to save Adam after his fall occasioned by the demon (227). Despite the careful wording (other interpreters, including Basil and John Chrysostom, advocated an ethical reading), Gregory too seems to believe in this soteriologically oriented exegesis. This is confirmed by the other passages in which he alludes to the parable: in these, either the robbers are associated with demons, or the Samaritan with Christ (228).

For lack of further explicit exegetical expositions of parables, we need to depart from their incorporation as exempla with a view to defining his hermeneutic stance. From the above cases, it appears that this incorporation corresponds with the interpretation; in other words, that the *Ernstbedeutung* of the exempla is derived from the *Eigenbedeutung* which Gregory ascribes to the parable.

If one can speak at all of a parable theory in the case of Gregory, then it is certainly far removed from present theories.

---

(226) II,1,1, vv.380–392 (*PG* 37.998–9, translation MEEHAN, *three poems* p.37).

(227) Cf. MONSELEWSKI pp.15-16, p.30, p.52 and pp.60–62.

(228) Or.14,37 (*PG* 35,908A, Εἰ δὲ τοσοῦτον σε κατετραυμάτισε τυχὸν ὁ τῶν ἡμετέρων ψυχῶν λῃστὴς καὶ τύραννος, ἢ ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ εἰς Ἱεριχὼ καταβαίνοντα....); and for the equation Samaritan - Christ: or.29.20 (*PG* 36,101A, Σαμαρείτης ἀκούει καὶ δαιμονῶν [John 8,48], πλὴν σώζει τὸν ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ καταβαίνοντα καὶ λῃσταῖς περιπεσόντα,...); I,1,27, vv.75-77 (*PG* 37,504, Εἰ δὲ τυπείην / Ληϊσταῖς, μεγάλης κατιὼν ἀπὸ Χριστοπόληος, Μή με λίπῃς χείρεσσιν ὑπ' ἀνδροφόνοισι δαμῆναι, to Christ).

In accordance with the explanatory accretion in the Gospels themselves and with the patristic tradition, he considers most parables not as metaphors (with one single *tertium comparationis*) but as allegories, of which the various details each function as a symbol for something else. Nor does he make any distinction between comparisons, « authentic parables » and exemplary narrations: in the *biblica*, for example, the parables of the mustard seed, of the Great Supper and of the Good Samaritan (which are usually counted among three different categories) are summed up without distinction under the names αἰνίγματα, μῦθοι, παροιμίαι or παραβολαί (229). The fact that they are sometimes *used* as a kind of exemplary narration, does not alter his basic allegorizing attitude (230). Due to this attitude, Gregory can describe - in a poem of 106 verses (the already often mentioned I,1,27) - his spiritual aspirations, his fear, and his hope, in a sequence of almost thirty interiorized parables.

D. Conclusion

With the goal of placing Gregory's hermeneutic viewpoint, I formulated a number of questions on p.249; by way of conclusion, I shall try to answer these here.

Events or text

Gregory looks for a spiritual meaning both in the events from biblical history, and in the inspired text itself. His approach to the text is often *philological*: he shares this grammatical attention to the correct literal meaning with the Antiochene school, but not with them solely: Origen too was a prominent Bible philologist. Yet, rather than the influence of an exegetical school, his rhetorical education will have played a major role in this.

Both from his explicit exegetical views and from his practice it appears that he, unlike the Antiochenes, positively sees several meanings in the *text itself*. Sometimes, this involves quite a detailed method of working (thus in his interpretation of Exodus 12, about the eating of the lamb), and he explicitly supposes a symbolical meaning behind every line (231).

---

(229) See the opening verses of I,1,24-27.

(230) Of the four *Beispielerzählungen* according to Jülicher (the Good Samaritan, the rich fool, the rich man and Lazarus, the Pharisee and the Tax Collector), Gregory uses only that of the Pharisee and the publican in an exclusively moralizing way, without transposition of image to issue. On the other hand, the parable of the unforgiving servant (Matt.18,23-35) is held up as an example in its most literal meaning before a financial creditor (or.40,31, *PG* 36,404B: Ἐὰν χρεωφειλέτην λάβῃς προσπίπτοντα, (...) **Μὴ γένῃ** πράκτωρ πικρὸς τοῦ ἐλάττονος χρέους (...) μὴ καὶ τῆς ἐκείνου φιλανθρωπίας ὑπόσχῃς δίκην, ἣν οὐκ ἐμιμήσω **λαβὼν ὑπόδειγμα**). Yet, elsewhere, this parable is allegorically interpreted (e.g. I,1,27, vv.86-87).

Historicity

Nowhere do we see Gregory emphasizing the historicity of the events described in the Bible, not even in his defence of the legitimacy of the allegorical explanation of the Bible versus that of myths, which he considers illegitimate. On the other hand, only in the exegesis of the book of Jonah does he seem to deny clearly that the history is to be taken entirely literally. Elsewhere, he does often use expressions which seem to exclude the literal meaning (of the type ὅστις ποτὲ ἐστιν). But in general, we can say that the historicity is of no consideration for Gregory. Also because of this, he leans much more closely towards the Alexandrian than to the Antiochene tradition.

Terminology

For the interpretation of events, characters or customs in their historical, christological or eschatological meaning, Gregory especially uses the common « typological » terminology: τύπος and derivatives (τυπικῶς, τυπόω,...), σκιά and derivatives (σκιαγραφέω, σκιώδης,...), and, with fluctuating meanings, μυστήριον and μυστικῶς, σύμβολον, εἰκών. For the interpretation of the text, he works with the opposition γράμμα (σῶμα, κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν, χρονικῶς) and πνεῦμα (ἀναγωγικῶς, κρυπτόν). For the allegorical or spiritual interpretation of the Bible, he especially uses θεωρία, and also ἀναγωγή; for this, he avoids using the other two traditional names, τροπολογία and ἀλληγορία. Hence, his choice of words seems influenced by the odium brought upon this last term by the Antiochenes; but this also goes for Cyril of Alexandria.

Sorts of spiritual meaning

In Gregory, we find both the traditional historical-typological meanings (christological, sacramental, eschatological) and the a-historical-allegorical ones (moral, anagogic). They are used interchangeably, with a clear preponderance of the second sort, at least in the explicit explanations discussed here. One and the same term or character can have various spiritual meanings in the same explanation, without this being systematized. Moreover. Gregory seems in two allusions to assent to Origen's doctrine of the three meanings of the Scripture. In any case, Gregory never repudiates this doctrine.

---

(231) Compare or.2.105 (*PG* 35,504C, just before the exegesis of the story about Jonah): Ἡμεῖς δέ, οἱ **καὶ μέχρι τῆς τυχούσης κεραίας καὶ γραμμῆς τοῦ πνεύματος τὴν ἀκρίβειαν ἕλκοντες**, οὔποτε δεξόμεθα, οὐ γὰρ ὅσιον, οὐδὲ τὰς ἐλαχίστας πράξεις εἰκῇ σπουδασθῆναι τοῖς ἀναγράψασι καὶ μέχρι τοῦ παρόντος μνήμῃ διασωθῆναι (for the rest of the quotation cf. supra p.80).

Like Origen, Gregory often replaces the progressive revelation of truth by a hierarchical knowledge, of which only the most wise of men, from the Old Testament as well as from the present, can achieve the highest θεωρία (so too in the meaning of « spiritual conception of the text »). This is connected with the fact that Gregory sometimes admits his own incapacity, and often states his allegorical explanations specifically with some reservations. This too, he has in common with Origen (232).

To me, Gregory's position within the assumed opposition Alexandria-Antioch is indubitable: nowhere in his hermeneutics do we find an inescapable indication of an influence of the Antiochene tradition, perhaps with the exception of his avoidance of the term ἀλληγορία. Conversely, many points show him to fit in with the Origenist tradition; moreover, with regard to concrete examples of exegesis (the discussed parables, Jonah), we came across the same explanation as in Origen. And even though the *Philocalia* is probably not compiled by Gregory, this does not alter the fact that it is an external argument in favour of Origenist influences: his appreciation of it remains: πυκτίον (...) τῆς Ὠριγένους Φιλοκαλίας ἐκλογὰς ἔχον τῶν χρησίμων τοῖς φιλολόγοις (233).

Nevertheless, Gregory is much less systematic in his exegesis than his predecessor, as is already revealed by the mere composition of his œuvre, in which only one exegetical homily occurs. That we cannot simply ascribe this to an unfortunate passing down of his work appears from the fact that in the *catenae*, hardly anything can be found which is not known from the direct tradition (234). Gregory's decision to bring out only one exegetical homily (as a specimen?) of his undoubtedly comprehensive production, confirms the impression one gets when studying his exegesis: in itself, this is only of relative importance to him (235). It should help to make the Bible instrumental in the present (236), for instance for the incorporation into exempla.

---

(232) Cf. HARL p.360 (about Origen, « paradoxalement »): « Il hésite, il propose plusieurs interprétations, il doute », and p.359: « Ce qu'ont retenu les Philocalistes (*according to Harl, Gregory and Basil*) est une leçon d'humilité devant 'le mystère'. »

(233) Ep.115.3.

(234) Cf. BIBLIA PATRISTICA p.6. This leads the authors to conclude that the direct tradition is practically complete, that is to say that just about all works *published* by Gregory have also been preserved.

4.3 The biblical exemplum

By way of introduction to the poem with his canon, Gregory indicates the use of Bible reading:

> 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.
> *Always be busy, in speech and in thoughts, with the divine words.*
> *Because as a reward for your efforts God put the following:*
> *either you gain insight in a bit of hidden light; or - the best -*
> *you are stimulated by the great commands of the pure God;*
> *or, thirdly, these occupations carry your mind away from earthly things* (237).

Of these three « functions » of the Bible, he puts forward the second, the moral, as the most significant function. Elsewhere, he cites the biblical commandment and example as the most cogent arguments for the φιλανθρωπία (or.14,35: πάντων δὲ **τὴν ἐντολὴν** αἰδώμεθα πλέον, καὶ **τὸ ὑπόδειγμα**. cf. supra p.82 n.153), or he explicitly posits that the biblical stories guide him (or.15,12:

---

(235) In any case, we have to take into account the fact that the image which we have of Gregory as « Sunday preacher » is quite restricted. Jerome, who is usually full of praise about Gregory's exegetical qualities, tells an anecdote in a letter to Nepotianus in which Gregory jestingly parries an exegetical question (about Luke 6,1, a *varia lectio* in Nestle-Aland). In the eyes of the serious Jerome, this was a negative exemplum towards Nepotianus; for GRÜTZMACHER p.178, it is an example of « gelehrte Charlatanerie » of Gregory; in my opinion, it is one more indication of the relative importance he attached to exegesis (and of his self-consciousness as an orator), - that is, if the anecdote is authentic, of course: *Praeceptor quondam meus Gregorius Nazianzenus rogatus a me ut exponeret quid sibi vellet in Luca sabbatum δευτερόπρωτον, id est 'secundoprimum', eleganter lusit: 'docebo te' inquiens 'super hac in ecclesia; in qua omni mihi populo acclamante cogeris invitus scire quod nescis, aut certe, si solus tacueris, solus ab omnibus stultitiae condemnaberis.' Nihil tam facile, quam vilem plebiculam et indoctam contionem linguae volubilitate decipere, quae quidquid non intelligit, plus miratur* (ep.52,8 LABOURT).

(236) This is of course also possible by means of exegetical homilies: see or.37.

(237) I,1,12, vv.1-5 (*PG* 37,472).

βοηθεῖσθαι μὲν τοῖς παλαιοῖς διηγήμασι, βοηθεῖσθαι δὲ καὶ τοῖς νέοις, cf. supra p.119). Yet Gregory's most significant enunciation about the *purpose* of the Bible can be found in the passage preceding the history of Jonah in his ἀπολογητικός: οὐδὲ τὰς ἐλαχίστας πράξεις εἰκῇ σπουδασθῆναι τοῖς ἀναγράψασι, καὶ μέχρι τοῦ παρόντος μνήμῃ διασωθῆναι· ἀλλ' ἵν' ἡμεῖς ἔχωμεν ὑπομνήματα καὶ παιδεύματα τῆς τῶν ὁμοίων, εἴ ποτε συμπέσοι καιρός, διασκέψεως· ὥστε τὰ μὲν φεύγειν, τὰ δὲ αἱρεῖσθαι, οἷον κανόσι τισὶ καὶ **τύποις**, τοῖς προλαβοῦσιν ἑπόμενοι **παραδείγμασι** (or.2,105, see already p.80): the authors of the Bible have written down their histories for the future generations as παιδεύματα, τύποι, παραδείγματα.

Thus, for Gregory, the use of biblical exempla complies with the essential purpose of the Scriptures (238). As appeared from the first part of this study, his writings abound with biblical exempla. The formal analysis showed that, in comparison with the pagan ones, the biblical histories are quoted notably more as *exempla probationis*, and especially as models. This **function** indeed leans closest towards the just mentioned purpose of the Bible itself. Furthermore, it also turned out that the New Testament exempla have a higher credibility and persuasiveness than the Old Testament ones; thus, the latter are quoted twice as often ἀπ' ἐλάττονος. This hierarchy corresponds to Gregory's (traditionally Christian) vision of the surpassing of the Old by the New Testament.

Most *exempla probationis* are quoted in their literal sense, without any exegetical remarks; of course, this does not imply an (exclusively) historical interpretation of the history in question (239). The relatively less numerous exempla with *ornamental function* are more often quoted metaphorically (I established a certain correlation between this function and metaphorical insertion). In the discussion of the ornamental exempla, I pointed out that the ostensibly pure embellishment can actually be significant (cf. p.112). The following quotation illustrates how a sacramental-typological exegesis lies hidden behind a seemingly common comparison (ornamental function, minimal insertion):

---

(238) Compare Paul's ἐγράφη δὲ πρὸς **νουθεσίαν** ἡμῶν (1Cor 10.11).

(239) Myths and parables are also used as exempla in their literal sense: so too are the histories of Jonah (e.g. II,1,11, vv.1838-1842) and of Moses' climbing of Mount Sinai (e.g. II.1.13, vv.117-123), of which Gregory gives allegorical explanations elsewhere (in the case of Jonah, even with denial of the literal meaning), as discussed above.

> Ὡς γὰρ ὄλεθρον
> Ἑβραίων ποτὲ παῖδες ὑπέκφυγον αἵματι χριστῷ,
> Τὸ φλιὰς ἐκάθηρεν, ὅτ' ὤλετο πρωτογένεθλος
> Αἰγύπτου γενεὴ νυκτὶ μιῇ, ὣς καὶ ἔμοιγε
> Σφρηγὶς ἀλεξικάκοιο Θεοῦ τόδε. νηπιάχοις μὲν
> Σφρηγίς, ἀεξομένοισι δ' ἄκος καὶ σφρηγὶς ἀρίστη.
> Χριστοῦ φωτοδόταο θεόρρυτος.
> *For just as once the Hebrews escaped destruction by the anointing blood*
> *which purified their doorposts, at a time when a whole generation of first-born children*
> *in Egypt died in a single night, so what corresponds for me*
> *is the seal of the God who wards off evil, a seal indeed for infants,*
> *but for those who are coming to maturity a cure*
> *and, flowing from God, the finest seal of Christ the giver of light* (240).

A general knowledge of Gregory's sacramental typology helps to interpret this kind of « comparisons »; on the other hand, this passage shows that he interpreted the smearing of the lamb's blood on the Jewish doorposts also as a τύπος of baptism (next to the anagogic interpretation in or.45,15 and or.16,11, cf. p.272). The connection between exemplary incorporation and hermeneutics is discussed more elaborately in the next chapter, which concentrates exclusively on metaphorical exempla.

As for the **insertion**, it appeared that the metaphorical way of inserting exempla occurs more often with biblical exempla than with pagan ones. For parables, it is even the most frequent form of insertion. In the discussion of Gregory's interpretation of parables, it turned out that almost no exegetical expositions can be found of parables: just as he does not pronounce on the *Eigenbedeutung*, he also seldom gives the *Ernstbedeutung*. In the case of the parables, these two often coincide, for that matter (cf. p.282).

Finally, the **elaboration** of the biblical exempla is often effected with a mere name-mentioning, which was explained by the authority of the biblical characters. Yet, the elaboration has no bearing on the Bible hermeneutics.

---

(240) I,1,9, vv.87-93 (*PG* 37,463-4, translation SYKES, *translation*).

CHAPTER V

MYTHOLOGICAL AND BIBLICAL METAPHORS

> οἷος ἐγὼ πάντα συντείνων πρὸς ἐμαυτόν...
> *I have a habit of relating everything to my own situation...* (241)

Gregory's inclination to recognize his own state of affairs in similar situations in present and past, in nature and literature, reveals itself in the numerous metaphors (242), especially in his autobiographical poems, but also elsewhere in his works. It is a form of *analogical thinking*. This kind of thinking is a joint characteristic of the analogical exemplum and the non-literal exegesis, whether applied to mythology or to the Bible, whether it is typological or allegorical (243).

This relationship also appears from the terminology: τύπος and παράδειγμα have the same original, material meaning (244). In the LXX, they are used alternately for the translation of the same Hebrew word *tabnith* which signifies « divine model » (245), and in the New Testament, both ὑπόδειγμα and τύπος can refer to an example with model function (246). Lausberg considers the metaphorical exemplum, more specifically the Vossian antonomasia, identical to the τύπος in its technical meaning: « Das *exemplum* wird in der Antonomasie auf die 'Beispielfigur' reduziert, die mit dem Verglichenen ineins gesetzt wird. 'Beispielfigur' und Typos sind identisch, wenn auch die profane Beispielfigur meist als überlegenes Muster hingestellt wird, während der theologische Typos meist durch seinen Antitypos (Adam durch Christus) überboten wird. Die gemischte (profan-theologische) Typologie bei Dante ist eine Konsequenz der Identität von Beispielfigur und Typos » (247).

---

(241) Or.26.9 (*PG* 35,1237D).

(242) By « metaphors », I mean metaphorically inserted exempla here, thus either (Vossian) antonomasias, or allegories. Because of the fact that I shall only deal with the Vossian reversal of the antonomasia in this chapter, I shall henceforth simply use the term « antonomasia ».

(243) Cf. ESPER pp.107-108, about Gregory of Nyssa. Esper emphasizes « seine analoge Betrachtungsweise, sein Denken in Vergleichen ». He calls the metaphorical exempla (Esper speaks of « Metaphorik ») in Gregory of Nyssa's letters and orations the *reversal* of the allegorical exegesis in his other works (Esper does not make any distinction between typology and allegorism: pp.11-12): the same analogical train of thought departs in the first case from the concrete situation and clarifies it by means of the Bible, while in the second case, we get the reverse.
This analogical thinking is no characteristic of the inductive exemplum. Hence, this kind of exemplum is not under discussion in this chapter, not even when it is metaphorically inserted (e.g. οἱ Χαρμίδαι for Socrates' ἐρώμενοι).

(244) Cf. VON BLUMENTHAL.

(245) GOPPELT pp.257-258: τύπος in Ex 25,40, elsewhere παράδειγμα.

(246) GOPPELT p.249. Examples respectively John 13,15, Jas.5,10; and Phil.3,17, 1Thess.1,7, 2Thess.3,9.

In this final chapter, I want to examine to what extent Gregory's metaphorical exempla reveal a connection between the *Ernstbedeutung* which has not been made explicit and the hermeneutic position towards the incorporated subject matter (dealt with in the preceding chapters of this second part). Can the different views regarding significance, veracity and purpose of respectively mythology and Bible be detected in different kinds of metaphorical use of both subject matters? Or can we already speak of a « standard typology » in Gregory's writings?

5.1 Towards a standard typology?

5.1.1 A similar literary treatment

The first part of this study taught us that pagan and biblical exempla are indistinguishable on the formal level. This also goes for the insertion. As a point of departure, I shall repeat some mythological and biblical examples quoted above, first with similar insertion formulas or hermeneutic remarks, then without insertion: antonomasias and allegories.

A. Apparent hermeneutic indifference

Εἴ τις Τάνταλός ἐστιν ἐν ὕδασιν αὖος ἀπίστοις,... (ept.40, v.1)

> **Εἴ τις** ὄρους καθύπερθεν ἁγνῆς ὀπὸς ἔπλετο μύστης / Μωσῆς,... (ept.57, vv.1-2) (248)

---

(247) Lausberg §1244 p.699.

(248) Probably, it concerns an *a fortiori* reasoning in both cases, not a reservation with regard to the historicity of the exemplary histories. Nevertheless, it has to be pointed out that in or.5,38 (*PG* 35,713C), when the same Tantalus is mentioned, the following, positively relativizing addition can be read: εἴτε ἀλήθεια ταῦτά ἐστιν εἴτε μῦθος...

Κἂν πτηνὸν αἴρῃ Πήγασος, ἢ ὁ τοῦ Σκύθου
Ἀβάριδος οἰστός, **ὅστις ἦν**, οἱ μυθικοί (I.2.10, vv.50-51)

> Τοῦτον ἔθετο μὲν ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ, **ὅστις ποτὲ ἦν** ὁ παράδεισος οὗτος (or.38,12).

The second formula especially suggests that the correct meaning of the myth or story is not all that important for the incorporation in exempla. Yet, of this formula there are no examples with biblical episodes in Gregory's poems, and the quoted passage from or.38 does not come from a παράδειγμα.

B. Antonomasias

Αἰγύπτιόν **τιν' ἄλλον** ὄψει Πρωτέα (II,1,11, v.808)

> Ἴσθι καθαιρόμενος (...) **ἄλλος** Ἰὼβ **τις** (I,2,38, vv.4-5)

Σκείρων **τίς** οὗτος, ἢ Τυφωεύς, ἢ γίγας
Ἥκει τυραννῶν νερτέρους; (epg.43, vv.1-2)

> **Τίς** πήξει Φινεὲς πορνοφόνῳ παλάμῃ / (...) ἢ **τίς** ἀρήξει / (...) / Μωσῆς; (II,1,15, vv.22-25)

C. Allegories

Τίς Σκύλλης σκοπέλους σε διεκπλώοντα κελεύει
Σπεύδειν εἰς Ἰθάκην, μή πως πάρος ἐνθάδ' ὄληαι;
Τίς δ' ὀλοήν σε Χάρυβδιν ἀπηνέα; (II,2,7, vv.148-50)

> Κεῖνος δ' ἐστὶν ἄριστος ὃς ἰθείην ὁδὸν ἕλκει,
> Οὐδὲ μεταστρέφεται Σοδόμων ἐπὶ τέφραν ἐρήμην,
> Ἣν διὰ μαργοσύνην ξείνῳ πυρὶ δῃωθέντων.
> Φεύγει δ' ἐσσυμένως ἐς ὄρος, πάτρης δὲ λέλησται,
> Μὴ μῦθος καὶ λᾶας ἁλὸς μετόπισθε λίπηται (II,1,1, vv.479-483).

On grounds of form, no distinction can be made between the exempla with Tantalus and Moses (εἴ τις), Proteus and Job (ἄλλος τις), Sciron and Phinehas (τίς;), the journey to Ithaca and the flight from Sodom.

5.1.2 Myths in the Bible

As is well-known, some names or concepts from Greek mythology have penetrated the LXX: thus, Job's youngest daughter is called « horn of Amalthea » in the Greek translation (Job 42,14), and « Hades » is the common term for the underworld. Even though Gregory quotes some psalm-verses in which

Hades (249) is mentioned, he does not further examine this phenomenon (250). In these cases, it would actually be wrong to speak of « myths in the Bible », since it is a matter of eroded Greek-mythological terms which are given a new content.

We have a different situation where the **giants** are concerned. These occur in the Bible (for the first time in Gn 6.1-4) as well as in Greek myths. Gregory mentions them some fifteen times. In most cases, the reference is clearly to the Greek-mythological characters (251), and three times he alludes to other scriptural passages than the episode of Genesis (252). The two remaining passages are the most interesting here.

In the second part of the ὑποθῆκαι παρθένοις (I,2,2, vv.408-652), Gregory addresses the parents. He exhorts them not to force their children - either in the direction of celibacy, or in that of marriage - but to have them following their own nature (vv.446-490). This is succeeded by some of the most difficult verses of his poetry, which I have attempted to translate as literally as possible:

> Ἤλιτε δ' ὅστις ἔμιξε φύσιν σάρκεσσιν ἄσαρκον,
> Ἀγγελικῶν τε πόθων κρατεροὺς ἀνέηκε Γίγαντας,
> Καὶ γαῖαν ἐκάθηρεν ἁμαρτάσιν οὐρανιώνων.
> Ἑλλήνων τάδε παισὶν, ἐπεὶ παθέεσσιν ἐκεῖνοι
> Ἄλκαρ, ἐμητίσαντο θεοὺς στήσασθαι ἀλιτρούς,
> *He sinned, who interbred a fleshless nature with (bodies of) flesh,*
> *and raised from the desires of angels the mighty giants,*
> *and purified the earth through the sins of celestials.*

---

(249) E.g. or.6,1 (Ps 140,7) and or.16,7 (Ps 6,6).

(250) In contrast with e.g. Gregory of Nyssa, who labels this biblical use as positive χρῆσις (*Comm. in Cant. or.9*, LANGERBECK 288-289): οἶδε γὰρ πολλάκις ἡ ἁγία γραφὴ καὶ μύθους τινὰς ἐκ τῶν ἔξωθεν συμπαραλαμβάνειν εἰς τὴν τοῦ ἰδίου σκοποῦ συνεργίαν (...). ἆρ' οὖν ἐπίστευσε τοῖς περὶ Ἀμαλθείας μυθολογουμένοις ἡ ἁγία γραφή; οὐκ ἔστι ταῦτα (quoted in PYYKKÖ p.58).

(251) Twice, Enceladus is referred to (or.4,85 and II,1,11, vv.1404-1406), while three times, the reference concerns their « being earthborn » (I,2,1, vv.302-303, or.27,9 and or.43,26, directed against the bishops who shoot up from the ground « ὡς ὁ μῦθος ποιεῖ τοὺς γίγαντας »). Gregory once refers to Hesiod (or.4,115, with mention of Enceladus, who is not included in Hesiod, however). Besides, there are four cases in which the giants are only cited for their proverbial « gigantic » strength (e.g. epg.74, v.1: ἔργα γιγάντων).

(252) Twice in the form of an allusion to Ps 18,6 (ἀγαλλιάσεται ὡς γίγας δραμεῖν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ): or.28,29 and or.43,66; once about Goliath, « ἀπόγονον τῶν γιγάντων »: or.13,2 (*PG* 35,853B).

> *That is for the children of the Greeks, for these have, as a support for their passions, had the idea to create depraved gods,...* (253).

In the first verse, Gregory reprimands the parents who force their children with an inclination towards celibacy (with a φύσις ἄσαρκος) into marriage. This rebuke is made by reminding his readers of the story of Genesis about the origin of the giants: they were the children of the sons of God and the daughters of men (ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ υἱοὶ [v.l. ἄγγελοι!] τοῦ θεοῦ τὰς θυγατέρας τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὅτι καλαί εἰσιν ... ἐκεῖνοι ἦσαν οἱ γίγαντες οἱ ἀπ' αἰῶνος, οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ ὀνομαστοί Gn 6,2-4). About men, God says in this passage that they will live only for a hundred and twenty years, « for they are flesh » (διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς σάρκας Gn 6,3). Gregory's first verses thus clearly refer to this Bible story. On the other hand, the formulation in the second verse recalls Hesiod's *Theogony* v.50: ἀνθρώπων τε γένος κρατερῶν τε Γιγάντων.

At first sight, it seems possible to connect the third verse with the flood, which is a result of the sinfulness of the descendants of the sons of God (see the concluding sentence of the passage from or.14, quoted below). Yet, in that case, the one who brought about the flood - God - would be accused of sinfulness (ἤλιτε ὅστις ... ἐκάθηρεν). From the following verses it appears that Gregory formulates his already mentioned criticism of myths in this verse: by inventing sinful gods (celestials), man exonerates his own (earthly) sinfulness. This perfidious purpose of the story is foisted upon the Greeks in the last two lines quoted.

If I understand this passage correctly, Gregory accuses the narrator of the myth of the giants (ἤλιτε ὅστις...) of having invented a pernicious blend of heavenly (ἄσαρκον) and earthly nature (σάρκεσσιν). Gregory looks upon the biblical and the Greek (Hesiodic) giants as identical, as was also done by Philo and others (254). In his eyes, the episode from Genesis tells a myth with an immoral message, belonging to Greek mythology. It is not clear how this can be reconciled with the divine inspiration of the Scripture. Perhaps Gregory assumed that the author of Genesis used a mythological allegory here? In our context, the fact that he clearly associates the episode with a Greek myth is more important than his precise interpretation of it.

---

(253) I.2,2, vv.491-495 (*PG* 37,617). The last verse and the following verses recur nearly literally in the epistolary poem to Nemesius, cf. p.227, about « myths and ethical truth. »

(254) For Philo: *Quaest. in Genesin* I,92. cf. Pépin, *Mythe* p.237. Also Philo spoke of « angels » instead of « sons of God ». Herzog, *Metapher* pp.160-161 refers to Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* IX,18, about an (anonymous) Jewish historician who linked the building of the tower of Babel with the Gigantomachy. Herzog also quotes Latin parallels.
Justin (*Apol. II*, 5,3) goes even further and identifies the children of the angels and the women with the demons, and thus - through the erroneous interpretation of the Greeks - with the pagan « gods ».

To my mind, a passage from the oration about the φιλοπτωχία confirms that Gregory positively considers this biblical narration as a myth. He calls on his listeners not to deem themselves more worthy than the destitute:

> Καὶ ὥσπερ ἦν τι τὸ παλαιόν, ὅσον ἐπὶ τοῖς μύθοις, γένος γιγάντων καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀνθρώπων· οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς τούτοις ἐσόμεθα ὑψηλοί τε καὶ ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον, οἷον Νεβρὼδ ἐκεῖνος, ἢ τὸ τοῦ Ἐνὰκ γένος, ἐκθλῖβον πάλαι τὸν Ἰσραήλ, ἢ δι᾽ οὓς ὁ κατακλυσμὸς τὴν γῆν ἐκάθηρεν;
> *In ancient times there was, at least according to the myths, a race of giants and of the rest of the world: shall we also take a lofty and superior attitude to them* (i.e. the poor), *like the famous Nimrod, or the tribe of the Anakites which previously threw Israel into confusion, or those who caused the Flood that cleansed the earth?* (255)

« They through whose fault the Flood cleansed the earth » are again the giants from Gn 6; also Nimrod (Gn 10,8) and the Anakites (Nu 13,33) are called γίγαντες in the LXX. These three Bible passages are quoted here as more concrete specimens of the mythical race of giants (256). Nowhere else in his œuvre do we find Gregory using the term μῦθος in connection with Bible passages. Hence, with regard to the giants, we can speak of one pagan-biblical mythology.

5.1.3 « Christianization of Greek myths »

In the longest chapter of her dissertation, Masson-Vincourt's attention is focused on « la christianisation des mythes païens » (257). If one might effectively speak of a Christianization of the myths in Gregory's œuvre, this would be an important step in the evolution towards a standard typology. Therefore, I summarize what Masson-Vincourt understands by this, and I also give my own opinion on this matter. In the second part of this chapter, these claims are verified on the basis of concrete examples.

---

(255) Or.14,23 (*PG* 35,888C).

(256) I think that Kurmann p.387 is mistaken in writing that « Or.14,23 *vergleicht* die Giganten mit den biblischen Nimrod und Enoch » (italics supplied). Both *are* giants: that Gregory already thinks of the *biblical* giants in the introductory clause (containing the general comparison with the γένος γιγάντων) – in so far as he makes any distinction at all, that is – appears from the fact that he looks upon the giants as a special kind of people (γένος γιγάντων καὶ τῶν **λοιπῶν** ἀνθρώπων). This is also the case in Gn 6,4 (οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ ὀνομαστοί), whereas for Hesiod, giants and human beings are different sorts of creatures.

Masson-Vincourt speaks of « christianisation » when Gregory uses (images from) Greek myths in the representation of Christian themes, in so far as the content of the Christian message is not altered by this (258). Thus, she thinks that in the case of the funeral epigrams, one cannot speak of christianized myths, because these epigrams obtained a profane character (259). Yet, most other mythological exempla (she speaks of images, symbols, allusions) serve a purely Christian purpose and are *therefore* christianized (260). Hence, in her view, the use in a Christian context is determinant.

The weakness of her conception of a « Christianization of myths » is that she takes no account of the difference between *Ernstbedeutung* and *Eigenbedeutung*, between exemplary use and interpretation. The mere fact that mythological images are used in a Christian context (which is by definition inherent in the work of a Church Father) in itself does not change the opinion on meaning, veracity, purpose of the myths. An exemplary use only points to a *literarization*, not to a Christianization of the myths. To my mind, one can speak only of the latter when the myth obtains a new, typically Christian *Eigenbedeutung*, when it is recovered so as to be part of the Christian theology or morality. In the discussion of mythology in Gregory's œuvre (chapter three), this turned out to be the case for example when he identified the pagan gods with the demon from the story of Genesis. But when Gregory has Nicobulus saying to his son:

---

(257) Masson-Vincourt, fourth chapter, pp.158-210.

(258) She makes « le tour des mythes que Grégoire utilise dans l'évocation du christianisme sous tous ses aspects » (Masson-Vincourt p.208); the criterion for christianization is the following question: « les images païennes sont-elles christianisées de façon à ne pas altérer la signification du christianisme? » (p.160).

(259) « Le mythe païen, loin d'être christianisé, imprime sa marque sur la pensée d'un homme dont on a peine à croire qu'il soit chrétien et même évêque » (p.167).

(260) See the intermediate titles: « Le mythe au service de la morale chrétienne », « ... de la théologie chrétienne », « ... de l'expression de l'expérience mystique », « Le mythe et le portrait du chrétien parfait ».

Οὐκ ὤμοισι τεοῖσιν ἀειρόμενός μ᾽ ἑκὰς οἴσεις,
Ὡς Ἀγχισιάδης γενέτην ἐὸν ἐκ πολέμοιο;
Won't you lift me on your shoulders and carry me far away,
as Aeneas carried his father Anchises from the stir of war? (261).

I do not consider this as a christianized myth, as Masson-Vincourt does (262). Christianization has to do with interpretation, I think, not with incorporation.

5.1.4 « Mythologization of the Bible »

Masson-Vincourt's « Christianization » found its counterpart in the observations of Reinhart Herzog, who spoke of a « Mythisierung der Bibel » with reference to - among others - Gregory. Like that of Masson-Vincourt, Herzog's term too is open to several interpretations. His point of departure is the « antikbiblische Einheitsmythologie » in Dante (compare Lausberg's « profan-theologische Typologie », also about Dante, mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, p.290). Herzog understands this as the end of a thousand year history of reception of Bible and mythology (263). He places the two most important phases of this development in late antiquity, because of the work of (especially the Greek) Church Fathers.

Under the intermediate title « Der griechische Mythos als christliche Metapher », Herzog comments on the prologue of the *Protrepticus* of Clement of Alexandria as an illustration of the first phase (264). He observes the phenomenon which also occurs in

---

(261) II,2,5, vv.85-86 (*PG* 37,1527).

(262) « Qu'Enée (...) soit pour le chrétien le modèle du fils qu'il doit être pour Dieu » (MASSON-VINCOURT p.187).

(263) Herzog notes that this history of reception still has to be written for patristic literature, and attributes this to the one-sided approaches which classicists and patrologists have taken with regard to this kind of literature: « Daß der Begriff der Rezeption nicht mehr in das einseitige Verständnis entweder als Nachleben (*sc. of the ancient inheritance*) oder als Säkularisierung (*sc. of biblical material*) auseinanderfällt, dessen bedarf die Literaturwissenschaft besonders, wenn sie sich der Spätantike zuwendet » (HERZOG, *Metapher* p.163). With this study, I try to contribute to this reception history.

(264) He also deals with the conclusion, in which Clement gives a brief survey of salvation history (τὸ σωτήριον δρᾶμα). Herzog calls this a « hypothetical, secondary myth », which gives evidence of both mythical and non-mythical features. In Gregory too, one often finds a short account of this « drama »; SZYMUSIAK calls this « mythical » too: *péché* pp.301-302 and *Teolog* p.582: « Dans ses poèmes, les récits bibliques prennent une dimension mythique. »

Gregory and which was defined by Masson-Vincourt as « Christianization »: « der griechische Mythos (wird) zum Vehikel der christlichen Aussage ». Yet he appropriately interprets this as the result of a literarization: « die Abwertung des Mythos gab ihn zur Deutung frei und entleerte ihn zur Metapher » (265). This way, mythology and Bible can be used as « ein einheitliches metaphorisches Kontinuum », which is, as pointed out, also the case for Gregory on the formal level (see for example pp.290-291 for the metaphorical exempla).

Herzog places the second phase in the fourth century (« Die rhetorische Synkrisis der christlichen Spätantike: Von der Typologie zur Mythisierung der Bibel »). As background and precondition for this « mythologization », he sees on the one hand a reception of the classical literary forms (especially poetry) (266), and on the other an emancipation of the (typological) exegesis, which lights upon new applications, apart from explicitly exegetical purposes: « die exegetisch bearbeitete Bibel wird frei zur literarischen Verwendung » (267). Some of Gregory Nazianzen's work is considered as prototypical of the « mythologization » – the concept is only indirectly defined by Herzog –, more specifically the extensive laudatory σύγκρισις in his funeral oration for Basil (or.43,70-76: Basil surpasses some thirty Bible characters from Old and New Testament). In examples from other Church Fathers, Herzog uses metaphorical exempla (antonomasias) as arguments. In his view, the soteriological dimension of the typological exegesis is disrupted at the transition to the panegyrical σύγκρισις, which, like the « Mythenüberbietung (...), deutet auf den ahistorischen, ständig wechselnden Punkt der Gegenwart » (268). The Bible characters become surpassable mythical characters, the σύγκρισις maintains neither the historical (i.e. typological), nor the metaphorical (i.e. allegorical) meaning of the biblical history and drives it back into its literal meaning. Herzog continues. Precisely « das litterale Verständnis der Bibel aber hatte die Mehrzahl der Väter (...) als μυθολογεῖσθαι abgelehnt » (269).

---

(265) *Metapher*, respectively pp.164 and 167.

(266) According to Herzog, this formal reception too has been treated unfairly: « Dieser Rezeptionsvorgang ist bisher, wenn überhaupt, von der klassischen Philologie zu einseitig als Depravierung bzw. Perpetuierung der antiken Gattungen beschrieben worden, während ihn die patristische Forschung noch weitgehend als eine fatale Literarisierung beurteilt » (*Metapher* p.177). At least for Gregory, this complaint is (somewhat) less valid than the previous one.

(267) *Metapher* p.176. About the myths as well, he said that they became *frei*.

(268) *Metapher* p.179. This is what « mythologization » signifies to him, cf. p.177: « Mythisierung der Bibel (...), genauer gesagt, inwiefern wir von einem Umschlagen des exegetisch-typologischen Verstehens in die literarische Technik der Mythenüberbietung reden können. » When Jerome

Another reason which prompts Herzog to speak of a mythologization of the Bible in Gregory is the detailed manner in which he explains the biblical histories: that is why they lose their historical (i.e. real) dimension: « An Wirklichkeiten kann Exegese nicht getrieben werden (...). Auslegung aber setzt als Ziel Wahrheit, nicht mehr Wirklichkeit voraus: die hermeneutischen Formen der Wirklichkeitsimmanenz, das Exempel und die Typologie (...) treten gegenüber der hermeneutischen Form des Dualismus Mythos - Wahrheit, der Allegorese, zurück. Die historische Dimension (...) schrumpft zum Auszudeutenden, zur Hülse der Wahrheit - zum Mythos » (270). In other words, allegorical interpretation is equated with mythologization here.

Herzog concludes: « Die Rezeption der antiken Literatur seit den 4.Jh.n.Chr. hat die biblischen Texte aus ihrer heilsgeschichtlichen und exegetischen Fixierung gelöst und als mythenähnliche Erzählungen zu verstehen gewagt (...). Die Bibel ersetzt nun den mythologischen Stoff der Dichtung. » « Die panegyrische Deutung deformiert die Bibel wie die theologische den Mythos » (271): the most important steps towards a pagan-biblical standard typology are taken at this.

In the third part of this chapter, I want to examine whether and to what extent Gregory breaks through the historical-typological framework with his use of metaphorical exempla and συγκρίσεις. Chapter four, on Gregory's view on the Bible, has already indicated that Herzog's arguments in speaking of « mythologization » should be put in perspective. First of all, he wrongly considers historical typology as internally biblical: the

---

and Ambrose also consider contemporaries as the fulfilment of Old Testament *figurae*, he likewise understands this as a breach « zwischen biblischer Heilsgeschichte und Mythisierung biblischer Geschichten ».

(269) *Metapher* p.181.

(270) HERZOG, *Literarisierung* pp.607-608. Also compare KURMANN, pp.402-403, in response to Gregory's defence of the allegorical reading of the Bible in or.4,118: « grundsätzlich wird jede Stelle der Bibel auch als 'Mythos' betrachtet, insofern sie für die Allegorese gebraucht wird. »

(271) *Metapher* pp.182-184.

extension to the present is common, certainly since the Alexandrians, and is essential in the Byzantine tradition (272): to speak of an « ahistorischen Punkt der Gegenwart » is inaccurate in this respect. Furthermore, the fact that « die Mehrzahl der Väter » would have considered literal interpretation of the Bible as μυθολογεῖσθαι, is overtly incorrect. What most Fathers, including Gregory, actually did reject was the clinging *exclusively* to the letter. This leads me to raise the most important rejection: Herzog does not seem to bear in mind sufficiently that the Church Fathers accepted several meanings of the Bible existing alongside one another. Just because Gregory only mentions the historical-literal meaning of, for instance, Joshua in his σύγκρισις (273) does not imply that he forgets or excludes the other meanings, in this case the Jesus-typology. Literal application does not necessarily imply an (exclusively) literal interpretation. Likewise, allegorical explanation does not exclude the historical-typological dimension: Herzog overlooks this, I think, when equating allegorical reading with mythologization (an « Antiochene » argument).

5.1.5 Literarization of mythology and Bible

Undeniably, mythological and biblical histories are similarly worked into Gregory's fairly numerous metaphorical exempla. Pagan-historical histories are hardly ever used in this way (274): for the incorporation into an antonomasia or an allegory, Gregory apparently only uses *interpretable* histories in his poems, even though they are often quoted in their literal meaning and there is by definition no sign of an explicit interpretation.

On the other hand, in his express judgements, Gregory makes a clear-cut distinction between myths (fictitious, theologically untrue, morally harmful) and Bible (true, meant as commandment and example). With the exception of the discussed passage about the giants, he never uses the term μῦθος (fictitious story) for biblical episodes; on the contrary, one of the rare times that a mythological and a biblical exemplum are put next to one another for confirmation (Pandora and Eve), he introduces the latter with ἄλλος δ' οὐκέτι μῦθος (275).

---

(272) For Gregory himself, see supra p.254.

(273) Herzog, *Metapher* p.181.

(274) The only pure example is I,2,25, v.126, in which Milo forms an antonomasia for « a strong man » (as opposed to ἀσθενής). Besides, Midas symbolizes « a rich man » in I,2,10, v.392, but Midas is a legendary character (cf. v.407 of the same poem: τὸν μῦθον αἰνῶ...), and moreover, Gregory explicitly quotes a verse of an (unnamed) comedian or tragedian here.

Taking into account Gregory's own interpretation of the concept of myth, I would consider it inappropriate, perhaps with a few exceptions (the giants), to speak of a « mythologization » of the Bible, just as one should not make mention of a « Christianization » of the Greek myths too quickly. « Literarization » seems better suited to both cases. But even then, the question remains as to whether the absence of explicit hermeneutics in the literary reception also implies that the exegesis is abandoned, disrupted or even reversed.

5.2. Mythological metaphors

Masson-Vincourt sees an opposition between Gregory's attitude towards Greek mythology and his exemplary reception of it: « Grégoire de Nazianze condamne chez les païens l'exégèse allégorique des mythes, mais nous avons vu que, paradoxalement, il ne répugnait pas à reprendre le procédé pour l'appliquer à la Bible (276). Il pousse le paradoxe encore plus loin, puisqu'on le voit pratiquer une sorte d'exégèse morale sur les mythes grecs eux-mêmes » (277).

The examples once more show that she confuses « exégèse morale » and « application morale »: her first quotation is that in which Gregory compares the unprepared bishops with the earthly born giants: ὁμοῦ τε σπαρεὶς καὶ ἀναδοθεὶς ὡς ὁ μῦθος ποιεῖ τοὺς Γίγαντας (278). Evidently, we only have an exemplary reception here, and not an exegesis of the myth of the Spartoi. Yet the question remains: is there no inconsistency between Gregory's polemical interpretation of the Greek myths and his metaphorical use of it even within this polemic itself (towards Julian as well as towards Nemesius) (279)?

As pointed out, Gregory has an ambivalent view on Greek mythology. Usually, he denies it every religious value: the myths are fictitious and untrue, the gods do not exist or are human creations. A valid metaphysical interpretation is out of the question in this case. Yet, sometimes, he ascribes a certain extent of reality to these gods, as wrongly interpreted demons, which makes a correct interpretation possible. I think that the metaphorical use of the Greek myths is not only not in contradiction with this double hermeneutic stance, but can even be explained by it.

---

(275) I.2.29, v.127 (cf. supra p.122).

(276) We have seen this as well, and modified this paradox somewhat: supra n.50 and p.266.

(277) Masson-Vincourt p.125.

(278) Or.43,26 (*PG* 36,532D, cf. n.251).

(279) A partial answer to this question has already been given on p.229: whereas the criticism mostly concerns myths about gods, it is usually myths about heroes which are used in an exemplary way.

5.2.1 Mythology as literature

In his criticism of myths, Gregory treats mythology as a part of religious paganism. Yet, precisely because he denies it the slightest amount of value, as he considers myths as sheer fables, he reduces mythology to literature, to a component of the cultural Hellenism which also belongs to the Christian inheritance. Only a desecrated myth can be employed in a literary manner in the view of Christians (280).

This literarized myth may be interpreted in a profane allegorism: see Gregory's explanation of μῶλυ and νηπενθὲς as the force of the word (p.231). Yet, in his poems, this is the only passage with explicit allegorical explanation of myths (281); all other exemplary histories are quoted in their literal sense, – though often with a metaphorical *Ernstbedeutung*. That is the case for example in the allegory of the journey to Ithaca (p.221). Of course, Gregory does not interpret Odysseus' passage past Scylla and Charybdis as a warning against the allegorical explanation of myths. However, it is quite attractive to formulate this warning in this manner. The majority of the mythological metaphors are included as mere ornamentation, and by no means reveal an appreciation or interpretation of the myth itself (282).

---

(280) Cf. Herzog about Clement (supra p.296); Horstmann p.11: « diese Liberalität (signalisiert) das Ende des theologischen Kampfes und den Triumph des Christentums. » Thus, for Gregory, the Greek myth actually belongs to Day's category of the « derivative myth » (Day p.7). Day himself places this desacralization only in the Middle Ages: « The most significant medieval treatment of classic literature was the desacralization of ancient myth, which the Patristic Fathers (*sic*) even in their most virulent hostility had recognized as religion » (Day p.53). Gregory's *practice* proves the opposite, I think.

(281) In the same context, the miraculous forces of Orpheus and Amphion are also allegorically interpreted: Ὀρφείη κιθάρη μῦθος πέλεν, ὥσπερ ἐΐσκω. / Πάντας ἄγων μελέεσσιν, ὁμῶς ἀγαθούς τε κακούς τε· / Ὡς δ' Ἀμφιονίη λύρη καὶ λᾶας ἔπειθε, / Ψυχὰς ἀντιτύπους πετρώδεας (II,2,5, vv.193-196, *PG* 37,1535).

(282) Along with the allegorical interpretation (cf. preceding note), Orpheus and Amphion can also simply function as antonomasias for an

As pointed out, I do not believe that one can speak of a Christianization of the myths here. Most exempla quoted by Masson-Vincourt as instances of Christianization have a purely ornamental function. I give some examples of exempla (especially metaphorical) from the poems.

Masson-Vincourt looks upon the following verse from the poem *against the gaudy women* as a myth serving Christian morality (283):

> ἔνδοθι τὴν Ἑκάβην, ἔκτοθι τὴν Ἑλένην (284).

Three centuries before Gregory, Lucillius, author of epigrams and not the most devoted of Christians, used the same antonomasias in a satire against old women who paint themselves up so as to appear as young girls (285).

In the dogmatic poem περὶ ψυχῆς, Gregory challenges the doctrine of the metensomatosis. It is held against the supporters of it that they have the soul go through the rotations of the arch-scoundrel Ixion:

> Ἰξίονος κύκλοισιν ἀλιτροτάτοιο φέροντες (286).

Even if this exemplary use were the manifestation of Gregory's understanding of Ixion's punishment as an eternal migration of the soul (which I doubt), then this could still hardly be called a Christian interpretation.

---

inspired singer: Νῦν δ' Ὀρφεὺς ἡμῖν πάντα κινῶν δακτύλοις,/ Ἢ τειχοποιὸς Ἀμφίων ἐκ κρουμάτων (II,1,41, vv.46-47, *PG* 37,1342). Here, the literal version of the myth is given.

(283) MASSON-VINCOURT p.171: « lorsqu'il christianise le mythe pour le mettre au service de la morale chrétienne (...) Grégoire en donne une exégèse chrétienne. » For the types of Christianization according to Masson-Vincourt, cf. n.260.

(284) I,2,29, v.42 (*PG* 37,887).

(285) Οὔποτε φῦκος καὶ ψίμυθος τεύξει τὴν Ἑκάβην Ἑλένην (*AP* 11,408, v.5). cf. KNECHT p.70.

(286) I,1,8, v.38 (*PG* 37,449). MASSON-VINCOURT refers to this on pp.194-195, as an example of a Christianized myth serving Christian theology.

There would also be some myths « que Grégoire christianise complètement, et par l'intermédiaire desquels il trace le portrait du parfait chrétien » (287).

> Πυνθάνομ' Ἀλφειοῖο καλὸν ῥόον, ὡς διὰ πικρῆς
> ἔρχεθ' ἁλός, μέγα θαῦμα, γλυκὺς ῥόος, οὐδ' ἐπίμικτος
> ἡ λώβη τελέθει.
> *As I hear, the beautiful stream Alpheus runs through*
> *the salty sea as a fresh stream - a great marvel -, and no taint*
> *can become fused with it* (288).

« L'élan d'Alphée vers Aréthuse est celui du chrétien vers Dieu. » In any case, in this passage from the poem περὶ ἀρετῆς, the Alpheus symbolizes the virtuous, impervious to corruption by the dangers of life, but this does not signify that Gregory also interprets the Alpheus as a Christian symbol.

Masson-Vincourt sees a similar kind of imagery in the following allusion to the myth of Arion, taken from the conclusion of the epistolary poem of Nicobulus to his son.

> Δελφὶς δ' εὐδιόωσαν ὑπεὶρ ἅλα, νῶτα φαεινοῖς
> Γυροῖς εὐγνάμπτοισιν ἑλισσόμενος πυμάτοισι,
> Σκιρτῴη κατὰ κῦμα τεὸν βίον ἡγεμονεύων,
> Ὥς ποτε καὶ νώτοισιν ἀοίδιμον ἤγαγ' ἀοιδόν.
> *Let a dolphin jump over the quiet sea, its back bowed*
> *in shining curves and its tail finely bent:*
> *let him lead your life jumping over the waves,*
> *as he once carried the famous singer on his back* (289).

Her allegorical explanation seems attractive: « ce dauphin (...), c'est le poisson sauveur; il faut y voir l'image du Christ; la mer symbolise, là encore, la vie temporelle à laquelle il faut échapper » (290). However, the context calls for caution. It is impossible that Nicobulus would be suggesting that his son has to escape worldly life (the sea is described as « quiet », for that matter): in the following verses, he is hoping that his son will be outstanding in the schools of rhetoric, and the tone of the entire text, put in the mouth of the sophisticated Nicobulus, is markedly profane. Furthermore, the image of the friendly dolphin fits in the context, in which the son is wished a kind of cosmic sympathy: that the whole earth may be favourably disposed towards him, that flowers may spring up under his feet, that rivers may ripple and each sea may bring him balmy winds (291). This is followed by the verses with the allusion to Arion, and those about the hoped for literary qualities (*honey may drip from your writings*) (292). The fatherly wish concludes with a bucolic scene including a quotation from Theocritus: that also the crickets and the birds may come to rejoice Nicobulus jr. when he is having a rest under the trees in spring (293).

---

(287) MASSON-VINCOURT p.205.
(288) I,2,9, vv.22-24 (*PG* 37,669).
(289) II,2,5. vv.234-237 (*PG* 37,1538).
(290) MASSON-VINCOURT pp.207-208.

Ultimately, the interpretation of Odysseus' journey past Scylla to Ithaca as « le chrétien qui s'assure l'immortalité et la vie céleste s'il évite les écueils de la vie mondaine » (294) is certainly wrong, as has already been shown (n.52).

In none of the above cases has a Greek myth been interpreted in a Christian manner, even though in other authors this is actually done for a number of the quoted characters. Orpheus, for instance, is considered by Clement as « a precursor of the truth of revelation » (295), but in Gregory, this is absolutely out of the question. Odysseus is usually appreciated by him, as an example of virtue, yet his voyage past the Sirens, tied to the mast, is not quoted by Gregory as an adumbration of the cross, – as it actually is in the writings of other authors (296). In my view, one can only truly speak of a Christianization of myths in this kind of interpretation.

---

(291) Πᾶσα μὲν ὑμετέροισιν ἐπίτροχος αἶα πέλοιτο / Ποσσὶν ἐπειγομένοισι, καὶ ἄνθεα καλὰ φύοιτο. / Καὶ ποταμοὶ κελάδοιεν ἐνηέα, πᾶς δέ τε πόντος / Νῆα φέροι πνοιῇσιν ἐλαφροτάτῃσιν ἐς ὅρμον (vv.230-233, *PG* 37,1538).

(292) Χρύσεα δ' αὖ πτυκτῇσιν ἐνὶ πινάκεσσι γράφοιτο / Γράμματα σῇ παλάμῃ, στάζοι δ' ἀπὸ κηρία βίβλου (vv.242-243, *PG* 37,1539).

(293) Εἰ δὲ σύ γ' ἀκρεμόνεσσιν ὀχήμενος (*patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi* or something like this), εἴαρος ὥρῃ, / Τῆμος ὅτε πνοιαὶ γλυκερώτεραι εἰσι βροτοῖσιν (...) Τέττιγες λαλαγεῦντες (= Theocritus, id.7,139), ἅμ' ὀρνίθεσσιν ἀοιδοῖς, / Σὸν δέμας ἡδυθρόοισιν ἀναψύχοιεν ἀοιδαῖς (vv.244-249, *ibidem*).

(294) Masson-Vincourt p.207.

(295) Bartelink, *Antieke cultuur* p.70.

(296) Rahner, *Mythen* pp.281-328, especially from p.315 on; most striking example from Ambrosius pp.323-324. Rahner emphasizes that there is more involved here than a mere metaphor: « Wenn die Christen später den Mastbaum, an dem sie den unsterblichen Meerfahrer angebunden sehen, als Symbol des Kreuzes betrachten, so ist das keine künstliche Willkürlichkeit und Allegorie » (p.316). With an improbable *Hineininterpretierung*, he reads a similar allusion to the voyage past the Sirens in the following verses of Gregory: Ψυχῆς δὲ πλόος ἐστὶ μέγας καὶ πνεύματος ἐσθλοῦ. / Τῇ ῥα περιτρομέουσα, πλέον Χριστοῖο δέδραγμαι· / Οὐχ οἷον, ποθέω δὲ

5.2.2 Mythology as demonology

A second way in which Gregory rules out the pagan gods and heroes is by exposing them as demons. Thus, they are fitted into the Christian demonology - Christianized, that is (297). Some mythological characters become accomplices or manifestations of the deceiver, the envious one, the seducer: this is what happens with Erinyes, Enyo, Phthonos, Momos, Empusa, Proteus. Thus, it runs in a θρῆνος:

> Πάντα γάρ, ὅσσ' ἐθέλῃσι, πέλει θανάτοιο σοφιστής,
> Γεγὼς ὁ Πρωτεὺς εἰς κλοπὰς μορφωμάτων.
> *Since the sophist of death becomes whatever he wants,*
> *he is Proteus with his deceitful appearances* (298).

Elsewhere, Gregory metaphorically describes Maximus as Proteus (Αἰγύπτιόν τιν' ἄλλον ὄψει Πρωτέα, see p.291), or does the same with opportunistic bishops who trim their sails to every wind:

> Πρωτεὺς σοφιστὴς εἰς κλοπὰς μορφωμάτων
> ἢ καὶ Μελάμπους ἤ τις ἄλλος ἄστατος.
> *(The good bishop may not...)*
> *be a veritable Proteus when it comes to adapting himself.*
> *He may not be a real Melampus indeed, or any other model of versatility* (299).

καὶ εὐδιόωσά περ ἔμπης / Χριστὸν ἐμόν, πόθον ἁγνόν, ὃς ἔμπεδός ἐστι ποθεῦσιν (I,2,1, vv.582-585, *PG* 37,566). « Christus ist also hier gleichsam der ans Holz des Mastbaums angebundene himmlische Odysseus » (p.322). And even if it were correct to speak of an allusion here, Rahner should have written « *Der Christ* ist also ... ». As a matter of fact, though, the only allusion to this Homeric episode in Gregory's œuvre is I,2,33, vv.65-66; there, only the wax with which the ears have to be stopped is mentioned.

(297) Cf. Masson-Vincourt pp.196-199: correctly in these cases.

(298) II,1,83, vv.9-10 (*PG* 37,1429). Himerius also uses the image of Proteus as a sophist, but in a positive sense: as an example of ποικιλία (cf. Kennedy, *Rhetoric* p.149).

(299) II,1,12, vv.728-729 (*PG* 37,1219, translation Meehan, *three poems* p.71). In or.4,82 too, Proteus and Melampus are put next to one another, in this case to describe Julian.
Gregory provides the only attestation of a version of the myth of Melampus in which this character changes form several times, cf. Lefherz pp.40-44.

In these - exceptional - cases, the mythological metaphor signifies more than mere literary ornamentation, I think. By means of Proteus, it is suggested that also Maximus, corrupt bishops and Julian (see n.299), are instruments of the devil. Through his demonological interpretation, Gregory transforms Proteus into a negative soteriological τύπος as it were. And by using this τύπος as an antonomasia, he subtly indicates his appreciation of contemporary events.

5.3 Biblical metaphors

With the exception of the last mentioned cases, there is a disruption of the correlation between hermeneutics and παράδειγμα, between *Eigenbedeutung* and *Ernstbedeutung* in Gregory's mythological metaphors. A prerequisite for that appeared to be a desecrating interpretation of myths, which literarizes mythology, that is, which makes it available for literary use. Exemplary use does not imply interpretation here (300).

As pointed out, Herzog postulates a similar procedure in the case of the reception of biblical histories. A condition for literary application is the typological interpretation here, which makes the Bible characters into τύποι, and the Bible itself « frei zur literarischen Verwendung ». Through the emancipation from the exegetical writings and the adoption of classical rhetorical forms (e.g. σύγκρισις and metaphorical exemplum), Gregory is said to have abandoned the soteriological meaning: the use of the literal meaning as well as the allegorization are indications of « mythologization » for Herzog. Hence, biblical metaphors would also reveal a breach between hermeneutics and παράδειγμα. On the basis of some representative examples, I intend to show that this is not the case (301).

---

(300) Eventually, there is no more difference between an exemplum derived from mythology and one from nature: in the disputation of the allegorical explanation of myths, the allegory of the journey to Ithaca is reinforced with an image from nature (cf. supra p.221).

(301) I shall deal no more with the parables, as I have already established when examining the exemplary use of these that there actually *is* a correlation between *Eigen-* and *Ernstbedeutung*. Moreover, it is hard to speak of « mythologization » of the parables: Gregory himself calls them μῦθοι: see, for example, his justification for his own use of εἰκόνες: Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἅπαξ εἰς τούτους κατέστην τοὺς λόγους καὶ πρὸς ἑτέραν ἦλθον **εἰκόνα**, σφόδρα τοῖς παροῦσι συμβαίνουσαν. Τάχα με γέροντα καὶ **μυθολόγον** νομίσετε, ἂν καὶ ὑμῖν ταύτην γνωρίσω· γνωριστέον δ' οὖν, ἐπεὶ **καὶ τὴν Γραφὴν**

5.3.1 Biblical metaphors and typology

It has already been denied (p.298-9) that the transposition of biblical characters into the « a-historical » present instead of using them only in internally biblical events would mean as much as abandoning the soteriological dimension. In the eyes of the Christians, salvation history continues, and the present adds new episodes to the succession of divine interventions. Nowhere does Gregory suggest this as clearly as in the first ψόγος against Julian. The προοίμιον is concluded with the situation of Gregory's own book in the biblical tradition:

> Πρότερον μὲν οὖν ἐδείκνυ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰ θαυμάσια Ἐνὼχ μετατιθέμενος, Ἠλίας ἀναλαμβανόμενος, Νῶε διασωζόμενος, (...). Τί με δεῖ καταριθμεῖν ἕκαστα, ὅσα δι᾽ αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ κατὰ τὴν σωτήριον αὐτοῦ παρουσίαν καὶ σάρκωσιν (...) τεθαυματούργηται; Πόσαι ταῦτα καὶ βίβλοι καὶ μνῆμαι φέρουσι.
> Τὰ δὲ δὴ νῦν « δεῦτε, ἀκούσατε καὶ διηγήσομαι ὑμῖν, πάντες οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν Θεόν » (Ps 65,16), « ὅπως ἂν γνῷ γενεὰ ἑτέρα » (Ps 77,6) καὶ διαδοχαὶ γενεῶν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ δυναστείας τὰ θαύματα. (...) πάντα μὲν οὖν ἐκτραγῳδεῖν τὰ ἐκείνου βίβλοις καὶ ἱστορίαις παρήσομεν.
> *Before, God's marvels were manifested by Enoch who was translated, by Elijah who was taken up into heaven, by Noah who was saved,* (... some twenty Old Testament episodes follow ...). *And why do I have to sum up all miracles, which are accomplished by Christ himself in the course of his saving presence and incarnation on earth? How numerous are the books and memories which contain these miracles. But the present miracles, « Come and hear, all you who fear God, and I will tell you », « so that the next generation might know them », and the successions of generations: the miracles of God's power. (...) To expound the whole tragedy of this man* (sc. Julian), *we do leave to the historical books* (302).

The Bible is obviously considered here as a registration of God's θαύματα in Jewish history and during the life of Christ. With his στηλογραφία, Gregory has similar intentions: to record the θαύματα from his age for future generations. It is quite remarkable that he expressly claims not to have any historiographic pretensions. I would think that this statement implicitly indicates that the Bible should not be read as a historiographic work

---

οἶδα πολλάκις τοιούτοις χρωμένην εἰς σαφεστέραν δήλωσιν (or.26,10, *PG* 35,1240C).

(302) Or.4,18-20 (*PG* 35,545C-549A).

either, but as a series of stories about God's miraculous intervention in history, that is, as a soteriological book (303).

The transition from explicit emphasizing of the continuity of God's θαύματα (as in the passage above) to a biblical metaphor in which the same soteriological continuity is implied, can be illustrated convincingly by means of Gregory's paradigmatic prayers. I come back to some passages from the examples quoted on pp.194-6.

1. The passage from the autobiographical poem II,1,11 starts with a partial enumeration of God's biblical θαύματα, to which are added some taken from Gregory's own life (the same technique as in or.4):

> πάντων δ' ὑπομνήσας σε τῶν πρὶν θαυμάτων,
> οἷς τὴν μεγίστην χεῖρά σου γνωρίζομεν,
> πόντου ῥαγέντος Ἰσραὴλ ὡδευκότος.
> (...)
> προσθεὶς τε τἀμὰ τοῖς πάλαι βοωμένοις,...

This is followed by an identification with the apostles on the lake; the formula καὶ νῦν (minimal insertion) asks for a repetition of Christ's salvatory intervention:

> « σός », εἶπον, « εἰμί, καὶ τὸ πρὶν καὶ νῦν ἔτι.
> (...)
> καὶ νῦν μαθητὴς ἐν σάλῳ· τίνασσέ μοι
> τὸν ὕπνον ἢ πέζευε, καὶ στήτω φόβος. » (304).

---

(303) Just as all these θαύματα are manifestations of a similar concern of God for man, thus there is also a continuity in negative soteriology for Gregory: the same Satan who already attempted to bring man down in Eden, and who led the Greeks astray, is now still present in all kinds of shapes (in this manner, I interpreted Proteus as a meaningful antonomasia).
This identity of the previous and the present originator of doom is succinctly phrased by Gregory in the πράξεις of the funeral oration for Basil. Basil had to deal with a hostile prefect, *sent to him by him who formerly set Hadad against Israel* (actually against Solomon): ἀλλ' ὁ κινήσας ποτὲ τῷ Ἰσραὴλ Ἀδὲρ τὸν ἀλιτήριον, οὗτος κινεῖ καὶ τούτῳ τὸν τῆς Ποντικῆς μοίρας ὕπαρχον (...) τῆς ἀσεβείας ὑπερμαχοῦντα καὶ κατὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας ἱστάμενον (or.43,55, *PG* 36,565C).

(304) II,1,11, vv.186-201 (*PG* 37,1042-3).

2. The following prayer does not explicitly express the continuity of the θαύματα, but illustrans and illustrandum are still separated:

> Ὃς πυρὶ καὶ νεφέλῃ στρατὸν ἤγαγες, ὃς δ' ὁδὸν εὗρες
> Ἐν πελάγει πήξας κύματ' ἐλαυνομένοις. (...)
> Καὶ νῦν τῷ θεράποντι συνέμπορος ἐλθὲ καλεῦντι,
> Χριστέ, φάος μερόπων, δεξιὰ πάντα φέρων (305).

3. In the next metaphorical paradigmatic prayer, exactly the same episodes are allegorically *used*, but the meaning has not changed. The typological *exegesis* is by no means abandoned; here too, two historical divine interventions are brought into connection:

> Χριστέ, φάος μερόπων, πυρόει στύλε Γρηγορίοιο
> Ψυχῇ, πλαζομένῃ πικρῆς βιότου δι' ἐρήμης,
> (...) Ἣν δὲ κίχῃσιν
> Ἐχθρὸς ἐπισπέρχων, σὺ δέ μοι καὶ πόντον ἐρυθρὸν
> Τμήξειας, στερεὴν δὲ διεκπεράοιμι θάλασσαν (306).

The majority of the biblical metaphors in Gregory's poems are a reflection of the same typological hermeneutics. When Gregory speaks of Noah's Ark instead of mentioning the Anastasia Church or the community of Nazianzus (307), he actually means that the leaders of these centres of orthodoxy received the same assignment as Noah had formerly: preserving the seeds of a new community in the middle of a world of sinfulness. When he calls his parents Abraham and Sarah, referring to their late parenthood and the spiritual sacrifice of their son (308), this is because the same God hears the same prayer and gets a similar token of gratitude. When he calls himself or someone else « a second Job », he does not only voice the acute squalor, but also explains it as a testing for which one will be eventually rewarded (309). Also New Testament events are used in metaphorical exempla, though less frequently, and then in particular where healings are concerned. For instance, the woman who suffered from a hemorrhage is set as an example in a metaphorical paradigmatic prayer:

---

(305) I,1,38 (*PG* 37,521-2).

(306) II,1,22a (*PG* 37,1281). Also compare the passage from the opening lines from the oration Εἰς τὰ Θεοφάνια, in which the episode of the pillar of fire recurs (or.38,2, *PG* 36,313A, cf. already supra n.154). Here, the liturgical feast itself is an actualization of the Old Testament interventions: Πάλιν τὸ σκότος λύεται, πάλιν τὸ φῶς ὑφίσταται, πάλιν Αἴγυπτος σκότῳ κολάζεται, **πάλιν Ἰσραὴλ στύλῳ φωτίζεται**. Πάλιν signifies the same as the καὶ νῦν in the quotations from his poetry.

(307) II,1,11, vv.1081-1083 (*PG* 37,1103) to the Anastasia: κιβωτὲ Νῶε, τὴν ἐπίκλυσιν μόνη / κόσμου φυγοῦσα καὶ φέρουσα δεύτερον / κόσμον τὸν ὀρθόδοξον ἐν τοῖς σπέρμασιν. II,1,30, vv.40-42 (*PG* 37,1291) about Nazianzus: Κιβωτὸς, ἡ μόνη / Κόσμου φυγοῦσ' ἐπίκλυσιν / Καλῶς ὀλωλότος. For this traditional image, see RAHNER, *Symbole* pp.516-538, with examples from Gregory's prose (or.18,17 and or.43,70) pp.530-531.

(308) II,1,11, vv.52-53 (*PG* 37.1033): Ἦν μοι πατὴρ (...) / πάτραρχος

> Εἰπέ, καὶ αἱματόεσσα ῥύσις λήξειε τάχιστα.
> *Say the word, and let the issue of blood be straightaway dried* (310).

And also elsewhere, Gregory identifies himself with this woman in an allegory:

> Σῶν κλέπτω θυσάνων παλάμαις ἄκος, ἀλλὰ ῥέεθρον
> Αἵματος ἴσχε τάχος σαρξὶ μαραινομέναις.
> *Secretly I seek healing by touching your garment, but quickly*
> *stop the hemorrhage which makes my body waste away* (311).

This kind of metaphorical exemplum irrefutably implies a typological exegesis: it presupposes and expresses typology as hermeneutics. In the same way as typology has a concrete history or character as *object* and as *result*, and as the interpretation is based on a soteriological *relation* (see p.247), thus too does the antonomasia or allegory in the above cases replace the *illustrandum* with the *illustrans* (both concrete histories or characters) on the basis of a soteriological *relation*. In fact, one should no longer speak of biblical *metaphors* here, but of biblical *metonymies*, and on a more general level, the term **metonymical exempla** should be used in these cases instead of *analogical* exempla, since the soteriological relation is not simply based on a similarity, but on

---

ὄντως, Ἀβραάμ τις δεύτερος. Ept.90, vv.1-3 (*PG* 38,56): Σάρρα φίλη, πῶς τὸν σὸν Ἰσαὰκ λίπες, ἡ ποθέουσα / τῶν Ἀβραὰμ κόλπων ὡς τάχος ἀντιάσαι, / Νόννα Γρηγορίοιο θεόφρονος;
For the same reason, Gregory compares himself more often with Samuel, though never in a metaphorical exemplum.

(309) The most apparent example is I,2,38, vv.3-6 (*PG* 37,967): Εἴ τις ἄριστος ἐὼν κύρσαις τραχέος βιότοιο, / Ὡς χρυσὸς χοάνοις ἴσθι καθαιρόμενος· / Ἢ φθονεροῖο πάλῃ κάμνων δέμας, ἄλλος Ἰὼβ τις, / Ὥς κεν ἀεθλήσας στέμμα νίκης φορέοις.

(310) II,1,1, v.584 (*PG* 37,1013, translation MEEHAN, *three poems* p.44).

(311) II,1,50, vv.73-74 (*PG* 37,1390); compare also II,1,46, vv.25-26.

a *real* correspondence (312). The illustrandum comes down to more than an analogous happening or even imitation of the exemplary history: it is a repetition, an actualization of it, with the same main actor (or director): through the biblical παράδειγμα, the present is denoted as a new θαῦμα τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ δυναστείας (313). (If one admits that – at least in the author's view – the relation between *illustrandum* and *illustrans* is indeed not simply based on analogy, this also implies that this « metonymical exemplum » is no technical means of persuasion, ἔντεχνος πίστις in the Aristotelian sense (cf. p.37): the author does not *establish* the relation, he simply *discovers* it through his hermeneutical practice, just as an orator can appeal to testimonies as ἄτεχνοι πίστεις, untechnical means of persuasion (314).)

The above description of biblical metonymies (the phrasing of current events [illustranda] by means of biblical events [illustrantia, or τύποι?] on the basis of a soteriological relation) may raise questions about the necessity of the historicity of the exemplary history.

---

(312) Cf. BAKER p.267: « typology implies a real correspondence ». Compare LAUSBERG §565: « Die Metonymie verwendet also ein Wort in der Bedeutung eines anderen Wortes, das semantisch mit dem verwendeten Wort in einer realen Beziehung steht » (in the case of an allegory, « Wort » should be replaced by « history », in the case of an antonomasia, by « character »). As an example of a « reale Beziehung », Lausberg mentions, among other things, « Symbol » (§568). The biblical characters are indeed soteriological symbols (cf. SCHNEIDER pp.156-157). Lausberg further indicates that « der Übergang von der Metonymie zur Metapher ist fließend » (§571). GENETTE too emphasizes the problematical classification of the tropes; he calls the most cautious description of the metonymy « tropes par correspondance » (p.167, after Fontanier). This description is perfectly suitable for the defined biblical παράδειγμα. Compare also LOOSE p.579: « De theologie van de middeleeuwse semiotiek is er een van unieke en eenmalige openbaring welke zich contextueel herhaalt als een aaneenschakeling van metonymieën. »
In this way, the three most important classical tropes (metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche) would correspond with three types of exempla (analogical, metonymical, inductive), the first two of which are formally hardly distinguishable in a rhetorical description.

(313) Despite the fact that it mostly concerns exempla which serve an *ornamental function* according to the formal rhetorical analysis, their actual *meaning* turns out to be more important than that of many *exempla probationis*.

(314) Cf. VON MOOS pp.73-77. He rightly remarks: « Der Unterschied zwischen der wirklichen (objektiven, wahren, natürlichen, unkünstlichen) und der « gemachten » (ausgedachten, konstruierten, künstlichen) Beziehung stellt in der hermeneutischen Praxis (sc. of the modern scholar) oft unlösbare Probleme » (p.76, cf. also my final remark in n.312).

When defining the concept of typology, I suggested that the typological method leaves the historicity of the interpreted history outside consideration (supra n.130). In the case of Jonah, it appeared that Gregory, despite the apparent rejection of (part of) the literal-historical meaning, mentions the episode in the whale and interprets it in a christological-typological way (supra p.276). In the same manner, he frequently uses the history of Jonah as a metaphorical exemplum. And in this as well, he makes use of the literal meaning. The semantic intentions are twofold (just as the interpretation of the episode is not unambiguous): either Gregory begs for a new intervention « from the belly of the whale », or he adapts himself to his vocation, « having become mellow inside the whale » (315).

Can one speak here of a « pushing back » into the literal meaning, then, and hence of a « mythologizing »? To the extent to which Gregory doubts the historicity of the story of Jonah, one can indeed say that he considers it as a μῦθος, in the sense of « narrative phrasing of a truth ». Yet, his criticism was only directed at a number of aspects of the history; without a doubt, he considers Jonah himself as a historical character. And if he were to look upon the episode in the whale as mythical, then there is still a wide gap between this kind of myth and the Greek myths: the story of Jonah is definitely *true*: in the allegorical use which he makes of it, he appeals to two « truths »: 'God brings salvation' (the story as θαῦμα) and 'one can / should not withdraw from one's vocation' (Jonah as τύπος / paragon). In both cases, the use remains within the typological-hermeneutic framework (316).

---

(315) II,1,51, vv.33-36 (*PG* 37,1396, end of a paradigmatic prayer): Μωσῆς παιδοφόνου ποθ' ὑπέκφυγε δόγμα τυράννου. / Κητείων λαγόνων σκότιον μόρον ἁγνὸς Ἰωνᾶς, / Καὶ θῆρας Δανιήλ, παῖδες φλόγας. Αὐτὰρ ἔμοιγε / Τίς λύσις κακότητος; Ἄναξ, σύ με, Χριστέ, σάωσον. II,1,1, vv.1 and 6-7 (*PG* 37,967-70, also in a paradigmatic prayer): Χριστὲ ἄναξ, (...) Ὅν διὰ καὶ μεγάλου ἀπὸ κήτεος ἔκθορ' Ἰωνᾶς / Εὐξάμενος, καὶ χεῖρας ἐνὶ σπλάγχνοισι τανύσσας.

(316) Instead of « mythologization », Daniélou speaks - with regard to Clement and Origen - of « demythologization », which he describes as follows: « elle dégage la vérité contenue dans le sens littéral, que celui-ci soit historique ou non » (DANIÉLOU, *démythisation* p.49). This description is certainly in line with Gregory's treatment of the Bible, in this case with the story of Jonah. Yet I doubt whether it makes sense to employ Bultmann's concept of *Entmythologisierung* in this regard. Daniélou himself points to « la différence de leurs contextes ». Gregory was still too much rooted in the mythological world view to be able consciously to distance himself from it.

Gregory's interpretation and metaphorical reception of the story of Eden should be placed somewhere in the middle between typological and allegorical exegesis (for his explicit exegesis, cf. p.273). As in the case of Jonah, the historicity of the exemplary history remains undecided (317), but in any case, a *history* is interpreted respectively used. What, then, is the relation between illustrans and illustrandum, and can this illustrandum be described as a concrete event? I quote two allegories: a complete θρῆνος and a fragment from a *carmen morale*.

> Οἴμοι προσῆλθε, Χριστέ μου, πάλιν δράκων.
> Οἴμοι προσῆλθε δειλιῶντί μοι σφόδρα.
> Οἴμοι γέγευμαι τοῦ ξύλου τῆς γνώσεως.
> Οἴμοι φθονεῖσθαι δ' ὁ φθόνος πέπεικέ με.
> Οὔτ' εἰμὶ θεῖος, καὶ βέβλημ' ἔξω τρυφῆς.
> Ῥομφαία, μικρὸν τὴν κακὴν σβέσον φλόγα,
> Ὡς ἂν πάλιν δέξῃ με τῶν φυτῶν ἔσω
> Χριστῷ συνεισελθόντα λῃστὴν ἐκ ξύλου.
> *Woe is me, again I was approached, my Christ, by the snake.*
> *Woe is me, he approached me and I was afraid.*
> *Woe is me, I have tasted the tree of knowledge.*
> *Woe is me, the Envious one talked me into envy.*
> *I am not (any longer) divine, and was thrown out of the garden of delights.*
> *Sword, quench your evil flame somewhat,*
> *so that you can let me in back again among the plants,*
> *a robber who enters together with Christ, straight from the wood* (318).

> Δίελθέ μοι φλογώδη / Ῥομφαίαν, ὦ θεόφρον.
> Θείων γενοῦ γεωργὸς / Φυτῶν Λόγῳ θαλλόντων,
> Ὧν μ' ἐστέρησεν ἐχθρὸς / Δι' ἡδονῆς συλήσας.
> Ξύλῳ πάλιν πρόσελθε / Ζωῆς ἀεὶ μενούσης.
> Ἡ δ' ἔστιν, ὡς ἀνεῦρον, / Γνῶσις Θεοῦ μεγίστου,

---

(317) Cf. ALTHAUS p.65: in Gregory's treatment, Adam is « nicht so sehr eine historische Einzelpersönlichkeit als vielmehr der Repräsentant der ganzen Menschheit (...). Und doch wäre es falsch, wollte man behaupten, Gregor schließe den historischen Sinn des Genesisberichtes ganz und gar aus. Adam ist und bleibt der historische Stammvater des Menschengeschlechtes. Wenn dies auch so ziemlich das einzige ist, was Gregor als historische Tatsache am Genesisbericht ohne Einschränkung anerkennt, so geht es ihm doch nicht um eine Leugnung der Historizität des Geschehens am Anfange der Menschheit, wie es von der Bibel verkündet wird, sondern nur um ein neues Verständnis desselben aus seiner Auffassung von Gott und der Welt heraus, um die bleibende Wahrheit für die zeitgenössischen Christen zu aktualisieren. »

(318) II,1,63 (*PG* 37,1406).

> Φάους ἑνὸς τριλαμποῦς, Πρὸς ὃν τὰ πάντα τείνει.
> *Go past the blazing sword, you who are pious.*
> *Become gardener of the divine plants, which bloom through the Logos,*
> *and which the enemy took from me when he robbed me through lust.*
> *Return to the tree of eternal life.*
> *This is, as I discovered, the knowledge of the highest God,*
> *the one light with threefold brightness, towards whom everything*
> *strives* (319).

The explicit exegesis of the garden, of man as γεωργός, and of the tree, is repeated here: here as well, hermeneutics and παράδειγμα go hand in hand. Adam's Fall is typologically represented, the individual sin is an ontological repetition, an ἀντίτυπος of it (320). In this sense, here too one can speak of a metonymical exemplum.

Yet, in the two passages, Gregory transcends (not: abandons) the *historical*-typological and the exegetical framework (the story of Genesis does not mention a return via the sword to the tree). The θρῆνος gives the gist of Christian soteriology, by suggesting Christ's redemption of the sins through the tree – cross typology (elegantly fitted into the double synecdoche « wood »). Gregory's identification with the robber who enters God's Kingdom with Christ points to the fact that the return « in the middle of the plants » is eschatologically intended. And since the return is only possible with and through Christ (Χριστῷ συνεισελθόντα), the relation illustrans – illustrandum is soteriological.

This soteriological aspect is not expressly present in the second passage. Gregory addresses the θεόφρονες here; one gets the impression that these bring about their return on their own and can thus achieve the γνῶσις, – which is elsewhere often formally denied by Gregory. The story of Eden seems to function *symbolically* here, expressing an abstract, a-historical ἀναγωγή. In that case, this allegorical use implies an allegorical interpretation with a gnostic bias.

---

(319) II,1,88, vv.164-175 (*PG* 37,1441-2).

(320) Cf. ALTHAUS p.109 (see already n.208): « jede spätere Sünde (...) ist dadurch im Grunde nichts anderes als eine Wiederholung und Nachahmung der adamitischen Sündentat. » About the metaphorical use, he writes p.111: « Die zunächst nur rein poetisch anmutenden Identifikationen mit der adamitischen Sündentat gehen also in Wirklichkeit auf den typologischen Ursündenbegriff Gregors zurück. (...) Nicht zu übersehen ist hier Gregors Biblizismus. Denn es ist nicht so sehr Ausdruck einer « mentalité mythique », wie J.M. Szymusiak meint (*cf. n.264*), als vielmehr Zeichen einer auffälligen Vorliebe für die Bibel und ihre Sprache, wenn Gregor die persönliche Sünde und Versuchung immer wieder unter den Bildern und Symbolen des biblischen Sündenfallberichtes darstellt. »

5.3.2 Biblical metaphors and allegorism

The allegorical (moral or anagogic) interpretation of the Bible with its a-historical, individual-psychological slant, is much less often at the bottom of the exemplary use of biblical histories in Gregory's works. The clearest example of an *anagogic* allegory can be found in the prologue of the second theological oration. In this text, Gregory describes his attempt (which is doomed to fail) to grasp the divine nature, in an identification with Moses who climbs Mount Sinai:

> Ἀνιόντι δέ μοι προθύμως ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος, (...) ἵνα τῆς νεφέλης εἴσω γένωμαι, καὶ Θεῷ συγγένωμαι (...), εἰ μέν τις Ἀαρών, συνανίτω καὶ στηκέτω πλησίον, κἂν ἔξω μένειν τῆς νεφέλης δέῃ, τοῦτο δεχόμενος. Εἰ δέ τις Ναδὰβ, ἢ Ἀβιούδ, ἢ τῆς γερουσίας, ἀνίτω μέν, ἀλλὰ στηκέτω πόρρωθεν, κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν τῆς καθάρσεως. Εἰ δέ τις τῶν πολλῶν καὶ ἀναξίων ὕψους τοιούτου καὶ θεωρίας... (Ex 19 and 24). Τί τοῦτο ἔπαθον, ὦ φίλοι καὶ μύσται καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας συνερασταί; Ἔτρεχον μὲν ὡς Θεὸν καταληψόμενος, καὶ οὕτως ἀνῆλθον ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος, καὶ τὴν νεφέλην διέσχον, εἴσω γενόμενος ἀπὸ τῆς ὕλης καὶ τῶν ὑλικῶν, καὶ εἰς ἐμαυτὸν ὡς οἷόν τε συστραφείς. Ἐπεὶ δὲ προσέβλεψα, μόλις εἶδον Θεοῦ τὰ ὀπίσθια· (Ex 33,23).
> *I eagerly ascend the mount (...) that I may enter the cloud and company with God (...). Is any an Aaron? He shall come up with me. He shall stand hard by, should he be willing to wait, if need be, outside the cloud. Is any a Nadab, an Abihu, or an elder? He too shall ascend, but stand further off, his place matching his purity. Is any of the crowd, unfit, as they are, for so sublime contemplation? (...)*
> *What experience of this have I had, you friends of truth, her initiates, her lovers as I am? I was running with a mind to see God and so it was that I ascended the mount. I penetrated the cloud, became enclosed in it, detached from matter and material things and concentrated, so far as might be, in myself. But when I directed my gaze I scarcely saw the averted figure of God* (321).

In the poems, there are no comparable biblical metaphors with anagogic bias. Yet, in these, one can find examples of *moral* allegories. One of Gregory's favourite images is the flight from

---

(321) Or.28,2-3 (*PG* 36,28A-29A, translation Wickham-Williams in NORRIS, *Faith* p.224-5). For this mystical interpretation of the episode, see especially Gregory of Nyssa's *Life of Moses*, part two (Θεωρία εἰς τὸν τοῦ Μωϋσέως βίον), in the tradition of Philo and Origen.

Sodom, and the transformation of Lot's wife into a pillar of salt: see already the example p.291, and similarly in the ὑποθῆκαι παρθένοις:

> Μηδὲ σύ γ' ἐκ Σοδόμων προφυγών, καὶ τέφραν ἀλύξας
> Τοῦδε βίου, θείου τε πυρὸς στονόεσσαν ἀπειλήν,
> Εἰς Σόδομα βλέψειας, ἐπεὶ λίθος αἶψα παγήσῃ,
> Στήλη καὶ κακίης, καὶ ἀργαλέου θανάτοιο.
> Μηδ' ἐκ μὲν Σοδόμων κλέψῃς πόδας, ἐν πεδίοις δὲ
> Γείτοσι δηθύνειν ἆσσον πυρός, ἀλλὰ τάχιστα
> Σώζεσθαι πρὸς ὄρος, μή σε πυρὸς ὄμβρος ἐπίσπῃ.
> *And if you flee from Sodom, and have escaped the ash-heap*
> *of this life, and the miserable threat of the divine fire,*
> *do not look at Sodom, since otherwise you will immediately be hardened into stone,*
> *a stele as a symbol of wickedness and of the awful death.*
> *And if you have taken to your heels away from Sodom, do not tarry*
> *in the nearby plains, close by the fire, but bring yourself as fast as possible*
> *to rescue on the mountain, so that the rain of fire may not strike you* (322).

The allegorical explanation of the episode from Genesis was customary in the Alexandrian tradition since Philo (323). Gregory's metaphorical use in his pareneses (often to the παρθένοι) is based on it: here, there is no breach between hermeneutics and παράδειγμα either. In contrast with the formally similar allegory of the journey to Ithaca, that of the flight from Sodom clearly reveals a direct correlation between allegorical use and allegorical explanation.

This kind of allegorical reading, in which the soteriological dimension is absent, is said to mythologize the Bible by Herzog: he posits that, since reality does not require exegesis, the story becomes a cover of truth: a myth (cf. p.298).

---

(322) I,2,2, vv.51-57 (*PG* 37,582).

(323) Cf. Munier, specifically about Gregory pp.134-135; and Zehles p.49. Cosmas explains Gregory's passage κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἀναγωγῆς λόγον (Mai p.387, and more extensively about the similar passage from II,1,1 pp.355-356): Σόδομα τοιγαροῦν ὁ θεῖος Γρηγόριος τὴν ἐν ἁμαρτίαις φησὶ διατριβήν,... Cosmas' « anagogic » explanation illustrates how slight the difference is between the various types of allegorical explanation. I speak of moral allegory here, because Gregory only argues in favour of a definitive abandonment of the earthly, sinful life (κάθαρσις), and makes no allusion to a mystical climb towards a knowledge of God (θεωρία). Yet, for Gregory, the former is a necessary condition for the second.

And indeed, in the quoted texts, the passages from Exodus and Genesis fulfil a role which is comparable to that of the Platonic myths (324). Nevertheless, for Gregory, both Moses' meeting with God on Sinai and the destruction of Sodom are actually historical events (325), with a specific function in soteriology: both episodes are nearly always included in the reviews he frequently provides about the most significant stages in salvation history (326). Yet, in his view, allegorical explanation is also one of the legitimate ways in which to interpret historical reality (327), in moralizing passages even the most appropriate way.

5.3.3 The laudatory σύγκρισις: rhetoric or typology?

With regard to Gregory's « mythologization » of the Bible, Herzog especially referred to the laudatory σύγκρισις, more specifically in the funeral oration for Basil. This is why I briefly touch upon this subject here, even though the exempla are not metaphorically inserted.

The comparison – sustained for pages on end (or.43,70–76) – of Basil with a whole series of characters from biblical history (Adam, Enosh, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Job, Moses, Aaron, Joshua, Samuel, David, Solomon, Elijah, Elisha, Jonah, the three young men, Daniel, the Maccabees, John the Baptist, Peter, Paul, the sons of Zebedee, Stephen) is a piece of pure rhetoric on the formal level, and in modern eyes, a ludicrous αὔξησις. It is obvious that the Bible takes the place of myths and ancestral history; as a matter of fact, the entire oration is a prototype of an ἐπιτάφιος λόγος. The biblical material indeed appears to be « literaturfähig », « frei zur literarischen Verwendung » (328). Still, does this imply that this matter is treated as mythical, and is this a reversal of the soteriological typology, as not only Herzog alleges (329)?

---

(324) In his *Life of Moses*, Gregory of Nyssa alludes repeatedly to the Phaedrus myth. Also in Gregory of Nazianzus, we can find reminiscences to the myth of the charioteer and his pair of winged horses, cf. inventory 2.

(325) Again see Gregory of Nyssa, who starts his *Life of Moses* with a first part entitled Ἱστορία.

(326) See e.g. in the poems I,1,9b, vv.16-33; I,2,1, vv.132-133; I,2,14, vv.87-89. The traditional episodes are Eden, Flood, tower of Babel, Sodom, Moses' law, prophets, Christ.

(327) About the interpretability of reality in medieval biblical symbolism, see Loose pp.579-580: « Alleen God kan naast de taal ook nog de werkelijkheid zelf zo ordenen dat ze naast haar historische en letterlijke inhoud nog een leessleutel inhoudt voor de morele opdracht van de mens, voor de eindtijdelijke verwachting en voor de finale ontsluiting van de oud-testamentische gebeurtenissen in de voltooiing ervan door Christus. »

In the discussion about the role of rhetoric and typology in the laudatory σύγκρισις with biblical characters, three standpoints have been taken. Herzog considers typological hermeneutics as a condition, but thinks that it is abandoned in the σύγκρισις. Pannenberg sees a rhetorical extension of typology in the σύγκρισις, but still places it within the soteriological framework. Fuhrmann, then, departs from the technique of the historical παράδειγμα, which makes use of a new body of subject matter; he speaks of « Profanierung der Bibel » (330).

In my view, the background of Gregory's σύγκρισις is, as in the case of most metaphors, an extension of historical typology into the present. Basil is presented as the ἀντίτυπος of biblical τύποι. The fact that he surpasses some of these is in line with the Christian vision of the relation between Old and New Testament: Basil only surpasses Old Testament characters, which is, in the case of Enoch, Joseph, Moses and Aaron, explicitly connected with the difference between σκιά/σῶμα and πνεῦμα (331). Besides, we also find episodes here which Gregory inserts metaphorically in his poems, like the orthodox Caesarea which is compared with Noah's Ark (332), in which Basil positively fulfils the same soteriological role as the exemplary character. In all these cases, the biblical episode is interpreted typologically.

---

(328) Respectively SCHAÜBLIN p.40 and HERZOG, *Metapher* p.176.

(329) See e.g. also GUIGNET, *Rhétorique* pp.310-316, and RUETHER p.113.

(330) HERZOG, *Literarisierung* respectively pp.596-599 (W. Pannenberg) and pp.605-606 (M. Fuhrmann).

(331) Ἐνὼχ μετετέθη, μικρᾶς εὐσεβείας – **ετι γὰρ ἐν σκιαῖς ἦν ἡ πίστις** (§70, *PG* 36,592A).
Ἰωσὴφ ἐγένετο σιτοδότης, ἀλλ᾽ Αἰγύπτου μόνης καὶ οὐ πολλάκις καὶ **σωματικῶς**. Ὁ δὲ πάντων καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ **πνευματικῶς**, ὅπερ ἐμοὶ τῆς σιτοδοσίας ἐκείνης αἰδεσιμώτερον (...). Τούτων (sc. Moses and Aaron) δὲ ἀμφοτέρων ζηλωτὴς ἐκεῖνος, βασανίζων μὲν **οὐ σωματικαῖς μάστιξι, πνευματικαῖς δὲ καὶ λογικαῖς**, ἔθνος αἱρετικὸν καὶ Αἰγύπτιον (...). πλαξὶ δὲ νόμους ἐγγράφων (...) **οὐκέτι σκιοειδεῖς, ἀλλ᾽ ὅλον πνευματικούς**· (§72, *PG* 36,593A-C).

(332) Νῶε κιβωτὸν ἐπιστεύθη καὶ κόσμου δευτέρου σπέρματα ξύλῳ μικρῷ πιστευθέντα καὶ καθ᾽ ὑδάτων σωζόμενα. Ὁ δὲ κατακλυσμὸν ἀσεβείας διέφυγε καὶ κιβωτὸν σωτηρίας τὴν ἑαυτοῦ πεποίηται πόλιν (§70, *PG* 36,592B). On p.309, I understood this as the reflection of typological hermeneutics. GUIGNET, *Rhétorique* p.313 erroneously writes: « Ce rapprochement d'une situation donnée comme réelle avec une situation manifestement métaphorique, est illégitime. Inutile d'ajouter qu'elle sent son

When other characters are quoted in their literal meaning, without any trace of spiritual interpretation involved, this does not necessarily mean that Gregory reduces these persons to mythical characters. Basil is presented in these cases as someone who follows - or avoids - the models from the Bible (333). And this (positive or negative) exemplary function is expressly defined as one of the intentions of the scriptural text (κανόνες, τύποι, παραδείγματα, cf. p.80); the numerous biblical exempla with model function testify this.

Of course, Gregory follows the rules of the genre when almost lamenting over the fact that his friend was not stoned, so that now he cannot be compared with Stephen, and when he ultimately considers Basil superior to all of his contemporaries, because he combined the qualities of all biblical heroes (334). Yet, despite all the hyperbolical rhetoric, this passage gives Basil a place in salvation history: it is comparable to the situation of Julian's

---

sophiste. » Herzog, *Metapher* p.180, does indicate that this is founded on the traditional typological exegesis of the Flood, but thinks that the σύγκρισις upsets this exegesis: « Noah erfüllt sich erst und endgültig in dem kappadokischen Bischof, seine Arche erst und endgültig in dessen Kirche (...). Nicht mehr Noah, sondern Basil « bedeutet » etwas; Typ und Antityp haben ihren Ort gewechselt. Die Umkehrung der Typologie beläßt der Bibel weder ihre historische noch ihre metaphorische Funktion: sie verleiht ihr die Struktur des überbotenen Mythos. » Yet I do not read in Gregory's text that Basil would be the « first and definitive » fulfilment of Noah. His task is *a* repetition or actualization of that of Noah. Christ remains *the* ἀντίτυπος, of Noah and other τύποι. And with him, Basil is *not* compared in the σύγκρισις.

(333) The New Testament characters especially are *imitated*: **Ἐμιμήσατο** Πέτρου τὸν ζῆλον, Παύλου τὸν τόνον, (...) τῶν υἱῶν Ζεβεδαίου τὸ μεγαλόφωνον, πάντων τῶν μαθητῶν τὸ εὐτελὲς καὶ ἀπέριττον (§76, *PG* 36,597B-C); Basil is called their *pupil*: Ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν νέαν μέτειμι διαθήκην καὶ τοῖς ἐνταῦθα εὐδοκίμοις τὰ ἐκείνου παρεξετάσας, **τιμήσω τὸν μαθητὴν ἐκ τῶν διδασκάλων** (§75, *PG* 36,596D). From Solomon on the other hand, Basil only adopted wisdom: Gregory tacitly passes over his degeneracy: Καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς παρήσω τοῦ Σολομῶντος· πᾶσι δὲ δῆλα κἂν ἡμεῖς φειδώμεθα (§73, *PG* 36,596B).

(334) Στέφανος μὲν γὰρ ἐκωλύθη γενέσθαι, εἰ καὶ πρόθυμος ἦν, ἐπισχὼν αἰδοῖ τοὺς λιθάζοντας. Ἔτι δὲ συντομώτερον εἰπεῖν ἔχω, ἵνα μὴ τοῖς καθ' ἕκαστον ἐπεξίω περὶ τούτων· ἐκεῖνος γὰρ τὸ μὲν ἐξεῦρε τῶν καλῶν, τὸ δὲ ἐζήλωσε, τὸ δὲ ἐνίκησε, τῷ δὲ διὰ πάντων ἐλθεῖν τῶν νῦν πάντων ἐκράτησεν (§76, *PG* 36,597C).

disappearance in the series of divine θαύματα. The question « rhetoric or typology » seems inaccurate to me; like Pannenberg, I consider the laudatory σύγκρισις as a rhetorical styling of an exegesis which searches for τύποι (prefigurations) and παραδείγματα (models) in the Bible. To answer the question to what extent this vision of the Bible - in which Gregory is not unique - is influenced by Greek rhetoric, more is required than a study of the παραδείγματα in Gregory Nazianzen's œuvre.

CONCLUSION
OF THE SECOND PART

The question concerning the correlation between interpretation and literary reception of exemplary histories should be answered in two ways, depending on whether it is applied to mythological or biblical histories.

Mythological exempla and hermeneutics

Gregory sees two possible relations between μῦθος and ἀλήθεια: a possibly inclusive one (μῦθος as fictitious wrapping of truth) and an exclusive one (μῦθος as the opposite of truth). In his criticism of myths, he nearly always considers the Greek myth as opposite to the truth: it is fictitious, the « deeper meaning » is theologically untrue and the literal meaning is immoral and harmful. This criticism especially goes for the myths featuring gods, which is reflected in their use as exempla: episodes with Olympian gods are nearly exclusively quoted as inductive exempla or in the shape of lexical allusions.

The fact that the myths are deprived of whatever kind of religious value, that is, their desacralization, on the other hand makes them free for literary, more specifically exemplary and metaphorical use. Mythological episodes in which the gods have no major part are exceptionally numerous in Gregory's poetry. In most cases, the exemplary use transforms the myths into literary creations, into a part of cultural Hellenism which the Christians are free to make use of according to Gregory. In the metaphorical use, in which the exemplary character or history has another than the actual, literal meaning, hermeneutics has been abandoned: reception does not imply interpretation, allegorical use does not correspond to allegorical exegesis. One cannot speak of a Christianization of the Greek myth in these cases, however Christian the message expressed by the myth may be.

In some cases, there does seem to be a Christian interpretation of mythological characters behind the metaphorical use: sometimes, Gregory considers the pagan deities as manifestations of the demons, which also play the role of the deceiver in biblical and Christian history. (An interpenetration of mythology and Bible also appeared to be the case where the giants were concerned.) With regard to these mythological metaphors, the typically

Christian hermeneutics is positively relevant in the semantic analysis of Gregory's text, and the ornamental function of the exemplum conceals a deeper meaning.

In both cases - whether or not the exemplum contains a hermeneutic substratum -, Gregory gives Greek mythology a function other than the deceptive-religious one which he ascribes to it. Of course, with regard to his purely literary use, which is the general rule in his poetry, he finds himself within the classical tradition which treated the myths for centuries as a means to describe people, as a « Welt der Beispiele » (335).

Biblical exempla and hermeneutics

In his handling of biblical exempla, Gregory keeps to the meaning and to the purpose of the Bible, or rather: to one of its meanings and purposes.

On the exegetical level, Gregory should be placed within the Alexandrian tradition, since there is an unmistakable concord with the work of Origen. The Bible, as history and as a text, has more than one meaning for him. The historical-typological interpretation of the biblical *history* is extended into the present, from which we get a « semi-biblical typology ». His philological approach to the scriptural *text* reveals his rhetorical education; still, as an exegete, his attention is directed at the spiritual significance (πνεῦμα) of the text rather than at the correct conception of the literal and historical meaning. He obtains this through moral or anagogic allegorism.

An allegorical reading treats the text of the Bible as a packaging of a higher truth; in this sense, one might say that the Bible becomes a μῦθος, but then only as a « wrapping of truth ». Even though Gregory does not emphasize the historicity of the biblical histories and sometimes - for specific episodes - even questions it, it would be wrong to say that the Bible is a collection of fictitious stories to him. A more significant distinction from Greek myth is that the deeper meaning of the biblical « μῦθος » is true, and the literal meaning - imperfect as it is, especially in the Old Testament - morally exemplary.

---

(335) DÖRRIE, *Sinn*, p.22.

In Gregory's view, the use of the literal meaning as model does correspond to a purpose of the Bible text. This text is written down πρὸς νουθεσίαν ἡμῶν (Paul), as ἐντολή and ὑπόδειγμα, full of ὑπομνήματα καὶ παιδεύματα, κανόνες, τύποι, παραδείγματα. The exempla with evidential and model function are usually in line with this meaning.

The metaphorical insertion of biblical characters or histories with ornamental function mainly turns out to correspond to an allegorical or, more often, typological exegesis of the episode in question. In this way, there is a close interaction between interpretation and use: acquaintanceship with Gregory's hermeneutics certainly helps to comprehend fully the semantic intention of the παράδειγμα, and conversely, a specific kind of exemplary use may give some useful indications as to Gregory's exegesis of the scriptural passage concerned. In the biblical exempla, allegorical explanation and allegorical use (allegorism and allegory), *Eigenbedeutung* and *Ernstbedeutung* are inextricably linked.

GENERAL CONCLUSION: RHETORIC AND HERMENEUTICS IN GREGORY'S PAGAN AND BIBLICAL *PARADEIGMATA*

The formal analysis of the παραδείγματα in Gregory's poetry clearly showed that they should be considered as an additional manifestation of the omnipresence of Greek rhetoric in his œuvre. Functions, methods of argumentation, insertion formulas, literary styling, formation of clusters, all attest to his rhetorical education. For these aspects, no systematic distinction can be made between pagan and biblical subject matter: the presence of Greek rhetoric is revealed in the same manner in pagan and biblical παραδείγματα.

However, we also noted some divergent tendencies in the rhetorical analysis. The semantic analysis in the second part of this study puts some of these observations in a new light. The superiority of the biblical exemplary material (quoted notably more with model function) corresponds to a higher explicit appreciation and is in accordance with an essential purpose of the Bible. Pagan material, on the other hand, is used more as ornamentation, and particularly with mythological exempla. Gregory is more reticent when it comes to elaboration and insertion.

The macro-analysis of the metaphorical exempla particularly is further explained in the second part. Pagan (i.e. nearly exclusively mythological) metaphors can be found especially in the *moralia*, biblical ones in the autobiographical poems, which was merely a statistical fact in the first part. The final chapter teaches us that mythological metaphors indeed provide useful images for moral parenesis, without corresponding to any interpretation: they are used purely for literary embellishment.

Hermeneutics can mostly and nearly exclusively be detected in the biblical παραδείγματα. Most biblical metaphors, even though formally not to be distinguished from the pagan ones, signify something totally different: they suggest a real actualization of the biblical events. Gregory presents his own history as a repetition, a constituent of salvation history. Hence, it is no coincidence that the biblical metaphors - or rather, metonymies - can be found especially in the autobiographical poetry.

Gregory's use of (biblical) παραδείγματα is thus inextricably linked with the central patristic idea of soteriological actualization, or to answer the epigraph to my preface: the exemplum is not a fortuitous, but an appropriate or even a necessary form for the message intended by Gregory as theologian.

INVENTORIES

I. TRADITIONAL ORDER OF GREGORY'S WORKS
II. ALPHABETICAL ORDER
III. TRADITIONAL ORDER OF THE BIBLE

General remarks

This **inventory** is more extensive than the subject of study which has been described in the introduction: here, one does not exclusively find the pagan and biblical *histories* used in an *exemplary* way. In inventory 1, these histories *are* clearly distinguishable from the other elements.

With regard to the *biblical material*, I have restricted myself to the histories. From the poems, I have attempted to select all histories, whether or not used in exempla, that is, also those histories which are part of the argument itself. Where the prose is concerned, I have not aspired to this completeness, and I have confined myself to the exemplary histories. The concept of « histories » too is interpreted quite broadly: regarding the mention of some characters, the narrative aspect is rather vague or even virtually inexistent; nevertheless, the quoting of a (Bible) character as a symbol for e.g. meekness, wisdom, greed (even if merely through the addition of an adjective) somehow echoes elements of this character's life story.

Concerning the *pagan subject matter*, I have adopted no criteria of selection whatsoever. Exemplary and non-exemplary characters are included, from poetry and prose, no matter whether their mention involves a narrative aspect or not (so too I include authors and philosophers when they are mentioned, not when they are quoted); the intention being to provide a complete survey of the traces of pagan mythology and history in Gregory's œuvre.

The inventory is drawn up according to three different orders. The first version, in the order of the œuvre itself, is especially useful for the rhetorical analysis of the text and hence also contains such information in particular. The other two, the alphabetical list and the inventory arranged in the order of the Bible books, are rather directed at a semantic analysis of the text.

INVENTORY I

TRADITIONAL ORDER OF GREGORY'S WORKS

Poems

About the poems themselves (only those from which material has been selected), one finds - along with the traditional serial number and title, and number of verses - the following information:
- the «*genre*» (explained on pp.61-63), coded as follows: D = *dogmatica*, B = *biblica*, H1 = hymns and prayers, H2 = *apotropaica*, M = *moralia* (M1 = προτροπή, M2 = ἀποτροπή), GN = gnomologies, TH = θρῆνοι, A = autobiographical (A1 = programmatic, A2 = elegiac, A3 = polemical, A4 = apologetical), EP = epistolary poems, E = epigrams;
- the *rhetorical situation* (explained on p.71), with the following possibilities: J = judicial, D = deliberative, E = epideictic;
- in the case of the epistolary poems and the (especially funeral) epigrams, the name of the *addressee*, and his religious persuasion: Christian (C), Pagan (P), or uncertain (?).

About the individual elements, the following information is listed:
- the *location* in the poem: verse or initial and final verse; in the case of real exempla, the location also comprehends the insertion of the history in the context;
- the *keyword* (possibly abbreviated), followed by a question mark when the identification is doubtful (either when the identification of what is clearly an allusion is uncertain - in an antonomasia, an anonymous narration, a proverb -, or when it is uncertain whether or not we are dealing with an allusion - in the case of lexical allusions and contaminations). Regarding these problematical cases in Gregory's verses, I use endnotes (from p.390 onwards) to account for my decisions. Where possible, I refer to predecessors, or to previous treatments in this study. In all cases, I try to be as concise as possible (1);

---

(1) From the rhetorical analysis, it appeared that especially the mythological exempla are quoted remarkably often in an allusion. That is why the inventory contains quite a number of mythological keywords which need a justification.

- the *subject matter*, with a further subdivision of biblical and pagan in on the one hand BH (« historical » Bible characters or histories) and BP (parables), and on the other PH (historical characters or histories), PM (mythology), PL (fables or *λόγοι*) and PV (characters from literature, *verisimiles res*, cf. p.45); CH (characters from Christian history) is to be placed in between;
- the *elaboration*, either a narration (N), or a name-mentioning (M), or an allusion (A);
- the exemplary *function*: evidence (E), model (M) or ornament (O);
- the manner of *insertion*: full (FU), minimal (MI), metaphorical (ME) or no insertion (NO).

Manner of insertion and elaboration both provide information about the literary form.

Since the last two codes are only attached to the real exempla, these can be distinguished from the non-exemplary material at a glance.

Where the **prose** is concerned, the information about the separate items is more limited: only the location, the keyword and the subject matter are indicated.

Orations

Next to the serial number, I also give the traditional title (sometimes abbreviated), the genre and the rhetorical situation (explained on pp.63 and 71). For the genre, I use the following codes: A = (auto)biographical: A1 = apologetical, A2 = ψόγοι, A3 = ἐγκώμια / ἐπιτάφιοι λόγοι, A4 = occasional orations; P = pastoral: P1 = sermons / panegyrics on holy days, P2 = theological, P3 = ἐγκώμια on saints and martyrs, P4 = moral, P5 = exegetical.

The chapter about the Bible in Gregory taught us that he handled the Scriptures quite freely, and did not verify each reference when quoting or using elements from them in exempla. The inaccuracies which may be the result of this form one of the causes of the doubtful identification of some biblical exempla. The anonymous or ambiguous allusions where a reference to the location in the Bible suffices as a justification are not further explained here: this reference can be found in inventory 2, along with parallel passages in Gregory's œuvre.

Letters

Of the letters themselves (again, only those from which material has been selected), the serial number is followed by information about the addressee:

- his / her name, sometimes followed by a number (e.g. Theodorus 1, Palladius 3; indicating that Gregory's works contain several persons with this name): this is the serial number attributed to the person in question in the prosopography of Hauser-Meury;
- a very brief situation, mostly about his / her relationship with Gregory, in the form of the following codes: F (friend), R (relative), P (personality: ecclesiastical or secular dignitary; sometimes also prominent rhetorician), A (acquaintance: often a parishioner), C (community, e.g. a governing body or a monastic order);
- his / her religious persuasion.

POEMS

1,1,1 Περὶ τοῦ Πατρός (39)
genre: D rhet. sit.: J

2-3	Icarus?[1]	PM	A	O	NO
6-7	Widow's offering	BH	A	E	NO
6-7	Odysseus and Eumaeus	PM	A	O	NO
10-13	Sinai (inaccessible)	BH	N	M	MI
16-24	Moses (song of)	BH	M	M	FU
16-24	Isaiah calls out to heaven	BH	M	M	FU

1,1,2 Περὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ (83)
genre: D rhet. sit.: J

62	Adam (creation)	BH	M
65	Jesus' birth in a manger	BH	M
65-66	Three wise men	BH	M
67-68	Jesus' temptation	BH	M
68-69	Multiplication of the loaves	BH	M
69	Cana	BH	A
70-71	Jesus' baptism	BH	M
72	Sea obeys	BH	M
73	Healings	BH	M
73	Samaritan woman	BH	M
74	Jesus at Gethsemane	BH	M
77-79	Cross and resurrection	BH	M

1,1,3 Περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος (93)
genre: D rhet. sit.: J

30-31	Gift of the Spirit	BH	M		
33-41	Eve (made from rib)	BH	A	E	FU
33-41	Seth	BH	M	E	FU

1,1,4 Περὶ κόσμου (100)

genre: D rhet. sit.: J

46-48	Lucifer	BH	A		
48-50	Adam (seduced)	BH	A		

1,1,5 Περὶ Προνοίας (71)

genre: D rhet. sit.: J

53-64	Star of Bethlehem	BH	N	E	FU

1,1,6 Περὶ Προνοίας (116)

genre: D rhet. sit.: J

26-33	David (psalmist)	BH	N	M	MI
62-64	David (and Bathsheba)	BH	A	E	FU
62-65	Moses dies before entry of Israel?	BH	A	E	FU
65	Moses (saw God)	BH	M		
66	Moses (exodus)	BH	M		
66	Moses (tables of stone)	BH	M		
67-68	Elisha and the young ribalds	BH	M	E	FU
88-96	Fat and lean cow	PL	N	E	FU
106	Job	BH	M	E	MI

1,1,7 Περὶ νοερῶν οὐσιῶν (99)

genre: D rhet. sit.: J

56-82	Lucifer	BH	N		
65-66	Serpent	BH	A		

1,1,8 Περὶ ψυχῆς (129)

genre: D rhet. sit.: J

38	Ixion	PM	M	O	MI
55-77	Creation of man	BH	N		
100-111	Eden	BH	N		
112-114	Adam (seduced)	BH	N		
115-118	Adam (curse)	BH	N		
118-122	Flaming sword, guardian of Eden	BH	N		

1,1,9 Περὶ Διαθηκῶν καὶ Ἐπιφανείας Χριστοῦ (159)

genre: D rhet. sit.: J

9-10	Adam (seduced)	BH	M		
b 2-3	Aaron (golden calf)	BH	M	E	FU
b16-17	Babel (tower of)	BH	A		
b16-17	Great flood	BH	A		
b16-17	Sodom	BH	A		
b22-24	Moses (exodus)	BH	N		
b25-26	Exodus (pillar of fire and of cloud)	BH	N		
b27-29	Moses (saw God)	BH	N		
b27-33	Moses (tables of stone)	BH	N		
b30	Sinai (inaccessible)	BH	M		
19-21	Prophets	BH	M		
22-24	Unfaithful kings	BH	M		
25-26	Exiles	BH	M		
44	Adam (seduced)	BH	M		
56-59	Jesus' temptation	BH	M		
61	Angels with shepherds	BH	M		
62-63	Three wise men	BH	M		
67-68	Annunciation	BH	A		
69-71	Presentation in the temple	BH	M		
72-74	John the Baptist	BH	A		
78-79	Cross and resurrection	BH	A		
78-79	Jesus' baptism	BH	A		

87-90	Egypt (tenth plague)	BH N	O MI

1,1,10 Κατὰ Ἀπολλιναρίου, περὶ ἐνανθρωπήσεως (74)
genre: D rhet. sit.: J

4	Adam (the first)	BH M	
16-18	Serpent	BH M	

1,1,14 Μάστιγες Αἰγύπτου (12)
genre: B rhet. sit.: E

1-12	Egypt (plagues)	BH M	M FU

1,1,15 Ἡ τοῦ Μωυσέως Δεκάλογος (10)
genre: B rhet. sit.: E

1-10	Moses (tables of stone)	BH M	

1,1,16 Εἰς τὰ θαύματα Ἠλίου τοῦ προφήτου καὶ Ἐλισαίου (30)
genre: B rhet. sit.: E

2	Elijah fed by ravens	BH M	
2-4	Elijah and the widow of Zarephath	BH M	
5-6	Elijah raising the child at Zarephath	BH M	
6	Elijah stops the rain	BH M	
7-8	Elijah: the contest on Mount Carmel	BH M	
8-9	Elijah fasts 40 days	BH M	
10	Elijah kills captains of fifty	BH M	
11	Elijah parts the Jordan	BH M	
12	Elijah (chariot of fire)	BH M	
13-15	Elisha (mantle of Elijah)	BH M	
16	Elisha (spring of Jericho)	BH M	
17	Elisha and the young ribalds	BH M	
18-19	Elisha (water from Edom)	BH M	
19-20	Elisha (jar of oil)	BH M	
20-21	Elisha and the Shunammite	BH M	
22	Elisha (spoiled pottage)	BH M	
22-23	Elisha (multiplication of the loaves)	BH M	
24-25	Elisha (the curing of Naaman)	BH M	
25-26	Elisha (iron axe head)	BH M	
27-28	Elisha (Syrian army blinded)	BH M	
28-29	Elisha (siege of Samaria)	BH M	
29-30	Elisha (miracle of reviving bones)	BH M	

1,1,17 Εἰς τὸ μαρτύριον Ἠλίου τὸ καλούμενον Χηρεῖον (12)
genre: B rhet. sit.: E

1-8	Elijah and the widow of Zarephath	BH M	
9-12	Elijah raising the child at Zarephath	BH M	

1,1,20 Τὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ θαύματα κατὰ Ματθαῖον (38)
genre: B rhet. sit.: E

3-30	Healings	BH A	
6	Sea obeys	BH M	
7	Gadarene demoniacs	BH M	
9	Woman suffering from hemorrhage	BH M	
15-16	Multiplication of the loaves	BH M	
17-18	Jesus walks on water	BH M	
23-24	Transfiguration	BH M	
31-32	Fig tree cursed	BH M	

1,1,21 Τὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ θαύματα κατὰ Μάρκον (17)
genre: B rhet. sit.: E

3-17	Healings	BH M	
5	Sea obeys	BH M	
6	Gadarene demoniacs	BH M	

6-7	Woman suffering from hemorrhage	BH M
8	Multiplication of the loaves	BH M
8-9	Jesus walks on water	BH M
13	Transfiguration	BH M
15-16	Fig tree cursed	BH M

1,1,22 Τὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ θαύματα κατὰ Λουκᾶν (20)
genre: B rhet. sit.: E

3-18	Healings	BH M
7	Anointing by a sinful woman	BH M
8	Sea obeys	BH M
8	Gadarene demoniacs	BH M
9	Woman suffering from hemorrhage	BH M
10-12	Multiplication of the loaves	BH M
12	Transfiguration	BH M

1,1,23 Τὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ θαύματα κατὰ Ἰωάννην (11)
genre: B rhet. sit.: E

3	Cana	BH M
4-9	Healings	BH M
6	Multiplication of the loaves	BH M
6-7	Jesus walks on water	BH M
8	Healing a blind man at Siloam	BH M
9	Lazarus (raising of)	BH M

1,1,24 Χριστοῦ παραβολαὶ καὶ αἰνίγματα (κατὰ Ματθαῖον) (18)
genre: B rhet. sit.: E

2	House built on rock / sand	BP M
3	The sower	BP M
4	The tares	BP M
5	Mustard seed	BP M
5-6	The leaven	BP M
6-7	Treasure hidden in a field	BP M
7-8	The Pearl of Great Price	BP M
9	The dragnet	BP M
10	The lost sheep	BP M
11	The creditors	BP M
12	Labourers in the vineyard	BP M
13	Two sons and the vineyard	BP M
14	Vineyard and wicked tenants	BP M
15	The marriage feast	BP M
16	The ten virgins	BP M
17	The talents	BP M
18	Sheep and goats	BP M

1,1,25 Παραβολαὶ Χριστοῦ κατὰ Μάρκον (7)
genre: B rhet. sit.: E

2	The sower	BP M
3	The tares	BP M
4	Mustard seed	BP M
4	Vineyard and wicked tenants	BP M

1,1,26 Παραβολαὶ κατὰ Λουκᾶν (22)
genre: B rhet. sit.: E

2	House built on rock / sand	BP M
3-4	Two debtors	BP M
4-5	The sower	BP M
5-6	The Good Samaritan	BP M
6-7	The unexpected question	BP M

8-9	Seven unclean spirits	BP M
9-10	The rich fool	BP M
11-12	Master returns when not expected	BP M
13	The barren fig tree (par.)	BP M
14	Mustard seed	BP M
14	The leaven	BP M
14	The marriage feast	BP M
15	The lost coin	BP M
15	The lost sheep	BP M
16	The prodigal son	BP M
17-18	The dishonest steward	BP M
18	The rich man and Lazarus	BP M
19	The widow and the unjust judge	BP M
20	Pharisee and tax collector	BP M
21	The ten pounds	BP M
22	Vineyard and wicked tenants	BP M

1,1,27 Παραβολαὶ τῶν τεσσάρων εὐαγγελιστῶν (106)

genre: B rhet. sit.: E

1-2	House built on rock / sand	BP N	M ME
3-6	The sower	BP N	M MI
7-14	The tares	BP N	M ME
15-17	Mustard seed	BP N	
18-22	The Pearl of Great Price	BP N	M MI
20-23	Treasure hidden in a field	BP N	M MI
24-31	The dragnet	BP N	M MI
32-35	Labourers in the vineyard	BP M	M ME
36-41	Two sons and the vineyard	BP N	
42	Vineyard and wicked tenants	BP M	
43-50	The marriage feast	BP N	M ME
51-61	The ten virgins	BP N	M ME
62-66	Master returns when not expected	BP N	M ME
67-70	Sheep and goats	BP N	M ME
75-77	The Good Samaritan	BP M	M ME
78-79	Seven unclean spirits	BP M	M ME
80-81	The barren fig tree (par.)	BP N	M ME
82-85	The lost sheep	BP M	M ME
82-85	The lost coin	BP M	M ME
82-85	The prodigal son	BP M	M ME
86-87	The creditors	BP M	M ME
88-89	The dishonest steward	BP M	M ME
90-91	The rich man and Lazarus	BP M	M ME
92-93	Pharisee and tax collector	BP M	M ME
94-95	The widow and the unjust judge	BP M	M ME
95-98	Ask, and it will be given you	BP M	M ME
98-100	The rich fool	BP M	M ME
101-106	The talents	BP M	M ME
101-106	The ten pounds	BP M	M ME

1,1,31 Ὕμνος (12)

genre: H1 rhet. sit.: E

2-6	Creation	BH M

1,1,33 Εὐχαριστήριον (11)

genre: H1 rhet. sit.: E

7-9	Cross and resurrection	BH M

1,1,35 Ἐπίκλησις πρὸ τῆς τῶν Γραφῶν ἀναγνώσεως (13)
genre: H1 rhet. sit.: E

9	Tartarus	PM	M		

1,1,36 Ἐνόδια (33)
genre: H1 rhet. sit.: E

3	Exodus (pillar of fire and of cloud)	BH	M	M	FU
3-4	Exodus (crossing the Red Sea)	BH	M	M	FU
5	Exodus (manna and flesh)	BH	M	M	FU
5-6	Moses (water from the rock)	BH	M	M	FU
7-8	Moses (battle with the Amalekites)	BH	M	M	FU
9	Joshua makes the sun stand still	BH	M	M	FU
9-11	Exodus (passage of the Jordan)	BH	A	M	FU
12-15	Incarnation	BH	M	M	FU
17-18	Jesus walks on water	BH	M	M	FU

1,1,38 Περὶ ἐνοδίας προσευχή (6)
genre: H1 rhet. sit.: E

1	Exodus (pillar of fire and of cloud)	BH	M	M	FU
1-2	Exodus (crossing the Red Sea)	BH	M	M	FU
3	Exodus (manna and flesh)	BH	M	M	FU
4	Moses (water from the rock)	BH	M	M	FU

1,2,1a Παρθενίης ἔπαινος (214)
genre: M1 rhet. sit.: D

92-99	Creation of man	BH	N		
103	Zeus	PM	A	O	NO
132	Babel (tower of)	BH	A		
132	Great flood	BH	A		
132	Sodom	BH	A		
133	Tables of stone	BH	A		
133	Prophets	BH	M		
200	Eve	BH	M		

1,2,1b (Σύγκρισις παρθενίης καὶ γάμου) (518)
genre: M1 rhet. sit.: D

226	Adam and Eve	BH	M		
303	Giants	PM	M	O	MI
305-309	Enoch	BH	N	B	FU
309-311	Noah	BH	N	E	FU
311-312	Abraham offering Isaac	BH	N	E	FU
313-314	Moses (exodus)	BH	M	E	FU
314-315	Moses (tables of stone)	BH	M	E	FU
315	Moses (saw God)	BH	M	E	FU
316	Aaron	BH	M	E	FU
317-318	Joshua makes the sun stand still	BH	N	E	FU
319	Samuel (anointed kings)	BH	M	E	FU
320	David	BH	M	E	FU
321	Solomon (wisdom)	BH	M	E	FU
322	Elijah (chariot of fire)	BH	M	E	FU
323-324	John the Baptist	BH	M	E	FU
325	Apostles	BH	M	E	FU
326	Paul (in the third heaven)	BH	M	E	FU
377-379	Icarus?	PM	A	O	NO
414-415	Adam (alone)	BH	N	E	FU
418-421	Zechariah	BH	N	E	FU

422-423	Mary (virgin mother)	BH	M	E	FU
430-431	Patroclus (burial games)	PM	A		
438-439	Adam (curse)	BH	M		
439-440	Serpent	BH	M		
448	Cain and Abel	BH	M	E	FU
448	Sodom	BH	M	E	FU
448-449	Babel (tower of)	BH	A	E	FU
449-450	Great flood	BH	M	E	FU
451	Pharaoh	BH	M	E	FU
451	Ahab	BH	M	E	FU
451-452	Assyria	BH	M	E	FU
452-454	Herod Antipas	BH	N	E	FU
454	Herod (Massacre of the children)	BH	M	E	FU
454-455	Annas and Caiaphas	BH	A	E	FU
455-456	Persecutors of Christians	CH	M	E	FU
457-460	Julian	CH	M	E	FU
485	Paul	BH	M	O	ME
486	Annas and Caiaphas	BH	M	O	ME
486	Judas	BH	M	O	ME
487	Judas	BH	M	O	MI
488	Paul	BH	M	O	ME
488-489	Peter (rock and keys)	BH	M	O	ME
492-493	Cain and Abel	BH	M	E	FU
494-495	Esau and Jacob	BH	M	E	FU
496-497	Solomon (unfaithfulness)	BH	M	E	FU
498-500	Paul's conversion	BH	M	E	FU
588-591	Eros?[3]	PM	A	O	NO
610	Multiplication of the loaves	BH	A	O	MI
611	Cana?[4]	BH	A	O	NO
627	Pandora[5]	PM	A	O	NO
680-681	Lucifer	BH	N	E	FU
681-683	Judas	BH	N	E	FU
693-695	Mary	BH	M	E	FU
717-719	Rich young man?	BH	A	M	NO
724-727	Eden (tree of life)	BH	A		

1,2,2 Ὑποθῆκαι παρθένοις (689)

genre: MI rhet. sit.: D

3	Penelope?[6]	PM	A	O	NO
31-36	Momos	PM	M		
39	Lyssa?	PM	M		
50	Phthonos?	PM	M		
51-57	Sodom (do not look back)	BH	N	M	ME
97	Marah (bitter water)	BH	M	O	ME
127	Glaucus and Diomedes?[7]	PM	A	O	NO
129-133	Achilles?[8]	PM	A	M	NO
131	Alcinous	PM	M	O	MI
135	Adam and Eve (fig leaves)	BH	M	M	MI
138-140	Odysseus	PM	A	O	NO
138-140	The rich man and Lazarus[9]	BP	M	M	ME
144	Hades	PM	M		
152-163	Jonadab	BH	N	M	FU
164-171	Exodus	BH	N	M	FU
165-166	Exodus (pillar of fire and of cloud)	BH	M		
167	Exodus (crossing the Red Sea)	BH	M		

167	Exodus (manna and flesh)	BH	M		
168	Moses (water from the rock)	BH	M		
168-169	Exodus (passage of the Jordan)	BH	M		
169	Joshua makes the sun stand still	BH	A		
170-171	Moses (battle with the Amalekites)	BH	A		
172	Elijah fed by ravens	BH	M	M	FU
172-176	Elijah and the widow of Zarephath	BH	N	M	FU
172-176	Hecale	PV	A	O	NO
177-180	The three young men	BH	N	M	FU
181-183	Daniel (and Habakkuk)	BH	N	M	FU
184-186	Jonah	BH	N	M	FU
187-189	John the Baptist	BH	N	M	FU
190	Thecla (saved from the fire)	BH	M	M	FU
190-193	Thecla (saved from lions)	BH	N	M	FU
194-201	Susannah	BH	N	M	FU
202-209	Paul in hunger and in cold	BH	M	M	FU
205	Paul (in the third heaven)	BH	M	M	FU
213-219	Jesus' temptation	BH	N	M	FU
246	Momos	PM	M		
246-247	Aphrodite and Momos	PL	A	E	MI
271	Athena and Tydeus?[10]	PM	A	O	NO
288	Jonathan tasted a little honey	BH	A	O	NO
314	Icarus?	PM	A	O	NO
344	Zeus Ephestius	PM	A	O	NO
371-372	House built on rock / sand	BP	N	M	ME
373-375	The sower	BP	N	M	MI
376-377	The tares	BP	N	M	ME
378-388	The ten virgins	BP	N	M	ME
389-396	The marriage feast	BP	N	M	ME
397-401	Master returns when not expected	BP	N	M	ME
406	Eli's sons	BH	M	M	FU
419	Jeroboam vs. Rehoboam?	BH	A	M	ME
419	Samaria vs. Jerusalem	BH	M	O	ME
432-434	Ananias and Sapphira	BH	M	M	FU
435-437	Ahan	BH	N	M	FU
441-444	Lucifer	BH	A		
465	Samuel (Hannah's prayer is granted)	BH	M	M	FU
485	Dike leaves the earth	PM	M	O	MI
491-493	Giants (Nephilim)	BH	M		
496	Hermes	PM	A		
496	Dionysus	PM	A		
496-497	Ares	PM	A		
497	Kronos	PM	A		
497	Zeus (against Kronos)	PM	A		
500	Zeus and Europa	PM	A	E	FU
500	Zeus and Leda	PM	A	E	FU
500	Zeus and Persephone?	PM	A	E	FU
500	Zeus and Olympias?[11]	PM	A	E	FU
500	Zeus and Danae	PM	A	E	FU
500	Zeus and Alcmene	PM	A	E	FU
500	Zeus and Ganymedes	PM	A	E	FU
501	Eros	PM	M		
510-512	Woman suffering from hemorrhage	BH	N	E	FU
526-530	Phoenix	PM	N	O	MI

564-567	Cross and resurrection	BH M	
596-599	Alpheus	PM A	M FU
605	Cimmerians	PM M	

1,2,3 Πρὸς παρθένους παραινετικός (100)
genre: Mɪ rhet. sit.: D

23	Adam (alone)	BH M	
23	Moses (abstinence)	BH M	
24	Zechariah	BH M	
33-34	Sodom (do not look back)	BH M	M ME
47	Lucifer	BH M	E FU
48	Judas	BH M	E FU
65-66	Eden (tree of life)	BH M	M ME
81-83	Jesus' temptation	BH N	M FU
85	Elijah and the widow of Zarephath	BH A	M ME
86	Elijah fed by ravens	BH M	M MI
87	Thecla (saved from the fire)	BH M	M FU
87	Thecla (saved from the lions)	BH M	M FU
88	Paul in hunger and in cold	BH M	M FU
90	Multiplication of the loaves	BH M	E FU
97-99	The ten virgins	BP A	M ME

1,2,6 Εἰς σωφροσύνην (65)
genre: Mɪ rhet. sit.: D

20-21	Lucifer	BH M	E FU
22-23	Judas	BH M	E FU
44-45	Sinai (inaccessible)	BH M	M MI
49-50	Elijah and the widow of Zarephath	BH A	M ME
51-52	Multiplication of the loaves	BH M	E FU
57-58	Eli's sons?[14]	BH A	M ME
57-58	David eats bread of the Presence	BH A	M ME
58-59	Sodom (do not look back)	BH M	M ME
62-65	Ahan	BH A	M FU

1,2,8 Σύγκρισις βίων (255)
genre: Mɪ rhet. sit.: D

89-90	Oak and reed-stem	PL N	O ME

1,2,9 Περὶ ἀρετῆς (156)
genre: Mɪ rhet. sit.: D

22-24	Alpheus	PM N	M NO
38	Phthonos?	PM M	
82	Moses (saw God)?	BH A	
82	Isaiah (call)?	BH A	
82-83	Enoch?	BH A	
82-83	Elijah (chariot of fire)?	BH A	
94	Phaethon	PM M	

1,2.10 Περὶ ἀρετῆς (998)
genre: Mɪ rhet. sit.: D

31-33	Gyges	PH N	O MI
33	Croesus?[15]	PH A	O MI
34-35	Cyrus	PH M	O MI
36	Agamemnon	PM A	O ME
40	Demosthenes	PH M	O MI
41	Lycurgus	PH M	O MI
41	Solon	PH M	O MI
42	Muses	PM M	
42	Homer	PH M	O MI

43-44	Plato	PH M	O MI
45-46	Eristics	PH A	O NO
47-49	Aristotle	PH M	O MI
47-49	Sceptics	PH M	O MI
50	Pegasus	PM M	O ME
50-51	Abaris	PM M	O ME
206	Stoa	PH M	
206	Peripatus?[14]	PH A	
207	Academy	PH M	
207-208	Sceptics	PH M	
218-227	Diogenes lived in a barrel	PH N	M FU
228-235	Crates »liberated himself«	PH N	M FU
236-243	Crates (possessions overboard)?[15]	PH N	M FU
242	Tyche	PM M	
244-258	Cynic (possessions overboard)	PH N	M FU
276-281	Diogenes (sesame bread)	PH N	E FU
286	Cleanthes drawing water from a well	PH M	E FU
286-293	Socrates (pederasty)	PH M	E FU
288	Charmides (eromene Socrates)	PH M	E ME
293	Telephus[16]	PM A	O ME
294-305	Alcmaeon with Croesus	PH N	E FU
306-312	Plato? (oil trade)	PH M	E FU
308-312	Speusippus? (oil trade)[17]	PH M	E FU
313-314	Plato with Dionysius	PH M	E FU
315-318	Plato (redeemed)	PH N	E FU
319-322	Aristippus smells of myrrh	PH M	E FU
323-334	Aristippus, Plato, Archelaus	PH N	E FU
335-340	Archelaus, Sophocles, Euripides	PH N	E FU
341-349	Aristides (Dikaios)	PH N	E FU
350-364	Fabricius and Pyrrhus	PH N	E FU
375	Apollo	PM M	
389-390	Plutus	PM M	
392	Midas	PH M	O ME
393-395	Theognis (teaches Cyrnus)	PH M	
396-406	Homer	PH N	
401-406	Odysseus and Nausicaa	PM N	E NO
407-411	Midas	PH N	M MI
426-427	Adam (curse)	BH A	
443-445	Plutus	PM M	
468-477	Eden	BH N	
478-487	Adam (curse)	BH N	
489-495	Abram (journey to Canaan)	BH N	M MI
496-499	Jacob (Mesopotamia)	BH N	M MI
500-507	Levites (no land)	BH M	M MI
501-502	Moses (saw God)	BH M	
502-503	Moses (tables of stone)	BH M	
504-505	Moses (allotment of land)	BH M	
508-523	Jonadab	BH N	M MI
523-525	Elijah fed by ravens	BH N	M MI
526-527	Elijah stops the rain	BH M	
528	Elijah and the prophets of Baal	BH M	
529-530	Elijah and the widow of Zarephath	BH M	M MI
531	Elijah raising the child at Zarephath	BH M	
532	Elijah (chariot of fire)	BH M	

533-534	Elisha (mantle of Elijah)	BH M	M MI
535-539	Samuel (Hannah's prayer is granted)	BH N	M MI
540-548	John the Baptist	BH N	M MI
549-550	Paul (tentmaker)	BH M	M MI
549-554	Peter and Paul	BH M	M MI
550-551	Peter (eating lupins)	BH M	M MI
555-556	Apostles (call)	BH N	M MI
560-566	Apostles (mission)	BH N	M MI
567-572	Rich young man	BH N	M MI
574-578	Zacchaeus	BH N	E MI
588	Aphrodite	PM A	
595-600	Cercidas	PH M	
604-611	Cleanthes?[18]	PH N	M MI
612-616	Sardanapalus	PH N	M MI
617-622	David (pours out water when thirsty)	BH N	M MI
633-635	The three young men	BH A	M MI
633-635	Daniel in the lion's den	BH A	M MI
636-641	Jesus' temptation	BH N	
676-677	Leos' daughters	PM M	M MI
678-679	Menoeceus	PM M	M MI
680-683	Cleombrotus' suicide	PH N	M MI
684-687	Epictetus' martyr's death	PH M	M MI
688-691	Anaxarchus' martyr's death	PH N	M MI
692-693	Socrates (poisoned cup)	PH M	M MI
697-732	Martyrs	CH N	M FU
758-763	Holy Games	PH N	M MI
778-786	Xenocrates and the prostitute	PH N	M FU
787-792	Epicurus lived in a controlled way	PH N	M FU
793-807	Polemon and the prostitute	PH N	M FU
808-817	Dion the stinking mouth[19]	PH N	M FU
818-822	Alexander and the female slaves	PH N	M FU
826	Alpheus	PM A	O ME
833-837	Zeus and Ganymedes	PM A	E MI
838-839	Ares and Aphrodite	PM A	E MI
841	Zeus and Europa	PM A	E MI
841	Zeus and Leda	PM A	E MI
841	Zeus and Alcmene	PM A	E MI
841	Zeus and Antiope	PM A	E MI
842	Zeus and Danae	PM A	E MI
842	Zeus and Persephone?	PM A	E MI
842	Zeus and Olympias?	PM A	E MI
844-845	Aphrodite (worship)	PH A	
846-847	Celeus & Triptolemus?	PM A	E MI
846-856	Dionysus (thiasus)	PM A	
851	Hermaphroditus	PM M	
851-852	Pan	PM M	
861-862	Aphrodite	PM M	
863-864	Phidias' inscription	PH N	E MI
869	Euphro as model	PH M	E FU
869	Phryne as model	PH M	E FU
869	Leaena as model	PH M	E FU
871-872	Lais as model	PH M	E FU
909-915	Nazarites	BH M	M FU

916-918	Thecla (virgin)	BH	M	M	FU

1,2,12 Περὶ τοῦ ἐπικήρου τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως (12)

genre: TH rhet. sit.: E

5-8	Creation of man	BH	M		

1,2,14 Περὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως (132)

genre: TH rhet. sit.: E

57-58	Adam (seduced)	BH	N		
61	The three young men	BH	A	O	MI
87	Eden	BH	M		
88	Great flood	BH	A		
88	Sodom	BH	A		
89	Tables of stone	BH	A		
89-92	Incarnation	BH	M		
103	Tartarus	PM	M		
103	Pyriphlegethon	PM	M		
117-118	Lucifer	BH	N	E	MI

1,2,15a Περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἐκτὸς ἀνθρώπου εὐτελείας (156)

genre: TH rhet. sit.: E

79-80	Heraclitus the weeping philosopher	PH	A	M	FU
79-80	Democritus the laughing philosopher	PH	A	M	FU
81-82	Trojan war	PM	M	E	FU
83-84	Calydonian hunt	PM	A	E	FU
85-86	Aeacids	PM	M	E	FU
85-86	Aias the Great's death	PM	A	E	FU
86	Agamemnon?	PM	A	E	FU
86	Aias the Lesser?	PM	A	E	FU
86	Achilles' death?[illegible]	PM	A	E	FU
87-88	Heracles at the stake	PM	M	E	FU
89	Cyrus	PH	M	E	FU
89	Croesus	PH	M	E	FU
91	Zeus and Olympias	PM	A	O	NO
91-92	Alexander's death	PH	M	E	FU
94	Agamemnon	PM	M	E	FU
94	Irus	PM	M	E	FU
95	Constantine	CH	M	E	FU
105	Adam (seduced)	BH	A	E	MI
106	Solomon (unfaithfulness)	BH	M	E	MI
107-108	Judas	BH	M	E	MI

1,2,15b (Πρὸς τοὺς φθονοῦντας) (8)

genre: A3 rhet. sit.: J

161	Exodus (pillar of fire and of cloud)	BH	A	O	ME

1,2,16 Περὶ τῶν τοῦ βίου ὁδῶν (40)

genre: TH rhet. sit.: E

20	Hades	PM	M		

1,2,17 Διαφόρων βίων μακαρισμοί (66)

genre: GN rhet. sit.: D

5	Rich young man?	BH	A	M	NO
5	Treasure hidden in a field?[illegible]	BP	A	M	NO
37-38	Rahab	BH	M	E	MI
39-40	Pharisee and tax collector	BP	M	E	MI

1,2,24 Περὶ πολυόρκους διάλογος (328)

genre: M2 rhet. sit.: D

225-232	Paul (oath)	BH	M	M	FU
290-292	Tables of stone	BH	A	O	ME

306–310	Plato swears by a plane tree	PH	N	M	MI

1,2,25 Κατὰ θυμοῦ (546)
genre: M2 rhet. sit.: D

61–63	Sea obeys	BH	M	M	MI
119	Zeus throws thunderbolts?[22]	PM	A	O	NO
126	Milon	PH	M	O	ME
134	Typhoeus	PM	M	O	ME
135–138	Polyphemus, Acis, Galatea	PM	N	O	ME
190–195	Aaron (meek towards Egypt)	BH	N	M	FU
190–195	Moses (meek towards Egypt)	BH	N	M	FU
193–194	Exodus (crossing the Red Sea)	BH	A		
197–201	Samuel (forgives Saul)	BH	N	M	FU
202–204	David (plays the lyre)	BH	N	M	FU
204–209	David spares Saul's life	BH	N	M	FU
210–219	David and Absalom	BH	N	M	FU
220–221	David and Shimei	BH	M	M	FU
222–230	Peter criticized by Paul	BH	N	M	FU
231–236	Stephen	BH	N	M	FU
237–242	Jesus' passion	BH	N	M	FU
239	Zeus throws thunderbolts	PM	A	O	NO
242–243	Malchus' ear	BH	N	M	FU
254	Tables of stone	BH	M		
254	Sermon on the Mount	BH	M		
261–270	Aristotle restrains anger	PH	N	M	FU
270–277	Alexander spares the city	PH	N	M	FU
278–284	Pericles	PH	N	M	FU
285–289	Euclides?[23]	PH	N	M	FU
290–303	Constantius	CH	N	M	FU
299–303	Bee and its sting	PL	A	O	ME
304–353	Sermon on the Mount	BH	N		
432–434	Abraham (dust and ashes)	BH	A	M	FU
432–434	Job (dust and ashes)	BH	A	M	FU
494–497	Diogenes taunts prostitutes	PH	N	M	FU
527	Hades	PM	M		
531	Tartarus	PM	M		
531–541	Gadarene demoniacs	BH	A	O	ME

1,2,26 Εἰς εὐγενῆ δύστροπον (40)
genre: M2 rhet. sit.: D

1 6	Nobleman and virtuous one	PL	N	M	FU

1,2,27 Εἰς εὐγενῆ δύστροπον (34)
genre: M2 rhet. sit.: D

17	Signs of the zodiac	PM	A	O	MI

1,2,28 Κατὰ πλουτούντων (κατὰ πλεονεξίας) (379)
genre: M2 rhet. sit.: D

70–84	The rich fool	BP	A	O	NO
140	Charybdis	PM	M	M	MI
148–150	Midas	PH	M	M	MI
151–158	Dipsas?[24]	BH	N	M	FU
159–168	Exodus (the hoarding of manna)	BH	N	M	FU
232–249	Owl is mocked	PL	N	E	FU
237	Zeus (birth Athena)	PM	A		
238	Athena (eyes of an owl)	PM	A		
293	Eden (tree of life)	BH	A	O	ME
334–335	Pillars of Heracles	PM	M		

338-339	Bending lobster?[25]	PL A	O ME
341	Tartarus	PM M	
344-345	Serpent	BH A	O ME
355	Socrates refuses exile?[26]	PH A	M NO
355-357	Apostles (mission)	BH M	M FU
362-369	The rich man and Lazarus	BP N	E FU
377	Chamos	BH M	
377	Plutus?	PM A	

1,2,29 Κατὰ γυναικῶν καλλωπιζομένων (334)
genre: M2 rhet. sit.: D

8	Maenad	PM M	O ME
41	Penelope's loom	PM N	O MI
42	Hecabe	PM M	O ME
42	Helen	PM M	O ME
53	Adonis (garden of)	PM M	O MI
55-58	Crow loses feathers	PL N	O MI
104-106	Circe	PM M	O ME
115-126	Pandora	PM N	M FU
127-134	Eden (tree of life)	BH N	M FU
139-141	Danae	PM M	O ME
153-154	Pan and Echo	PM N	E FU
155-156	Narcissus	PM N	E FU
157-160	Comaetho and Cydnus[27]	PM N	E FU
165-168	Daedalus and Pasiphae	PM N	O MI
169-170	Orpheus	PM M	O MI
185	Aphrodite[28]	PM A	O MI
187-210	Blush of shame	PL N	E FU
210	Sodom	BH M	O MI
221	Celts test offspring in Rhine	PH M	O MI
291-295	Esther	BH M	M FU
293-296	Jezebel	BH N	M FU

1,2,33 Γνωμολογία τετράστιχος (236)
genre: GN rhet. sit.: D

32	Ananias and Sapphira	BH M	E MI
65-66	Odysseus and the Sirens[29]	PM A	M NO
140	Jesus washes the disciples' feet	BH A	M MI

1,2,34 Ὅροι παχυμερεῖς (267)
genre: GN rhet. sit.: J

5-7	Lucifer	BH M
189	Incarnation	BH M
192-194	Eve	BH M
192-194	Mary (virgin mother)	BH A
192-195	The census of Augustus	BH M
196	Adam and Eve (fig leaves)	BH A
196	Jesus' birth in a manger	BH M
197	Herod (Massacre of the children)	BH M
198	Star of Bethlehem	BH M
199	Three wise men	BH M
200-201	Jesus' baptism	BH M
202-203	Jesus' temptation	BH M
204-218	Jesus' passion	BH N
204-220	Cross and resurrection	BH N
220	Hades	PM M

221	Ascension	BH	M		

1.2.37 Εἰς τὴν ὑπομονήν (9)

genre: TH rhet. sit.: E

7-9	Job	BH	M	E	MI

1.2.38 Εἰς τὴν ὑπομονήν (8)

genre: TH rhet. sit.: E

5-6	Job	BH	M	M	ME

2,1,1 Περὶ τῶν καθ' ἑαυτόν (634)

genre: A2 rhet. sit.: E

1-3	Moses (battle with the Amalekites)	BH	N	M	FU
3-5	Daniel in the lion's den	BH	N	M	FU
6-7	Jonah	BH	N	M	FU
8-9	The three young men	BH	N	M	FU
10-12	Jesus walks on water	BH	N	M	FU
13-14	Healings	BH	N	M	FU
91	Comaetho and Cydnus?[30]	PM	A	O	NO
127	Priam?	PM	A	O	NO
127	Nestor?[31]	PM	A	O	NO
128	Moses	BH	M	O	ME
128	Aaron	BH	M	O	ME
229-234	Hecabe's imprisonment?	PM	N	O	MI
235-240	Philoctetes?[32]	PM	N	O	FU
352	Egypt	BH	M	O	ME
352-353	Pharaoh	BH	M	O	ME
354-357	Babel (exile)	BH	M	O	ME
358-359	Assyria (exile)	BH	M	O	ME
367-392	The Good Samaritan	BP	N	M	FU
384-385	Adam (curse)	BH	N	O	MI
393-413	Pharisee and tax collector	BP	N	M	FU
424-432	Samuel (Hannah's prayer is granted)	BH	N	O	MI
432-436	Eli's sons	BH	N	O	MI
440-446	Abraham offering Isaac	BH	N	O	MI
442	Sarah (late motherhood)	BH	M	O	MI
457-458	Eve	BH	A	O	ME
479-483	Sodom (do not look back)	BH	N	O	ME
577-581	The rich man and Lazarus	BP	N	M	ME
581-593	Healings	BH	M	M	MI
584	Woman suffering from hemorrhage	BH	M	M	ME
585-586	Gadarene demoniacs	BH	N	M	ME
591	Multiplication of the loaves	BH	M	M	ME
591-592	Sea obeys	BH	M	M	ME
592	Transfiguration	BH	A	M	ME
593-594	Lazarus (raising of)	BH	A	M	ME
594-595	Fig tree cursed	BH	M	M	MI

2,1,3 Ἔνδεια Κωνσταντινουπόλεως (24)

genre: H1 rhet. sit.: E

7	Exodus (pillar of fire and of cloud)	BH	A	M	ME
8	Exodus (crossing the Red Sea)	BH	A	M	ME
8	Exodus (passage of the Jordan)	BH	A	M	ME
9	Exodus (manna and flesh)	BH	A	M	ME
10-11	Moses (battle with the Amalekites)	BH	A	M	ME
11-12	Jacob endures heat and cold?	BH	A	M	ME

2,1,6 Πρὸς τὸν Ἀναστασίας λαόν (12)
genre: A2 rhet. sit.: E

1–2	Zion (roads to Zion mourn)	BH	M	O	MI

2,1,10 Πρὸς τοὺς τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἱερέας (36)
genre: A4 rhet. sit.: J

7	Phthonos?	PM	M		
10	Moses (water from the rock)	BH	A	O	ME
25	Lethe	PM	M		

2,1,11 Εἰς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ βίον (1949)
genre: A4 rhet. sit.: J

53	Abraham	BH	M	O	ME
87–92	Samuel (Hannah's prayer is granted)	BH	M	O	MI
111–210	Paul's shipwreck?	BH	A	O	NO
188	Exodus (crossing the Red Sea)	BH	M	M	FU
189	Moses (battle with the Amalekites)	BH	A	M	FU
190	Egypt (plagues)	BH	M	M	FU
191	Joshua makes the sun stand still?	BH	A	M	FU
191	Moses (water from the rock)?	BH	A	M	FU
192	Jericho captured and destroyed	BH	A	M	FU
200–201	Sea obeys	BH	A	M	MI
217–218	Alpheus	PM	A	O	MI
292–293	Elijah fed by ravens	BH	M	M	MI
292–293	Elijah: the contest on Mount Carmel	BH	M	M	MI
294	John the Baptist	BH	M	M	MI
295	Jonadab	BH	M	M	MI
350–351	Io?[33]	PM	A	O	MI
353–354	Moses (on Sinai)	BH	A	O	MI
507–508	Aaron	BH	M	M	MI
507–508	Samuel	BH	M	M	MI
548–549	Thecla	BH	M		
671–673	Crates (possessions overboard)	PH	A	O	MI
675	Daniel in the lion's den	BH	A	O	MI
676	The three young men	BH	A	O	MI
677	Jonah	BH	A	O	MI
680–683	Paul, Peter, Apollos	BH	M	E	ME
740–745	Egypt (plagues)	BH	M	O	FU
746	Exodus (crossing the Red Sea)?	BH	M		
753	Ares?[34]	PM	A	O	ME
808	Proteus	PM	M	O	ME
823	Lucifer	BH	A	O	ME
828	Dike	PM	M		
834–835	Moses (reconnaissance of the land)	BH	A	O	MI
834–836	Joshua and Caleb	BH	M	O	MI
838–843	Egyptian gods	PM	M		
848–850	Elihu speaks to Job	BH	A	O	NO
863	Iphigenia	PM	A	O	ME
918–923	Samson	BH	N	O	FU
932	Judas hangs himself	BH	A	O	NO
960–961	Adam (seduced)	BH	M	O	MI
975	Heracles	PM	M		
1032	Diogenes	PH	M		
1032	Antisthenes	PH	M		
1033	Crates	PH	M		
1033–1034	Plato	PH	M		

1034	Stoa	PH M	
1035-1037	Socrates (wisest man)	PH M	O FU
1036-1037	Pythia	PH M	O FU
1076-1077	Hireling vs. good shepherd	BP A	M ME
1081-1083	Noah's ark	BH N	O ME
1103	Paul boasts a little	BH A	O NO
1151	Babel (tower of)	BH A	O MI
1167	Simon Magus	BH M	
1178-1179	Hydra	PM M	O MI
1207	Tables of stone	BH A	O ME
1239	Cleobulus (one of the wise men)	PH A	
1240	Telephus?	PM A	O ME
1249	Hades	PM M	
1258-1272	The sower	BP N	O ME
1404-1406	Enceladus?[35]	PM N	O FU
1506	Phthonos	PM M	
1733-1736	Nebuchadnezzar's dream	BH N	O ME
1737-1738	Ammonites and Moabites	BH M	O ME
1762-1765	Abram and Lot	BH N	O NO
1838-1842	Jonah	BH N	M NO
1844-1845	Rehoboth (Euruchoria)	BH M	O ME

2,1,12a Εἰς ἑαυτὸν καὶ περὶ ἐπισκόπων (175)
genre: A4 rhet. sit.: J

137-138	Thrasonides	PV M	O MI
170-171	Dung beetle	PL N	O ME

2,1,12b (Περὶ ἐπισκόπων) (661)
genre: M2 rhet. sit.: D

192-196	Apostles (call)	BH N	E FU
199-215	Apostles (mission)	BH N	M FU
220	Matthew the tax collector	BH M	E FU
222	Peter (rock and keys)	BH M	E FU
238-244	Paul	BH N	E FU
303	Sextus Empiricus	PH M	O MI
303	Pyrrhon	PH M	O MI
304	Chrysippus	PH M	O MI
304	Aristotle	PH M	O MI
305	Plato	PH M	O MI
401	Saul prophesies among the Prophets	BH M	O ME
419	Daniel as judge	BH M	O ME
430	Simon Magus	BH M	O ME
430	Simon Peter	BH M	O ME
434-435	Cyrus	PH M	O MI
435	Croesus	PH M	O MI
435	Midas	PH M	O MI
457-461	Zacchaeus	BH N	M ME
542	Momos?	PM M	
543	Elijah (chariot of fire)	BH M	O MI
588-589	Adam (seduced)	BH A	
590	Paul in hunger and in cold?[36]	BH A	O NO
596-597	Crates (possessions overboard)	PH A	O NO
653	Samuel (ephod / apron)	BH M	O MI
662	Telephus?	PM A	E ME
663-665	Marah (bitter water)	BH M	E ME
663-665	Healing a blind man at Siloam	BH M	E ME

674-682	Pharaoh's magicians	BH	N	E	FU
678	Aaron	BH	M	M	ME
684-685	David (and Bathsheba)	BH	A	O	ME
684-685	Nathan (the poor man's lamb)	BH	M	O	ME
693-695	Laban (flock divided)	BH	M	O	ME
695	Jacob endures heat and cold	BH	A	O	ME
698-708	Cat as bride	PL	N	O	FU
723	Jotham (allegory of the bramble)	BH	A	M	MI
724-726	Exodus (pillar of fire and of cloud)	BH	N	M	ME
728	Proteus	PM	M	O	ME
729-731	Melampus	PM	M	O	ME
740-741	Zeuxis	PH	M		
740-741	Polyclitus	PH	M		
740-741	Euphranor	PH	M		
742-745	Callimachus (painter)	PH	M		
742-745	Calais	PH	M		
746	Odysseus?[17]	PM	A	O	NO

2,1,13 Εἰς ἐπισκόπους (217)
genre: M2 rhet. sit.: D

44-45	Adam (seduced)	BH	N		
61-65	Field of Blood	BH	N	O	MI
85	Prometheus	PM	A	O	ME
92-95	Exodus (the hoarding of manna)	BH	N	O	ME
99	Saul prophesies among the Prophets	BH	M	O	ME
117-118	Moses (saw God)	BH	M		
117-118	Moses (on Sinai)	BH	M		
117-123	Sinai (inaccessible)	BH	N	E	FU
124-127	Nadab and Abihu	BH	N	E	FU
128-133	Eli's sons	BH	N	E	FU
136-137	Uzzah	BH	A	E	FU
137-138	Temple of Solomon	BH	M	E	FU
149-150	Gath's inhabitants punished	BH	M	O	MI
154-156	Paul, Peter, Apollos	BH	M	O	FU
174	Dike leaves the earth	PM	M	O	ME
176	Lucifer	BH	M		
177	Judas	BH	M	O	ME
177	Peter	BH	M	O	ME
178	Samaria vs. Jerusalem	BH	M	O	ME
184-185	Ammonites and Moabites	BH	N	M	FU
186-187	Joshua and the Gibeonites	BH	N	M	FU
188-192	Levites	BH	N	M	FU
205-206	Noah	BH	M	O	ME
207-208	Sodom	BH	M	O	ME

2,1,14 Εἰς ἑαυτὸν καὶ πρὸς τοὺς φθονοῦντας (67)
genre: A3 rhet. sit.: J

61	Isaiah's martyrdom	BH	M	E	MI
62	The three young men	BH	M	E	MI
63	Daniel in the lion's den	BH	M	E	MI
64	Paul's martyrdom	BH	M	E	MI
64	Peter's martyrdom	BH	M	E	MI
65	John beheaded	BH	M	E	MI

2,1,15 Εἰς ἑαυτὸν μετὰ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπάνοδον (52)
genre: A2 rhet. sit.: E

21-23	Phinehas	BH	M	O	ME

23-26	Moses (exodus)?	BH	M	O	ME
23-26	Moses kills an Egyptian?	BH	M	O	ME

2,1,16 Ἐνύπνιον περὶ τῆς Ἀναστασίας ἐκκλησίας (104)

genre: A2 rhet. sit.: E

62	Bethlehem	BH	M	O	ME
67-68	Assyria (exile)	BH	M	O	FU
69	Ark among the Philistines	BH	M	O	FU
70	Jacob mourns for Joseph	BH	M	O	FU

2,1,17 Περὶ τῶν τοῦ βίου διαφορῶν καὶ κατὰ ψευδιερέων (108)

genre: A2 rhet. sit.: E

51	Phthonos	PM	M		
53-56	Jonah	BH	M	O	MI
60	Anaxarchus' martyr's death?[38]	PH	A	O	NO
65-66	Priam at Achilles?[39]	PM	A	O	NO
70	Briareos	PM	M	O	MI

2,1,18 Πρὸς τοὺς φθονοῦντας (12)

genre: TH rhet. sit.: E

3	Phthonos?	PM	M		

2,1,19 Σχετλιαστικὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν αὐτοῦ παθῶν (104)

genre: A2 rhet. sit.: E

31-35	Job	BH	N	O	ME
84	Jonah	BH	A	O	ME
92	Pharisee and tax collector	BP	M	M	MI
92	Matthew the tax collector	BH	M	M	MI
93	Zacchaeus	BH	M	M	MI
94	Healing a paralytic on his bed	BH	M	M	MI
94	Healing the lame man at Bethesda	BH	M	M	MI
95	Healing an infirm woman	BH	M	M	MI
97	Jairus' daughter	BH	M	M	MI
97	Raising of a widow's son	BH	M	M	MI
98	Lazarus (raising of)	BH	M	M	MI

2,1,21 Εἰς τὸν πονηρόν (14)

genre: H1 rhet. sit.: E

4	Pharaoh	BH	M	O	ME
5-7	Babel (exile)	BH	M	O	ME
11 12	Sodom	BH	M	O	MI

2,1,22 Ἱκετήριον (24)

genre: H1 rhet. sit.: E

1-2	Exodus (pillar of fire and of cloud)	BH	A	M	ME
3	Pharaoh	BH	M	M	ME
4-5	Egypt	BH	M	M	ME
6-9	Exodus (crossing the Red Sea)	BH	N	M	ME
10	Exodus (passage of the Jordan)	BH	A	M	ME
10-11	Moses (battle with the Amalekites)?[40]	BH	A	M	ME

2,1,30 Εἰς ἑαυτόν (226)

genre: A3 rhet. sit.: J

39-42	Noah's ark	BH	M	O	ME
89	Baal of Peor (Israel's apostasy)	BH	M	O	ME

2,1,31 Πόθος τοῦ θανάτου (12)

genre: A2 rhet. sit.: E

1	Esau and Jacob[41]	BH	A	O	NO

2,1,32 Περὶ τῆς τοῦ βίου ματαιότητος (60)

genre: TH rhet. sit.: E

17-24	Homeric heroes	PM	A	O	NO

20-21	Heracles?[42]	PM A	O NO
27	Hades	PM M	

2,1,34a Εἰς τὴν ἐν ταῖς νηστείαις σιωπήν (150)
genre: A4 rhet. sit.: J

5	Jesus' forty days of fasting	BH M	
71	Trojan war	PM M	
71	Argo	PM M	
72	Calydonian hunt	PM A	
72	Heracles	PM M	
99-100	Nadab and Abihu	BH A	E FU
101-102	Uzzah	BH A	E FU

2,1,34b Εἰς τὴν ἐν ταῖς νηστείαις σιωπήν (60)
genre: A4 rhet. sit.: J

189	Phthonos?	PM M	
193-204	Polycrates	PH N	O FU

2,1,36 Εἰς τὴν ἐν ταῖς νηστείαις σιωπήν (12)
genre: A3 rhet. sit.: J

6	Phthonos	PM M	

2,1,37 Εἰς τὴν ἐν ταῖς νηστείαις σιωπήν (12)
genre: A3 rhet. sit.: J

5	Phthonos	PM M	

2,1,38a Ὕμνος εἰς Χριστὸν μετὰ τὴν σιωπήν (38)
genre: H1 rhet. sit.: E

15-16	Phaethon	PM M	

2,1,38b (Ὕμνος εἰς τὸν Πάσχα) (14)
genre: H1 rhet. sit.: E

41	Hades	PM M	

2,1,39 Εἰς τὰ ἔμμετρα (103)
genre: A1 rhet. sit.: J

7	Egypt (plagues)	BH M	O ME
88-89	David (plays the lyre)	BH N	E FU
102	Telephus	PM A	O ME

2,1,41 Πρὸς Μάξιμον (65)
genre: A3 rhet. sit.: J

15-16	Muses	PM M	
15-16	Homer?	PH A	O MI
15-17	Hesiod?	PH A	O MI
17	Pythia?	PH A	O MI
17	Daphne (oracle)?[43]	PH A	O MI
18	Cassotis?	PH A	O MI
18	Castalia?	PH A	O MI
21	Saul prophesies among the Prophets	BH M	O MI
46	Orpheus	PM M	O ME
47	Amphion	PM M	O ME

2,1,42 Θρῆνος διὰ τῶν αὐτοῦ μόγων (31)
genre: TH rhet. sit.: E

14-17	Job	BH M	O MI

2,1,43 Πρὸς ἑαυτὸν κατὰ πεῦσιν καὶ ἀπόκρισιν (31)
genre: A2 rhet. sit.: E

29	Daniel's vision of four beasts	BH A	
29	Pyriphlegethon	PM A	

2,1,44b Πρὸς τοὺς μονάζοντας (26)
genre: M1 rhet. sit.: D

36	Samson	BH A	O NO

38	Gadarene demoniacs	BH A	O ME

2,1,45 Θρῆνος περὶ τῶν τῆς αὐτοῦ ψυχῆς παθῶν (350)
genre: A2 rhet. sit.: E

3	Jacob mourns for Joseph?	BH A	O MI
4	Joseph weeps over Jacob?	BH A	O MI
4	Abraham weeps over Sarah?	BH A	O MI
5	Jeremiah weeps over Jerusalem?	BH A	O MI
6	Job?[44]	BH A	O MI
98	Adam (seduced)	BH M	
99-100	Eve	BH M	
101-102	Serpent	BH M	
103-104	Eden (tree of life)	BH M	
105-106	Adam (curse)	BH M	
168	Gadarene demoniacs	BH M	O MI
177-179	Tables of stone	BH M	
219-220	Labourers in the vineyard	BP A	O ME
223-224	Women at empty tomb	BH M	O MI
325-332	Lucifer	BH N	O FU

2,1,46 Κατὰ σαρκός (50)
genre: TH rhet. sit.: E

6	Eden (tree of life)	BH A	O ME
13-15	Creation of man	BH M	
25-26	Woman suffering from hemorrhage	BH A	O ME
39-40	Adam (the first)	BH M	M MI
41	Manasseh	BH M	M MI
42	David (and Bathsheba)	BH M	M MI
43	Nineveh	BH M	M MI
44	The prodigal son	BP M	M MI
45	Jesus eats with tax collectors	BH M	M MI
46	The lost sheep	BP M	M MI
47-48	Healings	BH M	M MI
49-50	Sea obeys	BH A	O ME

2,1,47 Ἐπιτίμησις κατὰ τοῦ ἀλόγου τῆς ψυχῆς (39)
genre: TH rhet. sit.: E

1-2	Empusa	PM M	O ME
1-2	Maenad	PM M	O ME
22	Hades	PM M	

2,1,50 Κατὰ τοῦ πονηροῦ εἰς τὴν νόσον (118)
genre: TH rhet. sit.: E

60	Serpent	BH M	
63-67	Job	BH M	E FU
69-70	Lazarus (raising of)	BH M	M ME
71-72	Healing a paralytic on his bed	BH M	M ME
73-74	Woman suffering from hemorrhage	BH A	M ME
75-76	Canaanite woman	BH M	M MI
75-76	Healing an infirm woman	BH A	M MI
77-78	Sea obeys	BH A	M ME

2,1,51a-b Θρηνητικὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς αὐτοῦ ψυχῆς (24 + 12)
genre: TH rhet. sit.: E

9	Ares	PM M	
10-11	Serpent	BH M	
32	Elijah (chariot of fire)	BH M	M MI
33	Moses (in the basket)	BH M	M MI
34	Jonah	BH M	M MI

34	Daniel in the lion's den	BH M	M MI
35	The three young men	BH M	M MI

2,1,54 Κατὰ τοῦ πονηροῦ (20)
genre: H2 rhet. sit.: E

6-8	Adam (seduced)	BH N	

2,1,55 Ἀποτροπὴ τοῦ πονηροῦ (24)
genre: H2 rhet. sit.: E

3-4	Serpent	BH M	
7-9	Gadarene demoniacs	BH M	M MI
13-14	Gadarene demoniacs	BH A	O ME
14	Sodom	BH M	O ME

2,1,56 Κατὰ τοῦ πονηροῦ (7)
genre: H2 rhet. sit.: E

4-5	Gadarene demoniacs	BH A	O ME

2,1,58 Κατὰ τοῦ πονηροῦ (7)
genre: H2 rhet. sit.: E

4	Adam (seduced)	BH M	M MI
5-6	Serpent (head and heel)	BH	
6-7	Bronze serpent	BH A	O ME

2,1,60 Κατὰ τοῦ πονηροῦ (14)
genre: H2 rhet. sit.: E

11	Adam (seduced)	BH A	O MI

2,1,62 Ἱκετήριον εἰς Χριστόν (7)
genre: H1 rhet. sit.: E

4	Hades	PM M	

2.1.63 Θρῆνος πρὸς Χριστόν (8)
genre: H1 rhet. sit.: E

1-4	Adam (seduced)	BH M	O ME
5	Adam (curse)	BH A	O ME
6	Flaming sword, guardian of Eden	BH M	O ME
7-8	Criminals on the cross	BH M	O ME

2,1.64 Θρῆνος πρὸς Χριστόν (3)
genre: H2 rhet. sit.: E

2	David (plays the lyre)	BH M	O ME

2.1.68 Εἰς ἑαυτόν (104)
genre: A4 rhet. sit.: J

63-66	Jonah	BH N	M MI
77-79	Lazarus (raising of)	BH M	O MI
83-86	Daniel in the lion's den	BH A	M FU

2,1,69 Δέησις πρὸς τὸν Χριστόν (10)
genre: H1 rhet. sit.: E

1-3	Sea obeys	BH A	O ME

2,1,72 Εἰς τὴν ἔξοδον (12)
genre: TH rhet. sit.: E

7	Gomorrah	BH M	O MI

2,1,73 Παρακλητικόν (12)
genre: TH rhet. sit.: E

3	Tartarus	PM M	

2,1.76 Θρῆνος πρὸς Χριστόν (7)
genre: TH rhet. sit.: E

3	Pyriphlegethon	PM A	

2,1,83 Περὶ τῶν δαιμονίων πολέμων (32)
genre: TH rhet. sit.: E

10	Proteus	PM M	O ME

25-26	Sea obeys	BH	M	O	MI
27-28	Healings	BH	M	O	MI
29-30	Adam (seduced)	BH	A	O	MI

2,1,88 Εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν στίχοι ἡμίαμβοι (181)
genre: Mɪ rhet. sit.: D

7-12	Gyges	PH	N	O	MI
13-17	Midas	PH	N	O	MI
48	Ares	PM	M		
50	Heracles?[45]	PM	A	O	NO
105-107	John the Baptist	BH	A	O	MI
107-108	Garments of skins	BH	A	O	MI
136-140	Serpent and farmer	PL	N	O	MI
164-165	Flaming sword, guardian of Eden	BH	M	O	ME
166-169	Adam (seduced)	BH	M	O	ME
170-175	Eden (tree of life)	BH	M	O	ME

2,1,89a-n Εἰς τὴν νόσον (43)
genre: TH rhet. sit.: E

7-9	Healing the lame man at Bethesda	BH	A	O	ME
16-18	Apostles tread upon scorpions	BH	A	O	ME
35-37	Abraham's bosom	BP	M	O	ME

2,1,93 Εἰς ἑαυτόν (10)
genre: E rhet. sit.: E

	Heracles?[46]	PM	A	O	NO

2,1,98 Εἰς ἑαυτόν (4)
genre: E rhet. sit.: E

4	Aaron?	BH	M	O	ME

2,2,1 Πρὸς Ἑλλήνιον περὶ τῶν μοναχῶν προτρεπτικόν (368)
genre: EP rhet. sit.: D Hellenius C

73-74	Elijah fed by ravens	BH	A	O	ME
119-120	Phthonos	PM	M		
145-147	Abraham offering Isaac	BH	M	O	MI
183-185	Jacob (ladder)	BH	M	O	MI
212-224	Sheep and goats	BP	A	O	ME
225-228	The ten virgins	BP	A	O	ME
233-234	Eve	BH	M	O	ME
239-240	Woman suffering from hemorrhage?[47]	BH	A	O	ME
247-251	Mary (virgin mother)	BH	A	E	FU
251-254	Women at empty tomb	BH	N	E	FU
263-264	Pactolus	PM	A	O	MI
273-276	Bethlehem	BH	M	E	FU
302	Aaron	BH	M	O	MI
337-338	The census of Augustus	BH	M	M	MI
339-340	Money for the temple tax	BH	A	M	MI
345-352	Adam (curse)	BH	N	E	MI
368	Momos	PM	M		

2,2,2 Πρὸς Ἰουλιανόν (30)
genre: EP rhet. sit.: D Julian C

1	Elijah stops the rain	BH	A		
1	Elijah lets it rain	BH	A	M	MI
2	Noah	BH	A	M	MI
3	Elisha (the curing of Naaman)?[48]	BH	A	M	MI
4	Exodus (manna and flesh)	BH	A	M	MI
14	The rich man and Lazarus	BP	M	O	ME

15-16	The census of Augustus	BH	M	M	MI

2,2,3 Πρὸς Βιταλιανὸν παρὰ τῶν υἱῶν (352)
genre: EP rhet. sit.: D Vitalianus C

13	Erinus	PM	M		
42-46	Polycrates	PH	N	E	FU
52-53	Narcissus	PM	N	M	FU
54-57	Agave and Pentheus	PM	N	M	FU
58-59	Medea	PM	A	M	FU
60-61	Actaeon	PM	A	M	FU
92-96	Nightingale and Hawk?	PL	A	M	MI
105-110	The prodigal son	BP	N	M	FU
111-115	The lost sheep	BP	N	M	FU
116-120	Pharisee and tax collector	BP	A	M	NO
123	Manasseh	BH	M	M	FU
124	Nineveh	BH	M	M	FU
125	Zacchaeus	BH	A	M	FU
132-136	Achilles?[49]	PM	A	O	NO
140-141	Alcinous	PM	M	O	MI
147	The prodigal son	BP	A	O	NO
148-151	The rich man and Lazarus	BP	M	O	MI
168	Chiron	PM	M	O	ME
207-210	Pan and Echo	PM	M	O	MI
211	Muses	PM	M		
212-214	Orpheus	PM	M	O	MI
226	Gadarene demoniacs	BH	A	O	ME
228	Erinus	PM	M		
232	Enyo	PM	M		
269-272	Sodom	BH	M	O	ME
273-274	The Pearl of Great Price	BP	A	O	ME
289-291	Serpent	BH	M	O	MI
303	Erinus	PM	M		
318-324	David and Absalom	BH	N	M	FU
318-332	Absalom	BH	N	M	NO

2.2.4 Παρὰ Νικοβούλου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα (208)
genre: EP rhet. sit.: D Nicobulus sr. C

122-123	Aeacids	PM	M	O	MI
122-123	Meleagrus	PM	M	O	MI
127-128	Spartoi?[50]	PM	M	O	FU
128	Pelopids	PM	M	O	FU
129	Agamemnon?[51]	PM	A	O	FU
130-131	Cecropids	PM	M	O	FU
141-143	Celts test offspring in Rhine	PH	A	O	ME
201	The ten virgins?[52]	BP	A	O	ME

2,2,5 Νικοβούλου πρὸς τὸν υἱόν (282)
genre: EP rhet. sit.: E Nicobulus jr. C

40-47	Creation of man	BH	N	M	FU
85-86	Aeneas carries Anchises	PM	M	O	MI
125	Tartarus	PM	M		
193-194	Orpheus	PM	M	E	MI
195-196	Amphion	PM	M	E	MI
196-199	Odysseus and Circe	PM	M		
196-199	Hermes (moly)	PM	M	E	MI
200-202	Helen with Polydamna	PM	M	E	MI
203-213	Odysseus and Nausicaa	PM	N	E	FU

234-237	Arion	PM	A	O	MI
252-256	Holy Games	PH	M	O	MI
262	The ten virgins?	BP	A	O	ME

2,2,6 Παραινετικὸν πρὸς Ὀλυμπιάδα (131)
genre: EP rhet. sit.: D Olympias C

99	Chiron	PM	M	O	ME

2,2,7 Πρὸς Νεμέσιον (334)
genre: EP rhet. sit.: J Nemesius P

23-26	Apostles (call)	BH	A	O	MI
33-36	Eros	PM	M	O	MI
49	Phaethon	PM	M		
85	Moses (battle with the Amalekites)	BH	M	O	MI
93	Apollo	PM	A		
93	Zeus against Kronos?	PM	A		
93	Ares?[53]	PM	A		
93	Hephaestus	PM	A		
94	Hermes	PM	A		
94	Dionysus	PM	A		
94	Ares and Aphrodite	PM	A		
94	Zeus and Ganymedes	PM	A	E	FU
96	Zeus and Europa	PM	A	E	FU
96	Zeus and Leda	PM	A	E	FU
96	Zeus and Danae	PM	A	E	FU
96	Zeus and Olympias?	PM	A	E	FU
96	Zeus and Persephone?	PM	A	E	FU
96	Zeus and Alcmene	PM	A	E	FU
96	Zeus and Callisto?[54]	PM	A	E	FU
97	Eros	PM	M		
104	Pan	PM	A	M	MI
104	Erichthonius	PM	A	M	MI
104-105	Dionysus (thiasus)	PM	A	M	MI
136	Hermas	PH	M		
148-150	Odysseus via Scylla and Charybdis	PM	A	O	ME
152	Tantalus?[55]	PM	A	O	NO
168-169	Gadarene demoniacs	BH	A	O	MI
184-187	Serpent	BH	M		
241	Orpheus	PM	M		
241-242	Hesiod	PH	M		
242	Homer	PH	M		
243-244	Musaeus	PM	M		
243-244	Linus	PM	M		
245-246	Hermes Trisaristos	PM	M		
246-247	Sibylla	PM	M		
253-255	Apollo	PM	M		
256	Castalia?	PH	M		
256	Daphne (oracle)?	PH	M		
256	Dodona	PH	A		
258	Ammon	PM	M		
259	Branchidae	PM	M		
259	Epidaurus (Asclepius)	PH	M		
260-261	Eleusis	PH	M		
262	Rhea (Cybele)	PM	A		
263	Corybants	PM	M		
264	Dionysus (thiasus)	PM	M		

265	Hecate	PM M	
265-266	Mithras	PM M	
267	Cybele	PM M	
269	Isis	PM M	
269	Osiris	PM M	
270	Sarapis	PM M	
271	Apis	PM M	
272-273	Artemis' cult in Sparta	PH A	
274-275	Zalmoxis	PM M	
275	Artemis' cult in Tauris	PH A	
276-277	Prosymnus	PM M	
277-278	Aphrodite (worship)	PH A	
278	Heracles Bouthoinas?[56]	PM A	
281-290	Empedocles' suicide	PH N	
286-290	Heracles	PM M	
286-290	Empedotimus' sham deification	PH M	
286-290	Trophonius	PH M	
286-290	Aristaeus	PH M	
331	The Pearl of Great Price	BP A	O ME

epg 1 Εἰς Γιγάντιον οἰκοδόμον (6)
genre: E rhet. sit.: E Gigantius C

1	Babylon (walls)	PH M	
2	Pyramids	PH M	
3	Xerxes bridged the Hellespont	PH A	O MI
3-4	Xerxes (ships over land)	PH A	O MI
6	Giants	PM M	O MI

epg 4 Εἰς Φιλάγριον καὶ πρὸς ὑπομονήν (12)
genre: E rhet. sit.: D Philagrius C

1-3	Epictetus' martyr's death	PH N	O MI
2-4	Anaxarchus' martyr's death	PH N	O MI

epg 14 Εἰς ἀγαπητούς (6)
genre: E rhet. sit.: D

1-2	Marah (bitter water)	BH M	O ME
6	Phthonos?	PM A	O NO

epg 15 Περὶ τῶν συνεισάκτων (16)
genre: E rhet. sit.: D

12	Momos	PM M	

epg 16 Περὶ τῶν συνεισάκτων (16)
genre: E rhet. sit.: D

13-14	Flaming sword, guardian of Eden	BH M	O ME
16	Momos	PM M	

epg 22 Ὅτι οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν πιπτόντων χρὴ τοὺς ἁγνοὺς διαβάλλειν (4)
genre: E rhet. sit.: D

1-2	Lucifer	BH M	E MI
2-3	Judas	BH M	E MI

epg 25 Ὅτι καὶ παίζειν ἔστι σεμνῶς (4)
genre: E rhet. sit.: E

3	Helicon	PH M	O MI
4	Pythia	PH A	O MI

epg 31-94 Κατὰ τυμβωρύχων (347)
epg 34 genre: E rhet. sit.: E

1-3	Midas	PH N	M FU

epg 43 genre: E rhet. sit.: E			
1	Sciron	PM M	O ME
1–2	Enceladus	PM A	O ME
1–4	Typhoeus	PM M	O ME
epg 44 genre: E rhet. sit.: E			
3	Dike	PM M	
epg 45 genre: E rhet. sit.: E			
1	Dike	PM M	
epg 47 genre: E rhet. sit.: E			
6	Sodom	BH M	O ME
epg 50 genre: E rhet. sit.: E			
1	Babylon (walls)	PH A	
1	Colossus of Rhodes	PH A	
2	Babylon (gardens)	PH A	
2	Pyramids	PH M	
2	Artemisium of Ephesus	PH A	
2	Zeus' statue in Olympia	PH A	
2	Mausolus' tomb	PH A	
epg 57 genre: E rhet. sit.: E			
1–2	Mausolus' tomb	PH M	
epg 65 genre: E rhet. sit.: E			
1	Zeus Xenius	PM A	O NO
epg 69 genre: E rhet. sit.: E			
5	Dike	PM M	
epg 71 genre: E rhet. sit.: E			
1	Erinyes	PM M	
epg 74 genre: E rhet. sit.: E			
1	Giants	PM M	O MI
epg 75 genre: E rhet. sit.: E			
1	Titans	PM M	O ME
epg 84 genre: E rhet. sit.: E			
1–3	Cyrus (?) opens tomb[57]	PH N	O MI
epg 86 genre: E rhet. sit.: E			
4	Dike leaves the earth	PM A	O ME
epg 87 genre: E rhet. sit.: E			
3–4	Dike leaves the earth	PM M	O MI
epg 88 genre: E rhet. sit.: E			
1	Orpheus (underworld)?	PM A	O MI
1	Odysseus (underworld)?	PM A	O MI
1	Theseus (underworld)?	PM A	O MI
1	Peirithous (underworld)?[58]	PM A	O MI
1	Icarus	PM A	O MI
1–2	Heracles	PM A	O MI
2	Prometheus and Deucalion	PM A	O MI
epg 90 genre: E rhet. sit.: E			
1	Rhodes (rain of gold)	PM M	O MI
epg 93 genre: E rhet. sit.: E			
31	Tartarus	PM M	
epg 94 genre: E rhet. sit.: E			
1	Tartarus	PM M	
2	Dike	PM M	
3	Tartarus	PM M	
3	Dike	PM M	

ept 5 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Prohaeresius?			
1	Cecrops	PM M	O MI
5	Brontes	PM M	O ME
7	Phthonos	PM M	
ept 6 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Caesarius C			
6	Phthonos	PM M	
ept 11 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Caesarius C			
3	Phthonos	PM M	
ept 18 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Caesarius C			
1	Heliads, Phaethon's sisters	PM A	M MI
1	Niobe	PM A	M MI
2	Byblis?[55]	PM A	M MI
6	Hades	PM M	
ept 21 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Caesarius C			
3	Phthonos	PM M	
ept 26 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Livia C			
3	Moira	PM M	
ept 27 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Livia C			
4	Alcmene[56]	PM A	O NO
ept 28 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Euphemius C			
5	Phthonos	PM M	
ept 29 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Euphemius C			
3	Erotes	PM M	
ept 30 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Euphemius C			
2	Muses	PM M	
4	Phthonos	PM M	
ept 31 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Euphemius C			
1	Golden generation	PM M	O MI
3	Charites	PM M	
ept 33 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Euphemius C			
3	Charites	PM M	
3	Muses	PM M	
3	Hymenaeus	PM M	
4	Phthonos	PM M	
ept 34 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Euphemius C			
1	Muses	PM M	
2	Charites	PM M	
4	Eros	PM M	
ept 35 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Euphemius C			
1–5	Charites	PM M	
1–5	Muses	PM M	
3	Phthonos	PM M	
ept 36 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Euphemius C			
4	Charites	PM M	
8	Elysian Fields	PM M	
ept 40 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Martinianus?			
1	Tantalus (thirst)	PM M	M MI
2	Tantalus (boulder)	PM M	M MI
3	Tityus (liver)?	PM A	M MI
3	Prometheus (liver)?[57]	PM A	M MI
4	Pyriphlegethon	PM A	
4	Erebus	PM A	
5	Tartarus	PM M	

6	Hades	PM M	
ept 42 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Martinianus?			
4	Themis	PM M	
ept 46 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Martinianus?			
1	Themis	PM M	
4	Sisyphus	PM M	O MI
ept 53 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Martinianus?			
2	Dike	PM M	
ept 57 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Gregory sr. C			
1-2	Moses (on Sinai)	BH M	E MI
ept 60 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Gregory sr. C			
3-4	Labourers in the vineyard	BP A	O ME
ept 62 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Gregory sr. C			
2	Elisha (mantle of Elijah)?	BH A	O NO
ept 63 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Gregory sr. C			
2	Bethlehem	BH M	O MI
ept 65 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Gregory sr. C			
1	Transfiguration	BH M	O MI
ept 68 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Nonna C			
1	Sarah calls Abraham « lord »	BH M	O FU
4-5	Samuel (Hannah's prayer is granted)	BH M	O FU
6	Hannah (prophetess)	BH A	O FU
ept 69 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Nonna C			
1-2	Empedocles' suicide	PH N	O MI
6	Susannah	BH M	O MI
6	Samuel (Hannah's prayer is granted)	BH M	O MI
6	Hannah (prophetess)	BH M	O MI
6	Mary?	BH M	O MI
6	Miriam?[62]	BH M	O MI
ept 70 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Nonna C			
1-3	Heracles	PM M	O FU
1-3	Empedotimus' sham deification	PH M	O FU
1-3	Trophonius	PH M	O FU
2-3	Aristaeus	PH M	O FU
ept 90 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Nonna C			
1	Sarah	BH M	O ME
2	Abraham's bosom	BP M	O ME
ept 92 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Nonna C			
1	Enoch	BH M	O MI
1	Elijah (chariot of fire)	BH M	O MI
ept 94 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Nonna C			
1-2	Abraham offering Isaac	BH M	O MI
1-2	Jephthah sacrificing his daughter	BH M	O MI
ept 100 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Nonna C			
1	Elijah (chariot of fire)	BH M	O MI
ept 105 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Amphilochius sr. C			
3	Charites	PM M	
3	Muses	PM M	
ept 111 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Bassus C			
1	Abraham's bosom	BP M	O MI
ept 119 genre: E rhet. sit.: E Basil C			
16	Sea obeys	BH A	O ME

ORATIONS

1 Εἰς τὸ Πάσχα καὶ εἰς τὴν βραδύτητα

genre: P1 rhet. sit.: E

1	Moses (burning bush)	BH
1	Jeremiah (call)	BH
1	Aaron (mission)	BH
1	Isaiah (call)	BH
3	Egypt (tenth plague	BH
3	Moses (exodus)	BH
4	Cross and resurrection	BH
7	Abraham	BH
7	Abraham offering Isaac	BH

2 Ἀπολογητικός

genre: A1 rhet. sit.: J

8	Saul prophesies among the Prophets	BH
41	Pharaoh's magicians	BH
49	Jordan (twelve stones)	BH
49	Samuel (Hannah's prayer is granted)	BH
51	Peter and Paul	BH
52	Moses	BH
52	Aaron	BH
52	Joshua	BH
52	Elijah	BH
52	Elisha	BH
52	Judges	BH
52	Samuel	BH
52	David	BH
52	Prophets	BH
52	John the Baptist	BH
52	Apostles	BH
52-56	Paul	BH
56	Princes of Zoan	BH
69	Apostles (mission)	BH
70	Pharisees	BH
73	The sower	BP
73	House built on rock / sand	BP
77	The marriage feast	BP
77	Samuel (Hannah's prayer is granted)	BH
79	Ammonites and Moabites	BH
84	Paul	BH
88	Moses (battle with the Amalekites)	BH
88	Joshua	BH
88	David (plays the lyre)	BH
88	David (kills Goliath)	BH
88	Samuel (anointed kings)	BH
88	Jeremiah	BH
89	Noah, Job and Daniel	BH
89	Judah vs. Israel	BH
89	Jeroboam vs. Rehoboam	BH
89	Samaria vs. Jerusalem	BH
92	Moses (on Sinai)	BH
92	Sinai (inaccessible)	BH

93	Nadab and Abihu	BH
93	Eli's sons	BH
93	Uzzah	BH
103	Abraham	BH
103	Sarah	BH
103	Jacob blessed by Isaac	BH
106–109	Jonah	BH
111	Saul hides himself	BH
114	Aaron (mission)	BH
114	Moses (burning bush)	BH
114	Isaiah (call)	BH
114	Jeremiah (call)	BH

3 Πρὸς τοὺς καλέσαντας ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ...

genre: P1 rhet. sit.: E

4	The marriage feast	BP
6	Bethlehem	BH

4 Κατὰ Ἰουλιανοῦ στηλιτευτικὸς λόγος

genre: A2 rhet. sit.: J

1	Sihon	BH
1	Og	BH
11	The sower	BP
12	Exodus (crossing the Red Sea)	BH
13	Sea obeys	BH
13	Serpent (head and heel)	BH
18	Enoch	BH
18	Elijah (chariot of fire)	BH
18	Noah	BH
18	Abraham (late fatherhood)	BH
18	Abraham offering Isaac	BH
18	Sodom	BH
18	Sodom (do not look back)	BH
18	Joseph	BH
18	Moses (saw God)	BH
18	Moses (tables of stone)	BH
18	Moses (exodus)	BH
18	Egypt (plagues)	BH
18	Exodus (crossing the Red Sea)	BH
19	Exodus (pillar of fire and of cloud)	BH
19	Exodus (manna and flesh)	BH
19	Moses (water from the rock)	BH
19	Marah (bitter water)	BH
19	Moses (battle with the Amalekites)	BH
19	Joshua makes the sun stand still	BH
19	Exodus (passage of the Jordan)	BH
19	Jericho captured and destroyed	BH
19	Gideon (fleece of wool)	BH
19	Samson	BH
19	Gideon (300 men lapping water)	BH
25	Cain and Abel	BH
28	Amorites	BH
41	Alexander and Porus	PH
43	Plato	PH
43	Chrysippus	PH
43	Peripatus	PH

43	Stoa	PH
54	Balaam	BH
54	Saul consults the spirit of Samuel	BH
59	Empedocles' suicide	PH
59	Aristaeus	PH
59	Empedotimus	PH
59	Trophonius	PH
62	Proteus	PM
65	7000 have not bowed to Baal	BH
65	The three young men	BH
65	Bronze serpent	BH
68	Herod (Massacre of the children)	BH
68	Judas	BH
68	Pilate	BH
69	John	BH
69	Peter	BH
69	Paul	BH
69	James	BH
69	Stephen	BH
69	Luke	BH
69	Andrew	BH
69	Thecla	BH
70	Heracles at the stake	PM
70	Pelops	PM
70	Iphigenia	PM
70	Menoeceus	PM
70	Scedasus' daughters	PM
70	Artemis' cult in Tauris	PH
70	Socrates (poisoned cup)	PH
70	Epictetus' martyr's death	PH
70	Anaxarchus' martyr's death	PH
70	Cleombrotus' suicide	PH
70	Pythagoreans	PH
70	Theano	PH
70	Artemis' cult in Sparta	PH
71	Epaminondas	PH
71	Scipio	PH
71	Selloi	PM
72	Solon	PH
72	Croesus	PH
72	Socrates (pederasty)	PH
72	Plato (with Dionysius)	PH
72	Xenocrates' gluttony	PH
72	Diogenes lived in a barrel	PH
72	Epicurus	PH
72	Crates «liberated himself»	PH
72	Zeno?	PH
72	Antisthenes	PH
72	Socrates (Potidaea)	PH
72	Homer	PH
72	Aristotle	PH
72	Cleanthes drawing water from a well	PH
72	Anaxagoras	PH
72	Heraclitus the weeping philosopher	PH

72	Diogenes (sesame bread)	PH
72	Plato (redeemed)	PH
77	Heracles Melampyges	PM
77	Peirithous	PM
77	Pan	PM
77	Heracles Bouthoinas	PM
77	Heracles Triesperus	PM
77	Heracles and Thestius' daughters	PM
78	Jesus called a Samaritan	BH
79	Minos	PM
82	Melampus	PM
82	Proteus	PM
85	Enceladus	PM
91	Echetus	PM
91	Phalaris	PH
92	Herodotus	PH
92	Thucydides	PH
94	Hydra	PM
94	Chimaera	PM
94	Cerberus	PM
94	Scylla	PM
94	Charybdis	PM
94	Hades' helmet	PM
94	Gyges	PH
96	Persecutors of Christians	CH
101	Hermes	PM
101	Telchines	PM
102	Pythagoreans	PH
103	Heracles Bouthoinas	PM
103	Rhea (Cybele)	PM
103	Aphrodite	PM
103	Artemis' cult in Tauris	PH
103	Artemis' cult in Sparta	PH
107	Trojan war	PM
107	Tables of stone	BH
107	Palamedes	PM
107	Crow loses feathers	PL
108	Old woman creates verse form	PL
108	Cyclopes	PM
108	Heracles' dog discovers purple	PM
108	Demeter	PM
108	Celeus & Triptolemus	PM
108	Icarius	PM
110	Rabshakeh sent by Sennacherib	BH
115	Hesiod	PH
115	Titans	PM
115	Giants	PM
115	Cottus	PM
115	Briareos	PM
115	Gyges (« giant »)	PM
115	Enceladus	PM
115	Zeus	PM
115	Hydra	PM
115	Chimaera	PM

115	Cerberus	PM
115	Gorgons	PM
115	Orpheus	PM
115	Baubo?	PM
115	Phanes	PM
115	Ericapaeus	PM
115	Kronos	PM
115	Oceanus and Tethys	PM
115	Zeus and Hera	PM
116	Helen	PM
116	Ares and Aphrodite	PM
117	Zeus	PM
121	Kronos (castrates Ouranos)	PM
121	Zeus (against Kronos)	PM
121	Hermes	PM
121	Apollo (oracle in Delphi)	PH
122	Zeus (metamorphoses)	PM
122	Zeus and Ganymedes	PM
122	Heracles and Thestius' daughters	PM
122	Ares	PM
122	Dionysus	PM
122	Artemis	PM
122	Apollo Loxias	PM
122	Hephaestus	PM
122	Zeus at Ethiopians	PM
122	Heracles Bouthoinas	PM

5 Κατὰ Ἰουλιανοῦ στηλιτευτικὸς λόγος

genre: A2 rhet. sit.: J

3	Jeroboam vs. Rehoboam	BH
3	Ahab	BH
3	Pharaoh	BH
3	Nebuchadnezzar	BH
4	Sodom	BH
4	Nadab and Abihu	BH
5	Ariadne (wreath)	PM
5	Berenice (lock of hair)	PM
5	Leda	PM
5	Theseus (bull)	PM
5	Asclepius Ophiouchos	PM
5	Heracles (lion)	PM
5	Star of Bethlehem	BH
8	Salmoneus	PM
8	Trajanus	PH
8	Hadrianus	PH
8	Carus	PH
8	Valerianus	PH
11	Cyrus and Zopyrus	PH
13	Cyrus and Artaxerxes	PH
15	Histiaeus and Aristagoras	PH
19	Hundred-handed giants	PM
20	Elysian Fields	PM
20	Rhadamanthys	PM
22	Athena (flute)	PM
26	Hezekiah prays for Jerusalem	BH

27	Egypt (plagues)	BH
28	Jeremiah	BH
29	Bel and Dagon	BH
29	Lebanon	BH
29	Sharon	BH
29	Ekron	BH
30	David (kills Goliath)	BH
30	David (plays the lyre)	BH
30	The ten virgins	BP
31	Creation	BH
31	Celeus & Triptolemus	PM
31	Zeus and Persephone	PM
31	Orpheus	PM
32	Dodona	PH
32	Pythia	PH
32	Castalia	PH
32	Apollo	PM
32	Daphne	PM
32	Dionysus	PM
32	Prosymnus	PM
32	Semele	PM
32	Hephaestus	PM
32	Thersites	PM
32	Ares and Aphrodite	PM
32	Aphrodite	PM
32	Athena	PM
32	Heracles (delirious)	PM
32	Zeus (metamorphoses)	PM
32	Hermes	PM
32	Isis	PM
32	Apis	PM
32	Pan	PM
32	Priapus	PM
32	Hermaphroditus	PM
34	Exiles	BH
34	Egypt	BH
34	Eli's sons	BH
35	Herod Antipas	BH
35	David (making merry before the ark)	BH
38	Pyriphlegethon	PM
38	Cocytus	PM
38	Acheron	PM
38	Tantalus	PM
38	Tityus	PM
38	Ixion	PM
38	Prometheus?	PM
39	Philoetius	PM
39	Polyphemus	PM
39	Odysseus and Ctesippus	PM
40	The three young men	BH
40	Daniel in the lion's den	BH
40	Maccabees	BH
42	Heracles' pillars	PM

6 Εἰρηνικὸς πρῶτος

genre: A4 rhet. sit.: D

1	Hades	PM
1	Jesus' tunic (casting lots for)	BH
3	The Pearl of Great Price	BP
7	Zechariah	BH
7	Judah vs. Israel	BH
7	Samaria vs. Jerusalem	BH
7	Paul, Peter, Apollos	BH
9	The talents	BP
10	Noah's ark	BH
15	Lucifer	BH
16–18	Diaspora	CH
17	Egypt	BH
17	Exodus (pillar of fire and of cloud)	BH
17	Exodus (crossing the Red Sea)	BH
17	Exodus (manna and flesh)	BH
17	Moses (water from the rock)	BH
17	Moses (battle with the Amalekites)	BH
17	Exodus (passage of the Jordan)	BH
17	Jericho captured and destroyed	BH
17	Egypt (plagues)	BH
17	Moses (tables of stone)	BH
18	Babel (exile)	BH

7 Εἰς Καισάριον ἐπιτάφιος

genre: A3 rhet. sit.: E

3	Aaron	BH
3	Moses	BH
10	Crates (simplicity)	PH
11	Serpent	BH
16	Patroclus?	PM
17	Abraham's bosom	BP
20	Hippocrates	PH
20	Galenus	PH
20	Euclides	PH
20	Ptolemeus	PH
20	Heron	PH
20	Plato	PH
20	Aristotle	PH
20	Pyrrhon	PH
20	Democritus	PH
20	Heraclitus	PH
20	Anaxagoras	PH
20	Cleanthes	PH
20	Epicurus	PH
20	Stoa	PH
20	Academy	PH

8 Εἰς Γοργονίαν ἐπιτάφιος

genre: A3 rhet. sit.: E

4	Abraham	BH
4	Sarah	BH
4	Abraham offering Isaac	BH
12	Job	BH
14	Eve	BH

14	Serpent	BH
16	Cross and resurrection	BH
18	Woman suffering from hemorrhage	BH
18	Anointing by a sinful woman	BH

9 Ἀπολογητικὸς εἰς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ πατέρα

genre: A1 rhet. sit.: J

1	Isaiah (call)	BH
1	Manoah	BH
1	Peter (call)	BH
2	Centurion	BH
2	Saul prophesies among the Prophets	BH
2	David (plays the lyre)	BH
3	The tares	BP

10 Εἰς τὸν πατέρα καὶ Βασίλειον

genre: A1 rhet. sit.: J

1	Elijah and the contest on Mount Carmel	BH
1	John the Baptist	BH
2	Eden (tree of life)	BH
3	The talents	BP
3	Paul	BH
3	Barnabas	BH
3	Silvanus	BH
3	Timothy	BH
3	Titus	BH

11 Εἰς Γρηγόριον Νύσσης

genre: A1 rhet. sit.: J

2	Moses	BH
2	Aaron	BH
2	Moses (as God to Pharaoh)	BH
2	Moses (cloud on Sinai)	BH
2	Moses (plagues of Egypt)	BH
2	Exodus (crossing the Red Sea)	BH
2	Moses (exodus)	BH
2	Exodus (manna and flesh)	BH
2	Moses (water from the rock)	BH
2	Marah (bitter water)	BH
2	Moses (battle with the Amalekites)	BH
3	Job	BH
5	7000 have not bowed to Baal	BH
5	The three young men	BH

12 Εἰς τὸν πατέρα

genre: A1 rhet. sit.: J

2	Aaron	BH
2	Aaron's sons (ordained)	BH
2	Nadab and Abihu	BH
2	Moses (Joshua as successor)	BH
2	Moses (battle with the Amalekites)	BH
3	Jacob blessed by Isaac	BH
4	Incarnation	BH
4	Cross and resurrection	BH

13 Εἰς τὴν χειροτονίαν Δοαρῶν...

genre: A4 rhet. sit.: E

1	Paul, Peter, Apollos	BH
1	Widow's offering	BH

1	Manasseh	BH
2	Exodus (crossing the Red Sea)	BH
2	Exodus (manna and flesh)	BH
2	Moses (water from the rock)	BH
2	Moses (battle with the Amalekites)	BH
2	Jericho captured and destroyed	BH
2	David (kills Goliath)	BH
2	Giants (Nephilim)	BH
3	Dathan and Abiram	BH

14 Περὶ φιλοπτωχίας

genre: P4 rhet. sit. S

2	Abram (journey to Canaan)	BH
2	Enoch	BH
2	Paul	BH
2	Lot (hospitable)	BH
2	Rahab	BH
2	Incarnation	BH
2	Gadarene demoniacs	BH
2	Malchus' ear	BH
2	Stephen	BH
2	Moses (meek)	BH
2	David (meek)	BH
3	Phinehas	BH
3	Elijah (ardour)	BH
3	Paul (ardour)	BH
3	David (ardour)	BH
3	Paul's ascesis	BH
3	Jesus' forty days of fasting	BH
3	Jesus' temptation	BH
3	Jesus at Gethsemane	BH
3	Mary (virgin mother)	BH
3	David pours out water when thirsty	BH
4	Elijah: the contest on Mount Carmel	BH
4	John the Baptist	BH
4	Jesus prays by himself	BH
4	Elijah and the widow of Zarephath	BH
4	John the Baptist	BH
4	Peter (eating lupins)	BH
4	Incarnation	BH
4	Jesus' passion	BH
4	Jesus called a Samaritan	BH
4	Jesus washes the disciples' feet	BH
4	Zacchaeus	BH
4	Rich young man	BH
11	Job	BH
15	Incarnation	BH
18	The rich fool	BP
23	Giants (Nephilim)	BH
23	Nimrod	BH
23	Enakites	BH
23	Great flood	BH
26	Serpent	BH
27	Tables of stone	BH
27	Prophets	BH

27	Incarnation	BH
29	Hermes	PM
29	Artemis' cult in Tauris	PH
34	Job	BH
34	The rich man and Lazarus	BP
37	The Good Samaritan	BP
37	Woman suffering from hemorrhage	BH
37	Healing the lame man at Bethesda	BH
39	Peter and Paul	BH
39	Rich young man	BH
40	Anointing by Mary at Bethany	BH
40	Joseph of Arimathea	BH
40	Nicodemus	BH
40	Three wise men	BH

15 Εἰς τοὺς Μακκαβαίους
genre: P3 rhet. sit.: E

	Maccabees	BH
	Eleazar	BH
1	Jesus' passion	BH
3	Stephen	BH
4	Abraham offering Isaac	BH
4	Hecabe	PM
6	Exodus (pillar of fire and of cloud)	BH
6	Exodus (crossing the Red Sea)	BH
6	Exodus (passage of the Jordan)	BH
6	Joshua makes the sun stand still	BH
6	Exodus (manna and flesh)	BH
6	Moses (battle with the Amalekites)	BH
6	The three young men	BH
9	Phinehas	BH
9	Samuel (Hannah's prayer is granted)	BH
9	Holy Games	PH
11	Jephthah sacrificing his daughter	BH
11	Daniel in the lion's den	BH
11	The three young men	BH
11	Martyrs	CH

16 Εἰς τὸν πατέρα σιωπῶντα...
genre: A4 rhet. sit.: D

1	Aaron	BH
1	Aaron's sons (ordained)	BH
2	Apostles (fishermen)	BH
4	Moses (heard by God)	BH
4	Pharaoh	BH
5	Amorites	BH
7	Assyria	BH
7	Hades	PM
9	The ten virgins	BP
9	The rich man and Lazarus	BP
10–11	Egypt (plagues)	BH
11	Moses (plagues of Egypt)	BH
11	Egypt (tenth plague)	BH
14	Nineveh	BH
14	Sodom	BH
14	Sodom (do not look back)	BH

15	Eden (tree of life)	BH
16	Cain and Abel	BH
16	Nineveh	BH
16	Sodom	BH
18	The rich fool	BP
19	Joseph (in Egypt)	BH
19	Solomon (unfaithfulness)	BH
19	Chamos	BH
19	Astarte	PM
20	Moses	BH
20	Phinehas	BH

17 Εἰς τοὺς πολιτευομένους Ναζιανζοῦ

genre: A4 rhet. sit. S

5	Peter (on the lake)	BH
7	The Pearl of Great Price	BP
10	Abraham offering Isaac	BH
11	The creditors	BP

18 Ἐπιτάφιος εἰς τὸν πατέρα

genre: A3 rhet. sit.: E

1	Moses (as God to Pharaoh)	BH
6	Briareos	PM
8	Eve	BH
13	Sinai (inaccessible)	BH
14	Moses (burning bush)	BH
14	Exodus (crossing the Red Sea)	BH
14	Exodus (manna and flesh)	BH
14	Moses (water from the rock)	BH
14	Exodus (pillar of fire and of cloud)	BH
14	Moses (battle with the Amalekites)	BH
14	Isaiah (call)	BH
14	Jeremiah (call)	BH
14	Paul's conversion	BH
17	Noah's ark	BH
17	Bethlehem	BH
24	Job	BH
24	Moses (meek)	BH
24	David	BH
24	Samuel (seer)	BH
24	Phinehas	BH
24	Peter and Paul	BH
24	Zebedee's sons	BH
24	Stephen	BH
28	Miriam (timbrel)	BH
29	Hezekiah' illness and recovery	BH
29	Moses (battle with the Amalekites)	BH
30	Exodus (manna and flesh)	BH
30	Moses (water from the rock)	BH
30	Elijah fed by ravens	BH
30	Daniel (and Habakkuk)	BH
31	Erinus	PM
35	Nazarites	BH
36	Ark of the covenant	BH
41	Sarah	BH
41	Abraham	BH

43	Isaac	BH

19 Εἰς τὸν ἐξισωτὴν Ἰουλιανόν

genre: A4 rhet. sit.: D

1	The Pearl of Great Price	BP
8	Paul, Peter, Apollos	BH
8	Widow's offering	BH
8	Pharisee and tax collector	BP
8	Manasseh	BH
8	Ark of the covenant	BH
11	John the Baptist	BH
11	Paying taxes to Caesar	BH
11	The rich man and Lazarus	BP
12	The census of Augustus	BH
12	Jesus' birth in a manger	BH
12	Three wise men	BH
12	Herod (Massacre of the children)	BH
13	Money for the temple tax	BH
14	The tares	BP
14	Eden (tree of life)	BH
14	Serpent	BH
14	Adam (curse)	BH

20 Περὶ θεολογίας καὶ καταστάσεως…

genre: P2 rhet. sit. D

2	Moses (on Sinai)	BH
2	Sinai (inaccessible)	BH
3	Eli's sons	BH
3	Uzzah	BH
4	Manoah	BH
4	Peter (call)	BH
4	Centurion	BH
4	Zacchaeus	BH
5	Solomon (wisdom)	BH
5	Paul	BH
9	Levi in the loins of Abraham	BH
12	Paul	BH

21 Εἰς Ἀθανάσιον ἐπίσκοπον Ἀλεξανδρείας

genre: P3 rhet. sit.: E

3	Enoch	BH
3	Noah	BH
3	Abraham	BH
3	Isaac	BH
3	Jacob	BH
3	Patriarchs	BH
3	Moses	BH
3	Aaron	BH
3	Joshua	BH
3	Judges	BH
3	Samuel	BH
3	David	BH
3	Solomon	BH
3	Elijah	BH
3	Elisha	BH
3	Prophets	BH
3	John the Baptist	BH

3	Apostles	BH
7	Ishmael and Hagar (desert)	BH
7	Elijah by the Cherith	BH
7	Sodom and Gomorrah	BH
8	Marcus	BH
12	Sextus Empiricus	PH
12	Pyrrhon	PH
12	Athenians	BH
12	Jeremiah	BH
13	Judas	BH
14	Judas	BH
15	Absalom	BH
16	Egypt (plagues)	BH
17-18	Job	BH
20	David	BH
20	Moses (tables of stone)	BH
22	Babel (tower of)	BH
22	Caiaphas	BH
26	Samson	BH
27	Apostles	BH
29	Entry into Jerusalem	BH
31	Cleansing of the temple	BH
36	Zeus Xenius	PM
36	Zeus	PM
36	Apollo	PM
36	Artemis	PM
36	Eirene?	PM
36	Diallage?	PM
36	Hermes	PM
36	Hera	PM

22 Εἰρηνικὸς τρίτος

genre: A4 rhet. sit.: D

1	Jacob mourns for Joseph	BH
1	David's elegy over Saul and Jonathan	BH
1	David and Absalom	BH
2	Ark among the Philistines	BH
2	Exiles	BH
5	Joseph	BH
5	Judas	BH
5	Caiaphas	BH
5	Elijah	BH
5	John the Baptist	BH
5	Jesus or Beelzebul	BH
12	Galloi (Cult Cybele)	PH

23 Εἰρηνικὸς δεύτερος

genre: A4 rhet. sit. E

4	Babel (tower of)	BH
12	Aristotle	PH
13	Rehoboth (Euruchoria)	BH

24 Εἰς Κυπριανόν

genre: P3 rhet. sit. E

3-4	Adam (seduced)	BH
4	Serpent	BH
8	Paul's conversion	BH

8	Matthew the tax collector	BH
9	Job (in Satan's hands)	BH
9	Jesus' temptation	BH
10	Susannah	BH
10	Thecla	BH
10	Jesus walks on water	BH
10	Gadarene demoniacs	BH
10	Daniel in the lion's den	BH
10	Jonah	BH
10	The three young men	BH
11–12	David (plays the lyre)	BH
13	Egypt (plagues)	BH
13	Joseph (to Egypt)	BH
13	Joseph (put in prison by Potiphar)	BH
13	Joseph (Pharaoh's dreams)	BH
13	Exodus (crossing the Red Sea)	BH
13	Exodus (manna and flesh)	BH
13	Joshua makes the sun stand still	BH
17	Mary	BH
17	Women at empty tomb	BH
19	Holy Games	PH

25 Εἰς Ἥρωνα τὸν φιλόσοφον

genre: A3 rhet. sit.: E

2	Nazarites	BH
2	Holy Games	PH
6	Peripatus	PH
6	Academy	PH
6	Stoa	PH
6	Epicurus	PH
6	Cynics	PH
6	Noah's ark	BH
6	Moses (burning bush)	BH
6	Heraclitus the weeping philosopher	PH
7	David	BH
7	Antisthenes	PH
7	Diogenes (sesame bread)	PH
7	Crates (polygamy)	PH
8	Judas	BH
11	Egypt (plagues)	BH
12	Tobias the Ammonite	BH
12	Assyria	BH
14	Lazarus (raising of)	BH
14	Ezechiel (vision of the valley)	BH

26 Εἰς ἑαυτόν

genre: A1 rhet. sit.: J

2	Jacob (Mesopotamia)	BH
4	Paul	BH
4	Jacob endures heat and cold	BH
5	The talents	BP
5	Isaac and Abimelech	BH
6	The rich man and Lazarus	BP
7	Elijah: the contest on Mount Carmel	BH
7	John the Baptist	BH
7	Jesus prays by himself	BH

12	Elijah and the widow of Zarephath	BH
12	Elijah by the Cherith	BH
12	Paul in hunger and in cold	BH
12	Jesus called a Samaritan	BH
13	Paul (has the spirit of God)	BH
16	Judas	BH
17	Elisha and the Shunammite	BH
17	Peter's denial	BH

27 Εἰς Εὐνομιανοὺς προδιάλεξις

genre: P2 rhet. sit.: J

3	Egypt	BH
3	Assyria	BH
3	The three young men	BH
6	Gadarene demoniacs	BH
9	Elijah (chariot of fire)	BH
9	Moses (saw God)	BH
9	Paul (in the third heaven)	BH
9	Spartoi	PM
9	Giants	PM
9	Exodus (sending of hornets)	BH
10	Pythagoreans	PH
10	Orphici	PH
10	Plato	PH
10	Epicurus	PH
10	Aristotle	PH
10	Stoa	PH
10	Cynics	PH
10	Democritus	PH

28 Περὶ θεολογίας

genre: P2 rhet. sit.: J

1	The sower	BP
2	Moses (cloud on Sinai)	BH
2	Aaron, Nadab and Abihu	BH
2	Sinai (inaccessible)	BH
2	Tables of stone	BH
2-3	Moses (on Sinai)	BH
3	Moses (as God to Pharaoh)	BH
3	Paul (in the third heaven)	BH
4	Hermes Trismegistos	PM
8	Stoa	PH
8	Epicurus	PH
11	Daniel interprets dreams	BH
12	Lucifer	BH
12	Exodus (pillar of cloud before Egypt)	BH
15	Ares	PM
15	Ares and Aphrodite	PM
15	Zeus (metamorphoses)	PM
15	Dionysus	PM
15	Zeus, Hades, Poseidon	PM
15	Rhea (Cybele)?	PM
15	Artemis' cult in Tauris ?	PH
16	Plato	PH
18	Enosh	BH
18	Enoch	BH

18	Noah	BH
18	Abraham	BH
18	Abraham offering Isaac	BH
18	Abraham (hospitality)	BH
18	Jacob (ladder)	BH
18	Jacob (stone in Bethel)	BH
18	Jacob wrestles with an angel	BH
19	Elijah at Mount Horeb	BH
19	Elijah (chariot of fire)	BH
19	Manoah	BH
19	Peter's confession	BH
19	Isaiah (call)	BH
19	Ezechiel (call)	BH
20	Paul (in the third heaven)	BH
21	Solomon (wisdom)	BH
21	Paul	BH
25	Euclides	PH
25	Palamedes	PM
25	Phidias	PH
25	Zeuxis	PH
25	Polygnotus	PH
25	Parrhasius	PH
25	Aglaophon	PH
25	Daedalus	PM
25	Ariadne	PM
28	Exodus (manna and flesh)	BH
28	Noah	BH
28	Elijah: the contest on Mount Carmel	BH
29	Giants (Nephilim)	BH
30	Plato	PH
31	Ark of the covenant	BH

29 Περὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λόγος πρῶτος

genre: P2 rhet. sit.: J

9	Levi in the loins of Abraham	BH
11	Adam (creation)	BH
19	John (in womb)	BH
19	Jesus' birth in a manger	BH
19	Three wise men	BH
19	Escape to Egypt	BH
19	Exodus (crossing the Red Sea)	BH
19	Transfiguration	BH
20	Jesus' baptism	BH
20	Jesus' temptation	BH
20	Multiplication of the loaves	BH
20	Jesus' thirst on the cross	BH
20	Samaritan woman	BH
20	Sea obeys	BH
20	Money for the temple tax	BH
20	Jesus called a Samaritan	BH
20	The Good Samaritan	BP
20	Gadarene demoniacs	BH
20	Lucifer	BH
20	Jesus threatened with stones	BH
20	Lazarus (raising of)	BH

20	Judas	BH
20	John the Baptist	BH
20	Gall to drink	BH
20	Cana	BH
20	Marah (bitter water)	BH

30 Περὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λόγος δεύτερος

genre: P2 rhet. sit.: J

18	Moses (burning bush)	BH
20	Seth	BH

31 Περὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος

genre: P2 rhet. sit.: J

1	Jesus threatened with stones	BH
1	Sinai (inaccessible)	BH
10	Phoenix?	PM
11	Adam (creation)	BH
11	Eve (made from rib)	BH
11	Seth	BH
16	Oceanus and Tethys	PM
16	Phanes	PM
16	Kronos	PM
16	Zeus, Hades, Poseidon	PM
26	Gift of the Spirit	BH
30	Ananias and Sapphira	BH

32 Περὶ τῆς ἐν διαλέξεσιν εὐταξίας...

genre: P2 rhet. sit.: J

1	The talents	BP
4	Judah vs. Israel	BH
5	Paul, Peter, Apollos	BH
6	The tares	BP
13	Corinthians (fed with milk)	BH
15	Moses (shining face)	BH
15	Paul (in the third heaven)	BH
16	Moses (saw God)	BH
16	Moses (as God to Pharaoh)	BH
16	Moses (exodus)	BH
16	Exodus (manna and flesh)	BH
16	Moses (water from the rock)	BH
16	Exodus (crossing the Red Sea)	BH
16	Exodus (pillar of fire and of cloud)	BH
16	Moses (battle with the Amalekites)	BH
16	Moses (cloud on Sinai)	BH
16	Aaron, Nadab and Abihu	BH
16	Aaron's sons (ordained)	BH
16	Sinai (inaccessible)	BH
17	Moses (ordination of the priests)	BH
17	Aaron	BH
17	Levites	BH
17	Ark of the covenant	BH
17	Babel (tower of)	BH
17	Dathan and Abiram	BH
18	Peter (rock and keys)	BH
18	John close to Jesus' breast	BH
18	Transfiguration	BH
18	Apostles	BH

23	Exodus (manna and flesh)	BH
24	Paul (in the third heaven)	BH
24	Icarus?	PM
25	Pyrrhon	PH
25	Chrysippus	PH
25	Aristotle	PH
25	Plato	PH
25	Egypt (plagues)	BH
30	The barren fig tree (par.)	BP
30	Fig tree cursed	BH

33 Πρὸς Ἀρειανοὺς καὶ εἰς ἑαυτόν

genre: A1 rhet. sit.: J

2	Ahab	BH
2	Josiah	BH
3	Nebuzaradan	BH
3	Belshazzar	BH
3	Sodom	BH
5	Abraham	BH
8	Elisha and the young ribalds	BH
10	Ramathaim (Samuel's birthplace)	BH
10	Samuel (Hannah's prayer is granted)	BH
10	Samuel (anointed kings)	BH
10	Saul (looks for asses)	BH
10	David (shepherd)	BH
10	Amos (shepherd)	BH
10	Joseph (slave)	BH
10	Abram (nomad)	BH
10	Moses in the basket	BH
10	Moses (exodus)	BH
10	Elijah (chariot of fire)	BH
10	Elisha (mantle of Elijah)	BH
10	John the Baptist	BH
10	Bethlehem	BH
10	Apostles (fishermen)	BH
11	Apostles (mission)	BH
11	Apostles' division of the areas	BH
13	Stephen	BH
14	Jesus' passion	BH
14	Sodom	BH

34 Εἰς τοὺς ἀπ᾿ Αἰγύπτου ἐπιδημήσαντας

genre: A4 rhet. sit.: E

1	Escape to Egypt	BH
1	Exodus (manna and flesh)	BH
1	Multiplication of the loaves	BH
3	Joseph (Pharaoh's dream)	BH
3	Peter	BH
5	Apis	PM
5	Isis	PM
5	Osiris	PM
5	Sarapis	PM
13	John the Baptist	BH
14	Ananias and Sapphira	BH
14	Ahan	BH
14	Cornelius	BH

15	Paul (in the third heaven)	BH

36 Εἰς ἑαυτὸν καὶ πρὸς τοὺς λέγοντας...

genre: A1 rhet. sit.: J

2	Moses (water from the rock)	BH
2	Isaac (wells of water)	BH
4	Marah (bitter water)	BH
4	Apostles	BH
5	Lucifer	BH
5	Adam (seduced)	BH
5	Cain and Abel	BH
5	Great flood	BH
5	Sodom	BH
5	Miriam (leprous)	BH
5	Dathan and Abiram	BH
5	Prophets	BH
5	Solomon (unfaithfulness)	BH
5	Judas	BH
5	Herod (Massacre of the children)	BH
5	Pilate	BH
5	Diaspora	CH
5	Julian	CH
5	Jeroboam vs. Rehoboam	BH
6	Gibeonites	BH
7	Rehoboam and the eldest	BH
10	Paul	BH
12	The rich man and Lazarus	BP

37 Εἰς τὸ ῥητὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου...

genre: P5 rhet. sit.: J

1	Jesus called a Samaritan	BH
2	Sermon on the Mount	BH
2	Sea obeys	BH
3	Moses (saw God)	BH
4	Jesus' passion	BH
4	Adam (seduced)	BH
4	Jesus threatened with stones	BH
4	Fig tree cursed	BH
4	John the Baptist	BH
5	Paul boasts a little	BH
7	Eve	BH
7	Adam (seduced)	BH
9	Assyria	BH
9	Egypt	BH
14	Mother of the sons of Zebedee	BH

38 Εἰς τὰ Θεοφάνια

genre: P1 rhet. sit.: E

2	Egypt (plagues)	BH
2	Exodus (pillar of fire and of cloud)	BH
2	Melchizedek	BH
2	John the Baptist	BH
7	Moses (burning bush)	BH
9	Lucifer	BH
11	Creation of man	BH
12	Eden	BH
12	Serpent	BH

12	Eden (tree of life)	BH
12	Adam (curse)	BH
13	Moses (tables of stone)	BH
13	Prophets	BH
13	Great flood	BH
13	Sodom	BH
13	Incarnation	BH
14	Jesus washes the disciples' feet	BH
14	Jesus eats with tax collectors and sinners	BH
15	Jesus called a Samaritan	BH
15	Samaritan woman	BH
15	Jesus' temptation	BH
15	Jesus' thirst on the cross	BH
16	Jesus' baptism	BH
16	Jesus' temptation	BH
16	Healings	BH
16	Multiplication of the loaves	BH
16	Jesus walks on water	BH
17	John (in womb)	BH
17	David (making merry before the ark)	BH
17	The census of Augustus	BH
17	Bethlehem	BH
17	Jesus' birth in a manger	BH
17	Ox and ass	BH
17	Three wise men	BH
17	Shepherds	BH
18	Herod (Massacre of the children)	BH
18	Escape to Egypt	BH
18	Jesus teaching in the temple	BH
18	Cleansing of the temple	BH
18	Jesus threatened with stones	BH
18	Jesus before Herod	BH
18	Jesus' passion	BH
18	Gall to drink	BH

39 Εἰς τὰ φῶτα
genre: P1 rhet. sit.: E

2	Adam (seduced)	BH
2	Jesus' temptation	BH
4	Zeus (metamorphoses)	PM
4	Kouretes	PM
4	Zeus (against Kronos)	PM
4	Rhea (Cybele)	PM
4	Kore	PM
4	Demeter	PM
4	Celeus & Triptolemus	PM
4	Zeus and Persephone?	PM
4	Dionysus	PM
4	Dionysus' birth	PM
4	Athena's birth	PM
4	Dionysus (thiasus)	PM
4	Semele	PM
4	Aphrodite	PM
4	Prosymnus	PM
4	Artemis' cult in Sparta	PH

4	Artemis' cult in Tauris	PH
5	Pelops	PM
5	Hecate	PM
5	Trophonius	PH
5	Dodona	PH
5	Pythia	PH
5	Castalia	PH
5	Orpheus	PM
5	Mithras	PM
5	Osiris	PM
5	Isis	PM
5	Apis	PM
7	Eden (tree of life)	BH
7	Lucifer	BH
9	Moses (shining face)	BH
9	Manoah	BH
9	Peter (call)	BH
9	Paul's conversion	BH
9	Centurion	BH
9	Zacchaeus	BH
12	Seth	BH
12	Adam (creation)	BH
14	Three wise men	BH
14	Shepherds	BH
14	Simeon	BH
14	Hannah (prophetess)	BH
14	John the Baptist	BH
14	Jesus' baptism	BH
14	Daniel as judge	BH
15	John (in womb)	BH
15	Jesus washes the disciples' feet	BH
15	Elijah	BH
16	Great flood	BH
17	Moses (water from the rock)	BH
17	Manasseh	BH
17	Nineveh	BH
17	Pharisee and tax collector	BP
17	Canaanite woman	BH
17	Exodus (pillar of fire and of cloud)	BH
17	Exodus (crossing the Red Sea)	BH
17	Exodus (manna and flesh)	BH
18	David (and Bathsheba)	BH
18	Peter's denial	BH

40 Εἰς τὸ βάπτισμα

genre: PI rhet. sit.: E

3	Elijah (chariot of fire)	BH
6	Moses (shining face)	BH
6	Moses (burning bush)	BH
6	Exodus (pillar of fire and of cloud)	BH
6	Elijah (chariot of fire)	BH
6	Shepherds	BH
6	Three wise men	BH
6	Transfiguration	BH
6	Paul's conversion	BH

7	Great flood	BH
9	The barren fig tree (par.)	BP
10	Jesus' temptation	BH
11	Exodus (Passover)	BH
16	Lucifer	BH
17	David (kills Goliath)	BH
17	Samuel (Hannah's prayer is granted)	BH
18	Cana	BH
19	Sodom	BH
19	Rahab	BH
19	Pharisee and tax collector	BP
20–21	Labourers in the vineyard	BP
24	Ishmael and Hagar (desert)	BH
24	Tantalus	PM
24	Exodus (the hoarding of manna)	BH
25	Peter and John (tomb)	BH
26	Philip baptizes an Ethiopian	BH
27	Queen of Sheba	BH
27	Samaritan woman	BH
28	Exodus (Passover)	BH
30	Jesus' forty days of fasting	BH
30	Last Supper	BH
31	The rich man and Lazarus	BP
31	Zacchaeus	BH
31	The creditors	BP
33	Canaanite woman	BH
33	Healing an infirm woman	BH
33	Woman suffering from hemorrhage	BH
33	Lazarus (raising of)	BH
33–34	Healings	BH
34	Elijah and the widow of Zarephath	BH
34	The tares	BP
35	Seven unclean spirits	BP
35	Gadarene demoniacs	BH
36	Sodom	BH
38	Thomas	BH
39	Jesus washes the disciples' feet	BH
40	Exodus (Passover)	BH
42	Chamos	BH
42	Astarte	PM
43	David (kills Goliath)	BH
43	Elijah raising the child at Zarephath	BH
43	Elijah and the prophets of Baal	BH
44	Pilate	BH
45	Exodus (pillar of fire and of cloud)	BH
45	Tables of stone	BH
45	Moses (tables of stone)	BH
45	Sinai (inaccessible)	BH
46	The ten virgins	BP
46	The marriage feast	BP

41 Εἰς τὴν Πεντηκοστήν

genre: P1 rhet. sit.: E

2	Pythagoreans	PH

2	Simon	CH
2	Marcion	CH
2	Creation	BH
3	Cain (avenged sevenfold)	BH
3	Lamech (avenged seventy-sevenfold)	BH
3	Zerubbabel	BH
4	Enoch	BH
4	Abraham	BH
4	Jericho captured and destroyed	BH
4	Elijah raising the child at Zarephath	BH
4	Elijah and the prophets of Baal	BH
4	Elijah: the contest on Mount Carmel	BH
4	Elisha and the Shunammite	BH
4	Multiplication of the loaves	BH
11-12	Gift of the Spirit	BH
12	Last Supper	BH
12	Moses (burning bush)	BH
12	Sinai (theophany at)	BH
12	The rich man and Lazarus	BP
13	Bezalel	BH
13	Elijah (chariot of fire)	BH
13	Elisha (mantle Elijah)	BH
14	David	BH
14	Amos	BH
14	Daniel as judge	BH
14	Apostles (call)	BH
14	Matthew the tax collector	BH
14	Paul's conversion	BH
15-17	Gift of the Spirit	BH
16	Babel (tower of)	BH

42 Συντακτήριος...

genre: A1 rhet. sit.: J

1	Paul's apostleship recognized in Jerusalem	BH
2	Egypt (plagues)	BH
3	Nebuchadnezzar	BH
5	Elijah and the contest on Mount Carmel	BH
5	Moses (exodus)	BH
5	Joseph (to Egypt)	BH
7	Abram (journey to Canaan)	BH
7	Sodom	BH
7	Moses in Midian	BH
7	Gideon (300 men lapping water)	BH
7	Abram leaves Chedorlaomer	BH
7	7000 have not bowed to Baal	BH
8	Ark among the Philistines	BH
9	Mustard seed	BP
18	Ammonites and Moabites	BH
19	Samuel's farewell address	BH
22	Democritus	PH
22	Gift of the Spirit	BH
26	Shiloh	BH
26	Jebus (Jerusalem)	BH
26	Nazarites	BH

43 Εἰς τὸν μέγαν Βασίλειον ἐπιτάφιος
genre: A3 rhet. sit.: E

3	Pelopids	PM
3	Cecropids	PM
3	Alcmaeonids	PM
3	Aeacids	PM
3	Heraclids	PM
7	Exodus (Israel murmurs)	BH
7	Exodus (manna and flesh)	BH
7	Exodus (crossing the Red Sea)	BH
7	Joshua makes the sun stand still	BH
7	Exodus (passage of the Jordan)	BH
8	Artemis	PM
8	Orion	PM
8	Actaeon	PM
8	Iphigenia	PM
8	Artemis' cult in Tauris	PH
9	Niobe	PM
12	Achilles	PM
12	Chiron	PM
14	Saul (looks for asses)	BH
21	Abaris	PM
21	Gyges	PH
21	Midas	PH
21	Pegasus	PM
21	Alpheus	PM
22	Orestes and Pylades	PM
22	Molionids	PM
23	Labyrinth	PM
23	Minos	PM
23	Rhadamanthys	PM
23	Elysian Fields	PM
26	Samuel among the Prophets	BH
26	Saul prophesies among the Prophets	BH
26	Jeroboam vs. Rehoboam	BH
26	Giants	PM
28	Momos?	PM
28	Nazarites	BH
29	Elijah: the contest on Mount Carmel	BH
29	John the Baptist	BH
32	Barnabas	BH
32	Paul and Barnabas	BH
35	Exodus (manna and flesh)	BH
35	Elijah and the widow of Zarephath	BH
35	Multiplication of the loaves	BH
35	Jesus washes the disciples' feet	BH
36	Joseph (in Egypt)	BH
37	Abraham	BH
38	Jesus increases in wisdom	BH
41	Egypt	BH
42	Jonah	BH
42	David	BH
43	Tables of stone	BH

43	Bezalel	BH
44	Seven unclean spirits	BP
45	Xerxes bridged the Hellespont	PH
45	Xerxes (ships over land)	PH
46	Esau and Jacob	BH
47	Nebuzaradan	BH
52	Samuel among the Prophets	BH
54	Egypt (tenth plague)	BH
54	David's child dies	BH
55	Hadad	BH
56	Jesus before Pilate	BH
57	Exodus (crossing the Red Sea)	BH
57	Exodus (passage of the Jordan)	BH
57	Moses (battle with the Amalekites)	BH
60	Crates « liberated himself »	PH
60	Diogenes lived in a barrel	PH
62	Mary	BH
62	The ten virgins	BP
63	Thebe	PH
63	Babylon (walls)	PH
63	Mausolus' tomb	PH
63	Pyramids	PH
63	Colossus of Rhodes	PH
63	Artemisium of Ephesus?	PH
64	Pharisee and tax collector	BP
64	Incarnation	BH
64	Jesus eats with tax collectors	BH
64	Jesus washes the disciples' feet	BH
64	Jesus' passion	BH
66	Giants (Nephilim)	BH
67	Sodom	BH
67	Babel (tower of)	BH
70	Adam (creation)	BH
70	Adam (seduced)	BH
70	Flaming sword, guardian of Eden	BH
70	Enosh	BH
70	Enoch	BH
70	Noah	BH
71	Abraham offering Isaac	BH
71	Isaac (promised by Lord)	BH
71	Isaac marries Rebekah	BH
71	Jacob (ladder)	BH
71	Jacob (stone in Bethel)	BH
71	Jacob wrestles with an angel	BH
71	Jacob (Mesopotamia)	BH
71	Jacob's blessing on his twelve sons	BH
71	Jacob blessed by Isaac	BH
72	Joseph (in Egypt)	BH
72	Job	BH
72	Moses (plagues of Egypt)	BH
72	Moses (exodus)	BH
72	Moses (cloud on Sinai)	BH
72	Moses (tables of stone)	BH

72	Aaron	BH
72	Joshua	BH
73	Samuel (Hannah's prayer is granted)	BH
73	Samuel (anointed kings)	BH
73	David (meek)	BH
73	David (plays the lyre)	BH
73	Solomon (wisdom)	BH
73	Solomon (unfaithfulness)	BH
74	Elijah (chariot of fire)	BH
74	Elisha (mantle of Elijah)	BH
74	Moses (burning bush)	BH
74	The three young men	BH
74	Jonah	BH
74	Daniel in the lion's den	BH
74	Maccabees	BH
75	John the Baptist	BH
75	John (in womb)	BH
75	Hades	PM
75	Herod Antipas	BH
76	Peter and Paul	BH
76	Peter (rock and keys)	BH
76	Zebedee's sons	BH
76	Apostles	BH
76	John close to Jesus' breast	BH
76	Stephen	BH
78	Moses dies before entry of Israel	BH

44 Εἰς τὴν καινὴν Κυριακήν
genre: P1 rhet. sit.: E

1	Babel (exile)	BH
2	Ark of the covenant	BH
2	Bezalel	BH
2	Moses (erection of the tabernacle)	BH
2	David (the anointing of)	BH
2	Feast of the Dedication	BH
4	Eden (tree of life)	BH
4	Adam (seduced)	BH
4	Incarnation	BH
6	Eden (tree of life)	BH
6	Eve	BH
7	Serpent	BH

45 Εἰς τὸ ἅγιον Πάσχα
genre: P1 rhet. sit.: E

1	Hades	PM
1	Adam (the first)	BH
3	Moses (burning bush)	BH
5	Lucifer	BH
7	Creation of man	BH
8	Eden	BH
8	Serpent	BH
8	Eden (tree of life)	BH
8	Adam (curse)	BH
9	Moses (tables of stone)	BH

9	Great flood	BH
9	Prophets	BH
9	Sodom	BH
9	Incarnation	BH
10	Exodus	BH
11	Moses (on Sinai)	BH
11	Sinai (inaccessible)	BH
12	Adam (curse)	BH
12	Tables of stone	BH
15	Egypt	BH
15	Pharaoh	BH
16	Last Supper	BH
16	Jesus' legs not broken	BH
17	Sodom (do not look back)	BH
18	John the Baptist	BH
18	Job	BH
19	Moses (burning bush)	BH
19	Apostles (mission)	BH
20	The dishonest steward	BP
21	Rachel steals household gods	BH
21	Leah	BH
21	Exodus (pillar of fire and of cloud)	BH
21	Exodus (crossing the Red Sea)	BH
21	Exodus (manna and flesh)	BH
21	Moses (water from the rock)	BH
21	Moses (battle with the Amalekites)	BH
21	Exodus (passage of the Jordan)	BH
21	Joshua makes the sun stand still	BH
21	Jericho captured and destroyed	BH
21	Exodus (sending of hornets)	BH
22	Abraham offering Isaac	BH
22	Bronze serpent	BH
24	Simon of Cyrene	BH
24	Criminals on the cross	BH
24	Joseph of Arimathea	BH
24	Nicodemus	BH
24	Women at empty tomb	BH
24	Eve	BH
24	Peter and John (tomb)	BH
24	Hades	PM
26	Jesus washes the disciples' feet	BH
26	Jesus eats with tax collectors	BH
27	Samaritan woman	BH
27	Jesus' temptation	BH
27	Jesus' thirst on the cross	BH
27	Jesus called a Samaritan	BH
28	Eden	BH
28	Adam (seduced)	BH
28	Adam (curse)	BH
28	Incarnation	BH
29	Marvels at crucifixion	BH

LETTERS

E 2 Basil F C		
1	Abaris	PM
E 4 Basil F C		
4	Cimmerians	PM
5	Hades	PM
5	Eden	BH
5	Moses (water from the rock)	BH
11	Tantalus (boulder)	PM
E 5 Basil F C		
1	Tantalus (thirst)	PM
2	Lotophagi	PM
2	Alcinous	PM
2	Odysseus	PM
5	Augias	PM
5	Xerxes bridged the Hellespont	PH
E 6 Basil F C		
2	Job	BH
5	Xerxes (Golden plane tree)	PH
6	Paul, Peter, Apollos	BH
6	Aaron (rod)	BH
E 10 Candidianus P P		
1	Muses	PM
2	Momos	PM
8	Eumelius	PM
8	Odysseus	PM
E 11 Gregory of Nyssa F C		
1	Paul boasts a little	BH
E 12 Nicobulus R C		
1	Giants	PM
3	Aloads	PM
E 19 Basil F C		
6	Bezalel	BH
E 28 Amphilochius R C		
1–2	Glaucus	PM
E 32 Philagrius F C		
2	Diogenes endures fever	PH
7	Phalaris	PH
8–9	Anaxarchus' martyr's death	PH
10	Epictetus' martyr's death	PH
11	Socrates (poisoned cup)	PH
12	Job	BH
E 38 Themistius P P		
1	Spartoi?	PM
1	Pelops	PM
E 44 Eusebius Samosata P C		
2	Moses (water from the rock at Massah)	BH
3	Sea obeys	BH
4	Judith	BH
E 45 Basil F C		
4	David, the blind and the lame	BH

E 48 Basil F C		
6	Ares	PM
7	Moses (battle with the Amalekites)	BH
E 51 Nicobulus jr. R C		
7	Eagle is most beautiful	PL
E 52 Nicobulus jr. R C		
1	Nestor	PM
2	Eurystheus	PM
2	Heracles	PM
E 52 Nicobulus jr. R C		
2	Aphrodite (ribbon)	PM
E 54 Nicobulus jr. R C		
1	Homer	PH
1	Antimachus	PH
E 58 Basil F C		
6	Dathan and Abiram	BH
E 70 Eutropius P P		
1	Tantalus (thirst)	PM
4	Helen with Polydamna	PM
E 71 Eutropius P P		
5	Homer	PH
5	Achilles and Patroclus	PM
E 77 Theodorus 9 A C		
7	Phinehas	BH
8	Moses kills an Egyptian	BH
8	Miriam (leprous)	BH
9	Nineveh	BH
9	Manasseh	BH
10	Ephraim	BH
10	Jesus and Samaritans	BH
10	Malchus' ear	BH
11	Peter on forgiveness	BH
11	The creditors	BP
11	Sermon on the Mount	BH
13	The barren fig tree (par.)	BP
E 80 Philagrius F C		
2	Sea obeys	BH
E 90 Anysius F C		
1-2	Athenian delegation to Sparta	PH
E 95 Leontius F C		
1	Sodom	BH
E 96 Hypatius P C		
1	Demeter	PM
1	Celeus & Triptolemus	PM
E 98 Governors C P		
1	Diogenes	PH
E 99 Sacerdos F C		
1	John the Baptist	BH
1	Elijah: the contest on Mount Carmel	BH
E 101 Cledonius A C		
genre: P2 rhet. sit.: J		
44	Moses (as God to Pharaoh)	BH
50	Moses (burning bush)	BH
50	Abraham (Lord's visit)	BH

58	Joseph (put in prison by Potiphar)	BH
E 110 Palladius 3 F C		
1	Incarnation	BH
E 114 Celeusius A C		
2–5	Swallows and swans	PL
3	Tereus, Procne, Philomele	PM
E 120 Helladius P C		
2	Egypt	BH
E 121 Theodorus 1 P C		
2	Jacob blessed by Isaac	BH
E 135 Sophronius F C		
4	Jonah	BH
E 147 Asterius P C		
1	Israel (chosen people)	BH
E 153 Bosporius P C		
1	Esau and Jacob	BH
E 156 Asterius P C		
1	Heracles	PM
1	Iolaus	PM
1	Hydra	PM
2	Actoriones (Molionids)	PM
E 165 Stagirius A ?		
7	Telephus	PM
E 166 Stagirius A ?		
2	Achilles' horses	PM
2	Patroclus	PM
E 175 Eudoxius jr. A C		
2	Eunomus	PM
E 176 Eudoxius jr. A C		
3	Achilles	PM
E 178 Eudoxius jr. A C		
1–2	Athenian choice of profession	PH
7	Agoracritus	PV
E 180 Eudoxius jr. A C		
2	Lysias	PH
E 183 Theodorus 7 P C		
6	The talents	BP
E 186 Nectarius P C		
4	The widow and the unjust judge	BP
E 189 Eustochius A ?		
1	Alexander and the Athenians	PH
E 190 Eustochius A ?		
1	Odysseus	PM
4	Telchines	PM
E 198 Nemesius A P		
1	Pythagoras	PH
E 199 Nemesius A P		
6	Lucifer	BH
E 203 Valentinianus R C		
3	Eve	BH
7	Apostles (mission)	BH
E 206 Adelphius 2 A C		
2	Eli's sons	BH

E 209 Castor F C		
1	Odysseus	PM
E 223 Thecla A C		
3	David	BH
E 231 Eusebius 4 A C		
3	Erotes	PM
E 232 Diocles A C		
2	Cana	BH
E 233 Ablabius ? ?		
1	Marathon	PH
1	Salamis	PH
1	Miltiades	PH
1	Cynegirus	PH
1	Callimachus (soldier)	PH
1	Lamachus	PH
E 235 Adamantius A ?		
4	Cynegirus	PH
4	Callimachus (soldier)	PH
4	Marathon	PH
4	Salamis	PH
E 239 Epiphanius A ?		
2	Nestor	PM
E 240 Meletius F ?		
2	Arganthonius	PH
3	Achilles' horses	PM

Discussion of some problematical identifications in the poems

1. I,1,1, vv.2-3 (*PG* 37,397-8) The expression τυτθαῖς πτερύγεσσι πρὸς οὐρανὸν σπεύδομεν may remind one of the myth of **Icarus** (thus Sykes. *Literary Questions* p.7 - cautiously - and Nardi p.158). Gregory makes use of similar images, with mention of the (possible) fall, in I,2,1, vv.377-379; I,2,2, v.314; or.32,24. (In the latter case, Gallay, *SC 318* pp.136-137 is affirmative: « allusion à la légende d'Icare ». He also translates interpretatively: μηδὲ πτερορρυείτω becomes « qu'il ne voie pas fondre ses ailes »). Probably, these passages rather reveal a reminiscence of the myth of the charioteer and his pair of winged horses, from Plato's *Phaedrus*: for the fall of the soul through the loss of its wings. Plato also uses πτερορρυέω twice (*Phaedrus* 246c and 248c).

2. I,1,6, vv.59-66 (*PG* 37,434-5) This passage, about the sometimes obscure relation between merit / guilt and reward / punishment in the O.T., is an example of an enthymeme supported by exempla (p.90 n.169). First, we read three premises, then three names and finally three episodes by way of explanation. The problem is located in the second premise (v.59), with Moses as evidence (v.62), accounted for in vv.65-66:

58 Τὰ μὲν μέγιστα τῶν κακῶν συγγνωστά πως,
Τὰ δ' οὐ μέγιστα τῶν κακῶν (καλῶν mss., SICHERL) τιμητέα·
62 Δαυῒδ σε ταῦτα πειθέτω, καὶ Μωϋσῆς,
64 Ὁ μὲν κολασθεὶς ἐνδεῶς τοῖς πταίσμασι,
Ὁ δ' ἀντὶ μικρῶν, καὶ Θεοῦ λαβὼν θέαν
Νόμον τε, καὶ τοσοῦτον ἐκσώσας στρατόν.

The interpretation depends especially on v.59: does one read *κακῶν* or *καλῶν*; is this form considered as partitive or as subjective genitive: does τιμητέα signify « what should be honoured » or « what should be punished » here? The Maurists read *κακῶν* as partitive genitive, and interpret it as a punishment; they translate vv.59 and 65 as follows: *Et culpae non maximae poenis afficiebantur (…) Iste vero (Moyses) pro levibus graviter punitus est.* They refer to the fact that **Moses** had to die before the entry into the promised land (Nu 20,12; Dt 32,50-52). Caillau *ad locum* proposes to read *καλῶν*, also takes this to be a partitive genetive and sees a reward in it: *Virtutes non maximae honori habebantur (…) Moyses autem consecutus est pro meritis non magnis, ut videret Deum, etc. Videat lector et judicet.* My opinion is that his translation of v.65 is not sound *and* that the content (depreciatory for Moses) does not correspond with Gregory's general attitude towards Moses. The interpretation of the Maurists is hence preferable, but in order to maintain this with the version *καλῶν*, we have to understand this form as a subjective genitive, which is awkward after the partitive genitive in v.58. Nevertheless, I think that the verses 59 and 65-66 should be translated as follows:

And not too great (crimes) of good people were to be punished (…). And the other (sc. Moses) (was punished) because of a trifle, despite the fact that he had been allowed to see God and receive the law, and that he had saved such a large army of people. Videat lector et judicet.

(In *Biblia Patristica*, Nu 20,12 is accompanied by a reference to v.65. Apparently, the Strasbourg research group agrees with the identification of the Maurists. Unless otherwise mentioned, the following problematical cases are not indicated in *Biblia Patristica*. This is not necessarily a counter argument: from random checks, it turned out that several manifest allusions have been overlooked: thus, with regard to John 2,1-10 (Cana), there are only two references to Gregory Nazianzen (I,1,23, v.3 and or.40,18), whereas in fact there are five undeniable references and one that is uncertain, cf. inventories 2 and 3).

3. I,2,1, vv.588-591 (*PG* 37,567) Christ's shooting of arrows at the heart (ὀϊστεύσειε τεὴν φρένα… ἀναψύχοντι βελέμνῳ) seems influenced by the Hellenistic image of **Eros**. (Cf.Sundermann pp.186-187).

4. I,2,1, vv.611-612 (*PG* 37,568) Παρθενίη opposes her own sober life to the luxurious way of life of the person she is speaking to: the latter has a sumptuous meal before her, while she herself is pleased with a small bite (τρύφος, implying an unstated pun on τρυφή), « as that with which Christ fed thousands » (v.610). This is followed by our verses: Σοὶ ποτὸν ἡμερίδων, τὸ δ' ἐμὸν μέθυ πλούσιον αἰεί, / κρῆναι, καὶ ποταμοί, καὶ φρείατα μακρὰ νάουσι. (*Your drink comes from the vine, but my wine is always abundantly supplied: sources, and rivers, and wells flow copiously.*) In my view, Gregory alludes to the transformation of water into wine at the wedding of **Cana** here. In I,1,2, v.69 too, he links the multiplication of the loaves with Cana. The joint *Ernstbedeutung* of both exempla would then be: austerity is wealth.

5. I,2,1, v.627 (*PG* 37,570) According to Sundermann p.627, τυκτὸν *κακόν* is an allusion to the creation of **Pandora** (cf. Hes. *Theog.* 570, 585).

6. I,2,2, v.3 (*PG* 37,578) The παρθένος is addressed with περίφρων, an epithet for **Penelope** in Homer; in v.320, her task appears to consist of spinning and weaving.

7. I,2,2, v.127 (*PG* 37,588) *Χρύσεα χαλκείων διαμεῖψαι* is proverbial, based on *Il.* 6, 235-255 (misled by Zeus, **Glaucus** exchanges his golden armour for the bronze one of Diomedes). This has already been indicated by Cosmas (Mai pp.388–389).

8. I,2,2, vv.129-133 (*PG* 37,589) The priamel is formally similar to that with which **Achilles** refuses the presents of the Greeks in *Il.* 9,379–386: *οὐδ' εἴ μοι... δοίη* (Gregory *δοίης*) ... *οὐδέ κεν ὥς*.... (Cf. Zehles pp.95–96).

9. I,2,2, vv.138–140 Cf. p.150.

10. I,2,2, v.271 (*PG* 37,599) In Homer, the term ἐπιτάρροθος is always used for gods helping in the struggle; in combination with ῥηιδίως, as in Gregory, it is used in *Il.* 5,808 for **Athena** supporting Tydeus. (Also see Zehles p.158).

11. I,2,2, v.500 (*PG* 37,618) Zeus' metamorphosis into an ὄφις is related by Cosmas (Mai p.404) to **Olympias**; Masson-Vincourt pp.47-48 disputes this and refers to **Persephone**. It seems to me that Cosmas' explanation cannot be ignored just like that: in I,2,15, v.91, Gregory calls Alexander δρακοντιάδης. Nowhere does he allude as clearly to Zeus' affair with Persephone (unless perhaps in or.5,31, see Masson-Vincourt, *Eleusis* pp.158-60).
The allusion can also be found in I,2,10, v.842 and II,2,7, v.96.

12. I,2,6, vv.57-58 (*PG* 37,647) The thieves of the κανοῦν (ritual breadbasket) are most probably **Eli's sons** Hophni and Phinehas: in I,2,2, these are also - together with Achan (here in v.62) cited as a negative exemplum. Yet this remains uncertain because the sacrifice which they stole (1Rg 18) did not consist of bread. The one who did eat from the holy bread was David (1 Rg 21,2-7), but this was given to him by the priest. However, as has appeared before, it is not unusual for Gregory to conflate narratives.

13. I,2,10, v.33 Cf. p.147.

14. I,2,10, v.206 (*PG* 37,695) ἐξ ὧν Στοαί τε καὶ προσώπων ὀφρύες, in most mss., the Maurists text and in Crimi. One late ms. (Oxon. Barocc. Gr. 96, 14th century) gives περιπάτων, followed by Höllger p.96 and p.149. Crimi, *Nazianzenica* pp.204-206 suggests that this late variant is influenced by Cosmas' commentary (Mai p.555), which indeed identifies the προσώπων ὀφρύες as the **Peripatetics**, apparently mechanically borrowing from Ps-Nonnus' commentary on or.4,72. Crimi's remark is convincing, but the question remains as to who the προσώπων ὀφρύες are. Crimi thinks the Stoics are targeted at, since Gregory speaks in or.27,10 of τῆς Στοᾶς τὴν ὀφρύν. Thus the whole verse would deal with the **Stoa**. In my opinion, this parallel is not conclusive: Gregory uses ὀφρύς and derivatives some 40 times, mostly in the metaphorical sense of *arrogance*. Only once, it is associated with the Stoa; elsewhere, it is used, for example, for a habit of the Cynics (II,1,11, v.707), Aristaeus (II,2,7, v.287 = epit.70, v.2), the Sophists (ep.176,6), Epidaurus (II,2,7, v.259). My principal objection is that the conjunction τε καί suggests that Gregory has two different philosophical schools in mind, as in the next verse (Ἀκαδημίαι τε καὶ πλοκαὶ Πυρρωνίων). In that case, the most obvious school beside Stoa, Academy, and Scepsis, would indeed be the Peripatus.

15. I,2,10, vv.236-243 **Crates** » or someone else «, cf. p.192 n.387.

16. I,2,10, v.293 Cf. p.145, and n.281.

17. I,2,10, vv.308-312 (*PG* 37,702-3) Gregory tells mockingly about a philosopher who was an oil merchant: in the immediate context, **Plato** and **Speusippus** are mentioned, but for neither of them is such a biographical detail known from elsewhere. Perhaps there is a confusion with Zeno, who (according to Diogenes Laertius VII,1) had become rich by trading, and once was shipwrecked on a journey to Athens (compare v.310: *πόνους διαντλῶν κέρδεσσιν θαλασσίοις*); Aristotle recounts how Thales made large profits from a speculation in olive-presses (*Pol* A.11, 1259ᵃ), and Pliny knows a similar anecdote about Democritus (*N.H.* XVIII,273). Gregory probably takes Speusippus to be the merchant, unless v.308, where he is mentioned as *ὁ χαρίεις Σπεύσιππος*, is an interpolation, as de Billy and the Maurists assume, – a conjecture I consider to be unfounded.

18. I,2,10, vv.604-611 (*PG* 37,724) (= *SVF* III 710) *Στωϊκῶν τῶν φιλτάτων τις* is probably **Cleanthes**. (Thus, with argumentation, Werhahn, *Σύγκρισις* pp.86-88).

19. I,2,10, vv.808-817 (*PG* 37,738) The **Dion** with the stinking mouth is the one from Prousa, *ὃν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο κατ' εὐφημισμὸν Χρυσόστομον Ἕλληνες ὠνόμασαν* (scholium in Lucian, *Hermot.* 34), cf. Crimi, *Dione*.

20. I,2,15, vv.85-86 (*PG* 37,772) The death of two **Aeacids** is described as follows: *Αἰακίδαι μέν ἄεισμα, θάνον γε μέν, ὃς μὲν ἐπ' ἐχθροῖς / Μαινομένῃ παλάμῃ, αὐτὰρ ὁ μαχλοσύνῃ.*
In this, modern editors and commentators have chosen to see, along with Aias the Great, either Agamemnon or Aias the Lesser (Agamemnon: de Billy and Masson-Vincourt p.20; Aias the Lesser: Gaullyer and the Maurists). But the Byzantine scholiasts Cosmas and Nicetas David were right to refer to the death of Achilles, who was shot by Paris when he wanted to « marry » Polyxena (thus in Cosmas, MAI pp.430-431).

21. I,2,17, v.5 (*PG* 37,782) Cf. I,1,27, vv.20-22.

22. I,2,25, v.119 (*PG* 37,821) The adjective *ἀστραπηφόρος* might hide an allusion to **Zeus**, as is certainly the case in v.239: *κεραυνῶν δεσπότης* (about Christ: an oxymoron with his passion described afterwards).

23. I,2,25, vv. 285-289 Cf. p.191.

24. I,2,28, vv.151-158 Cf. p.175 n.345.

25. I,2,28, vv.338-339 (*PG* 37,874) Cf. Beuckmann pp.118-119.

26. I,2,28, v.355 (*PG* 37,882) The life of the Christian, who *πόλεις ἀμείβετ' ἐκ πολέων* (cf. Matt. 10,23), is implicitly opposed through a lexical allusion to **Socrates**' refusal to live *ἄλλην ἐξ ἄλλης πόλεως ἀμειβομένῳ* (Plato, *Apol.* 37d). (Cf. Beuckmann p.123).

27. I,2,29, vv.157-160 (*PG* 37,896) According to Lefherz pp.44-46, this text by Gregory is the only evidence of a (Hellenistic?) version of the myth of **Comaitho and Cydnus**, who are not mentioned by name.

28. I,2,29, vv.185-186 Cf. p.145.

29. I,2,33, vv.65-66 (*PG* 37,933) An unmistakable allusion to **Odysseus**' voyage past the **Sirens** (*Κηρῷ τὰ ὦτα φράσσε πρὸς φαύλους λόγους*...).

30. II,1,1, v.91 (*PG* 37,977) The formulation *παλάμαις μάρπτοντα παραΐσσοντα ῥέεθρα* is similar to the description of the myth of **Comaitho and**

Cydnus in I,2,29. Still, it would probably be more prudent to interpret this as mere imagery.

31. II,1,1, v.127 (*PG* 37,979) Gregory calls his father ἀμφότερον πολιός τε νόον, πολιός τε κάρηνον, according to Wyss, *RLAC* p.840 « bloß die rhythmische Struktur » of *Il*.3,179 (ἀμφότερον, βασιλεύς τ' ἀγαθὸς κρατερός τ' αἰχμητής, about Agamemnon), according to ΑΓΑΘΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ p.40, a reminder of « τὸν ὁμηρικὸν τοῦτον περὶ τοῦ Νέστορος », an untraceable verse: ἀμφότερον, πολιός τε ῥητὴρ κρατερός τ' αἰχμητής.
Inspiration might be derived from the Homeric description of Priam: πολιόν τε κάρη πολιόν τε γένειον (*Il*.22,74 and 24,516). An assimilation of the Elder Gregory with **Priam** would make sense and would correspond with Gregory's literary practice, but one cannot be fully affirmative in such cases.

32. II,1,1, vv.229-240 (*PG* 37,987-8) Gregory compares his own sorrow with two situations, introduced respectively by ὥς τις and ἀρχαίη φάτις ἐστίν. It is tempting to think of two concrete histories here, namely the imprisonment of **Hecabe** (vv.229-234: the queen in chains) and the painful tribulations of **Philoctetes** (vv.235-240: the man with the stinking snakebite, who can complain to no one). But these might equally well be common comparisons.

33. II,1,11, vv.350-351 (*PG* 37,1053) Gregory tells about himself: ὥς οἱ μύωπι τῶν βοῶν πεπληγότες / εἰς Πόντον ἦλθον. This might be a common comparison, but I consider it worth mentioning that also **Io** crossed Pontus.

34. II,1,11, v.753 (*PG* 37,1081) When Gregory says of the « dog » Maximus that he is ἄρις, *without the ability to track* (thus in the critical text of Jungck), the image of the Greek war-god **Ares** (phonetically) rings through.

35. II,1,11, vv.1404-1406 (*PG* 37,1126) In all probability the giant has to be identified as **Enceladus** rather than as Typhoeus. Cf. or.4,85 and 115, and especially epg.43, v.1: ἢ Τυφωεύς, ἢ γίγας (cf. p.165).

36. II,1,12, v.590 (*PG* 37,1209) As an example of the (topical) hunger and cold, Meier pp.137-138 correctly refers to **Paul** here.

37. II,1,12, v.746 (*PG* 37,1220) It is difficult not to think of **Odysseus** when finding an ἀνὴρ πολύτροπος at the end of the hexameter. The adjective can be found some ten other times in Gregory, which does not mean that each time a conscious allusion is assumed behind it.

38. II,1,17, v.60 (*PG* 37,1266) The Maurists suspect that behind the metaphorical use of the term θυλάκῳ (actually: *bag in which to preserve food*) for « body », a lexical allusion to the anecdote about **Anaxarchus**' martyr's death is hidden. Gregory indeed uses the term three times when he recounts this death.

39. II,1,17, vv.65-66 (*PG* 37,1266) Gregory announces that he will not humiliate himself any more for any favours in Constantinople. Cosmas (Mai pp.411-412) thinks that Gregory reminds us of **Priam** who comes to ask Achilles for Hector's corpse.

40. II,1,22, vv.10-11 (*PG* 37,1281) Normally, the ἀλλόφυλοι are the Philistines, but considering the context of the paradigmatic prayer (fully quoted on p.196), this term exceptionally refers to the Amalekites here.

41. II.1,31, v.1 (*PG* 37,1299) Δὶς τοῦτο ἐπτερνισμένος seems a lexical allusion to Gn 27,36: ἐπτέρνικεν γάρ με ἤδη δεύτερον τοῦτο (**Esau** about Jacob).

42. II.1,32, vv.20-21 (*PG* 37,1302) Cosmas (MAI p.415) sees an allusion to **Heracles** in the ἀγῶσι κύδιμος.

43. II.1,41, vv.15-18 (*PG* 37,1340) Maximus is mockingly called μουσόπνευστος, like τῶν πάλαι σοφῶν τινες. Probably, Gregory is thinking of **Homer** and **Hesiod**, among others. It cannot be said with certainty exactly which oracles are meant in verses 17 and 18.

44. II,1,45, vv.3-7 (*PG* 37,1353-4) The possible identifications (Jacob, Joseph, Abraham, Jeremiah, Job) are those of Cosmas (MAI 406-407); however, it is quite probable that it is simply a matter of human exempla in general (see also p.159 n.310).

45. II.1,88, v.50 (*PG* 37,1437) Behind the θηροκτόνον κάρτος, Cosmas (MAI p.618) suspects an allusion to **Heracles**, for whom this adjective is indeed an epithet.

46. II.1,93 (*PG* 37,1448) This epigram reveals apparent lexical and structural correspondence with *AG* 16,92, about the works of **Heracles**. According to BALDWIN p.3, it is difficult « to resist the conclusion that Gregory is consciously adapting, if not parodying, this poem and its theme ».

47. II,2,1, vv.239-240 (*PG* 37,1468) Touching the fringe of Christ's garment (Χριστοῦ δραξάμεναι θυσάνων) is an allusion to the healing of the **woman suffering from a hemorrhage**. Of the three other passages in which Gregory uses the word θύσανοι, two deal with the same pericope (II,1,46, v.26 and II,1,50, v.73).

48. II,2,2, v.3 Cf. p.86 n.162.

49. II,2,3, vv.134-136 (*PG* 37,1489-90) Lexical allusion to the μῆνις of **Achilles** (cf. *Il.* 9,496 and 16,34-35). (Cf. WYSS, *RLAC* pp.840-841).

50. II,2,4, vv.127-128 (*PG* 37,1515) Nicobulus asks his father for a κλῆρον πατρώϊον, ὡς ποτε λόγχην Σπαρτιάται, Πέλοπός τε γένος Πελοπήϊον ὦμον. In ep.38,1, both marks are also mentioned together. The origin of the (ivory) shoulder of the Pelopids is not problematical (see also explicitly or.4,70): the lance of the Σπαρτιάται on the other hand, has so far not been recognized as a mythological exemplum. After all, Σπαρτιάτης usually means Spartan (thus explicitly in the Maurists and in GALLAY, *Lettres 2* p.124, n.2 to p.47); in this context, it stands for « descendant of the **Spartoi** », with as identifying sign a birth mark in the shape of a spear-head (see e.g. Dion Or.4,23 and Julian Or.2,81c).

51. II,2,4, v.129 (*PG* 37,1515) The most famous σκῆπτρον which was transferred from father to son is that of **Agamemnon** (*Il.* 2,100-108). In any case, the context (after Pelopids and Spartiats, before Cecropids) points to a mythological allusion.

52. II,2,4, v.201 (*PG* 37,1520) = II,2,5, v.262 (*PG* 37,1540) Μηδὲ φάος λύχνοιο θάνοι, λήγοντος ἐλαίου has been adopted as a metaphor from the parable of the **ten virgins**.

53. II,2,7, v.93 (*PG* 37,1558) In a series of epithets about the Olympian gods, most of which are clear-cut, we also find ἀνδροφόνος, with πατροφόνος

as *varia lectio*. In the first case, **Ares** is probably implied, in the second, **Zeus**. According to Sicherl (in Gertz p.180), the first reading is correct.

54. II,2,7, v.96 (*PG* 37,1558) In the traditional list of Zeus' metamorphoses, this is the only passage where the transformation into a bear (ἄρκτος) is mentioned. We have no traces of such an episode: Gregory probably alludes to the myth of **Callisto**, in which she - not Zeus - changes into a bear. (Thus Masson-Vincourt p.39).

55. II,2,7, v.152 (*PG* 37,1562) Thus according to Pyykkö; to me, it seems improbable (cf. p.222 n.52).

56. II,2,7, v.278 (*PG* 37,1573) The mentioning of Lindus points to the worship of **Heracles Bouthoinas** (cf. or.4,103).

57. epg.84, v.1 (*PG* 38,123) As Beckby suggests *ad locum* (AG 8,214), the anecdote about « Cyrus », who opened a tomb in search of gold, probably goes back to Herodotus 1,187, where **Darius** opened Nitocris' grave. In Herodotus, immediately afterwards there is mention of Cyrus who opposes Nitocris' son.

58. epg.88, v.1 (*PG* 38,125) It is possible that Gregory himself had different possibilities in mind, rather than thinking of one particular visitor to the underworld.

59. ept.18, v.2 Cf. p.160 n.314.

60. ept.27, v.4 (*PG* 38,24) About his aunt Livia, Gregory writes that she φῦλον πασέων καίνυτο θηλυτέρων. From the parallel with Ps.-Hesiod 'Ασπίς v.4 (ἣ ῥα γυναικῶν φῦλον ἐκαίνυτο θηλυτεράων), about **Alcmene**. Salvatore pp.41-42 concludes that Gregory implicitly associates his aunt with this mythological character.

61. ept.40, v.3 Cf. p.189 n.377.

62. ept.69, v.6 (*PG* 38,47) The Μαρίαμ with whom Nonna is compared is probably not Jesus' mother but Moses' and Aaron's sister: also in or.18,28, Miriam stands as a symbol for (probably) Nonna (cf. p.193 n.389).

INVENTORY II

ALPHABETICAL ORDER

This inventory is subdivided according to the subject matter: first, the biblical material is listed (historical and parables; exemplary characters from Christian history are classified separately at the end of the list of the biblical material), then, the pagan items follow (historical, fables, mythological and characters from literature). The following information can be found in this inventory:

- *keyword*: the choice of the keywords is directed as much as possible at indicating which episode, anecdote or characterization of the character in question is quoted by Gregory. This is especially the case with characters who occur frequently and about whom several histories are known from the Bible or the classical tradition (e.g. Moses or Zeus, providing respectively 25 and 20 different keywords). It is not the case with characters who are only mentioned in one story (e.g. Ananias and Sapphira), or who are connected with one specific episode in particular (e.g. Judas or Medea), or when the mention of a character does not involve a narrative aspect. Two types of internal references can be found: the addition (cf. also ...) to existing keywords with their own locations, and the addition (cf. ...) to non-independent keywords.
- next to the *biblical* keywords, a brief *reference* (Bible book and chapter) is added: more detailed references can be found in inventory 3.
- next to the *fables*, it is mentioned - wherever possible - where these have been found among the fables of Aesop, Babrius or Phaedrus, or another source. The abbreviations used are explained in the inventory itself.
- the *locations* in Gregory are classified as follows: first, the poems, then the epistles (E), then the orations (O), and finally the epigrams / epitaphs (epg / ept). In a number of cases, the location is also followed by a reference to a chapter from the Bible, pointing to the fact that Gregory was inspired in that specific passage by (still) another Bible book, besides the one indicated next to the keyword: usually, it concerns New Testament episodes where Gregory uses a synoptic other than Matthew, whom I refer to next to the keyword. However, it may also be an indication of what is now called an intertextual link, namely

when Gregory interprets an Old Testament episode through the eyes of later Bible texts, especially Paul and the Epistle to the Hebrews, but e.g. also Jesus Sirach or the non-canonical fourth book of the Maccabees (¹).

BIBLICAL MATERIAL

1) HISTORICAL

Aaron Ex 28		
1,2,1	316	Sir 45
2,1,1	128	
2,1,11	507	508
2,1,12	678	
2,1,98	4	
2,2,1	302	
O 2	52	
O 7	3	
O 11	2	
O 12	2	
O 16	1	
O 21	3	
O 32	17	
O 43	72	
Aaron (golden calf) Ex 32		
1,1,9b	2	3
Aaron (meek towards Egypt) Ex 7		
1,2,25	190	195
Aaron (mission) Ex 4		
O 1	1	
O 2	114	
Aaron, Nadab and Abihu Ex 24		
O 28	2	
O 32	16	
Aaron (rod) Nu 17		
E 6	6	
Aaron's sons (ordained) Ex 28		
O 12	2	
O 16	1	
O 32	16	
Abel (cf. Cain)		
Abihu (cf. Aaron and Nadab)		
Abimelech 1 (cf. Isaac)		
Abimelech 2 (cf. Jotham)		
Abiram (cf. Dathan)		
Abraham Gn 12		
2,1,11	53	
O 1	7	
O 2	103	
O 8	4	
O 18	41	
O 21	3	
O 28	18	
O 33	5	
O 41	4	
O 43	37	
Abraham (dust and ashes) Gn 18		
1,2,25	432	434
Abraham (hospitality) Gn 18		
O 28	18	
Abraham intercedes for Sodom Gn 18		
O 21	5	
Abraham (late fatherhood) Gn 21		
O 4	18	
Abraham (Lord's visit) Gn 18		
E 101	50	
Abraham offering Isaac Gn 22		
1,2,1	311	312 Sir 44
2,1,1	440	426
2,2,1	145	147
O 1	7	
O 4	18	
O 8	2	
O 15	4	
O 17	10	
O 28	18	
O 43	71	
O 45	22	
ept 94	1	2
Abraham (weeps for Sarah) Gn 23		
2,1,45	4	

---

(1) Thus, for instance, Gregory often compares the tablets of stone, following 2Cor. 3,3, with the « tablets of human hearts ». Something similar also explains the reference to Psalm 140 next to a location of the mythological name *Hades*.

Abram (journey to Canaan) Gn 12
1,2,10 489 495
O 14 2
O 42 7
Abram leaves Chedorlaomer Gn 14
O 42 7
Abram and Lot Gn 13
2,1,11 1762 1765
Abram (nomad) Gn 12
O 33 10
Absalom (cf. also David) 2Rg 13
2,2,3 318 332
O 21 15
Adam (alone) Gn 2
1,2,1 414 415
1,2,3 23
Adam (creation) Gn 1
1,1,2 62
O 29 11
O 31 11
O 39 12
O 43 70
Adam (curse) Gn 3
1,1,8 115 118
1,2,1 438 439
1,2,10 426 427
1,2,10 478 487
2,1,1 384 385
2,1,45 105 106
2,1,63 5
2,2,1 345 352
O 19 14
O 38 12
O 45 8
O 45 12
O 45 28
Adam and Eve Gn 2
1,2,1 226
Adam and Eve (fig leaves) Gn 3
1,2,2 135
1,2,34 196
Adam (the first) Gn 1
1,1,10 4
2,1,46 39 40
O 45 1
Adam (seduced) Gn 3
1,1,4 48 50
1,1,8 112 114
1,1,9 9 10
1,1,9 44
1,2,14 57 58
1,2,15 105
2,1,11 960 961
2,1,12 588 589
2,1,13 44 45
2,1,45 98
2,1,54 6 8
2,1,58 4
2,1,60 11
2,1,63 1 4
2,1,83 29 30
2,1,88 166 169
O 24 3 4
O 36 5
O 37 4
O 37 7
O 39 12
O 43 70
O 44 4
O 45 28
Achan Jos 7
1,2,2 435 437
1,2,6 62 64
O 34 14
Ahab 3Rg 16
1,2,1 451
O 5 3
O 33 2
Amalek (cf. Moses)
Ammonites and Moabites Dt 23
2,1,11 1737 1738
2,1,13 184 185
O 2 79
O 42 18
Amorites Gn 15
O 4 28
O 16 5
Amos Am
O 41 14
Amos (shepherd) Am 1
O 33 10
Ananias and Sapphira Act 5
1,2,2 432 434
1,2,33 32
O 31 30
O 34 14
Anakites Nu 13
O 14 23
Andrew N.T.
O 4 69
Angels with the shepherds Luke 2
1,1,9 61
Annas and Caiaphas John 18
1,2,1 454 455
1,2,1 486
Annunciation Luke 1
1,1,9 67a 68
Anointing by Mary at Bethany John 12

O 14 20
Anointing by a sinful woman Luke 7
1.1.22 7
O 8 18
Apollas (cf. Paul....)
Apostles N.T.
1.2.1 325
O 2 52
O 21 3
O 21 27
O 32 18
O 36 4
O 43 76
Apostles (call) Matt. 4
1.2.10 555 556
2.1.12 192 196
2.2.7 23 26
O 41 14
Apostles' division of the mission areas Trad
O 33 11
Apostles (fishermen) Matt. 4
O 16 2
O 33 10
Apostles (mission) Matt.10
1.2.10 560 566
1.2.28 355 357
2.1.12 199 215
E 203 7
O 2 69
O 33 11
O 45 19
Apostles tread upon scorpions Luke 10
2.1.89 16 18
Ark of the covenant Ex 25
O 18 26
O 19 8
O 28 31
O 32 17
O 44 2
Ark among the Philistines 1Rg 4
2.1.16 69
O 22 2
O 42 8
Ascension Act 1
1.2.34 221
Assyria 4Rg 17
1.2.1 451 452
O 16 7
O 25 12
O 27 3
O 37 9
Assyria (exile) 4Rg 17
2.1.1 358 359
2.1.16 67 68
Athenians Act 17
O 21 12
Augustus (cf. census)
Baal of Peor (Israel's apostasy) Nu 25
2.1.30 89
Babel (exile) Is 40
2.1.1 354 357
2.1.21 5 7
O 6 18
O 44 1
Babel (tower of) Gn 11
1.1.9b 16 17
1.2.1 132
1.2.1 448 449
2.1.11 1151
O 21 22
O 23 2
O 32 17
O 41 16
O 43 67
Balaam Nu 22
O 4 54
Barnabas (cf. also Paul) Act 11
O 10 3
O 43 32
Bathsheba (cf. David)
Beelzebul (cf. Jesus or)
Bel and Dagon Is 46
O 5 29
Belshazzar Dn 5
O 33 3
Bethesda (cf. healing)
Bethlehem Matt.2
2.1.16 62
2.2.1 273 276 Mich 5
O 3 6
O 18 17
O 33 10
O 38 17 Mich 5
ept 63 2
Bezalel Ex 35
E 19 6
O 41 13
O 43 43
O 44 2
Bronze serpent Nu 21
2.1.58 6 7
O 4 65
O 45 22
Caiaphas (cf. also Annas) Matt.26
O 21 22
O 22 5
Cain and Abel Gn 4

  1,2.1 448
  1,2.1 492 493
  O 4 25
  O 16 16
  O 36 5
Cain (avenged sevenfold) Gn 4
  O 41 3
Caleb (cf. Joshua)
Cana John 2
  1,1,2 69
  1,1,23 3
  1,2,1 611
  E 232 2
  O 29 20
  O 40 18
Canaanite woman Matt.15
  2,1,50 75 76
  O 39 17
  O 40 33
Census of Augustus Luke 2
  1,2,34 194 195
  2,2,1 337 338
  2,2,2 15 16
  O 19 12
  O 38 17
Centurion Matt.8
  O 9 2
  O 20 4
  O 39 9
Chemosh 1Rg 11
  1,2,28 377
  O 16 19
  O 40 22
Corinthians (fed with milk) 1Cor.3
  O 32 13
Cornelius Act 10
  O 34 14
Creation Gn 1
  1,1,31 2 6
  O 5 31
  O 41 2
Creation of man Gn 1
  1,1,8 55 77
  1,2,1 92 99
  1,2,12 5 8
  2,1,46 13 15
  2,2,5 40 47
  O 38 11
  O 45 7
Criminals on the cross Luke 23
  2,1,63 7 8
  O 45 24
Cross and resurrection N.T.
  1,1,2 77 79
  1,1,9 78 79
  1,1,33 7 9
  1,2,2 564 567
  1,2,34 204 220
  O 1 4
  O 8 16
  O 12 4
Dagon (cf. Bel)
Daniel (cf. Noah, ...)
Daniel as judge Sus
  2,1,12 419
  O 39 14
  O 41 14
Daniel and Habakkuk Bel
  1,2,2 181 183
  O 18 30
Daniel interprets dreams Dn 5
  O 28 11
Daniel in the lion's den Dn 6
  1,2,10 633 635
  2,1,1 3 5
  2,1,11 675
  2,1,14 63
  2,1,51 34
  2,1,68 83 86
  O 5 40
  O 15 11
  O 24 10
  O 43 74
Daniel's vision of four beasts Dn 7
  2,1,43 29
Dathan and Abiram Nu 16
  E 58 6
  O 13 3
  O 32 17
  O 36 5
David 1-2Rg
  1,2,1 320 Sir 47
  E 223 3
  O 2 52
  O 18 24
  O 21 3
  O 21 20
  O 25 7
  O 41 14
  O 43 42
David and Absalom 2Rg 18
  1,2,25 210 219
  2,2,3 318 324
  O 22 1
David (the anointing of) 1Rg 16
  O 44 2
David (ardour) Ps 68
  O 14 3

David and Bathsheba (cf. also Nathan) 2Rg 11
  1.1.6 62 64
  2.1.12 684 685
  2.1.46 42
  O 39 18
David, the blind and the lame 2Rg 5
  E 45 4
David's child dies 2Rg 12
  O 43 54
David eats bread of the Presence 1Rg 21
  1.2.6 57 58
David's elegy over Saul and Jonathan 2Rg 1
  O 22 1
David kills Goliath 1Rg 17
  O 2 88
  O 5 30
  O 13 2
  O 40 17
  O 40 43
David making merry before the ark 2Rg 6
  O 5 35
  O 38 17
David (meek) Ps 131
  O 14 2
  O 43 73
David plays the lyre 1Rg 16
  1.2.25 202 204
  2.1.39 88 89
  2.1.62 2
  O 2 88
  O 5 30
  O 9 2
  O 24 11 12
  O 43 73
David pours out water when thirsty 2Rg 23
  1.2.10 617 622 4Mcc 3
  O 14 3
David (psalmist) Ps 72
  1.1.6 26 33
David (shepherd) 1Rg 16
  O 33 10
David and Shimei 2Rg 16
  1.2.25 220 221
David spares Saul's life 1Rg 24
  1.2.25 204 209
Dedication (Feast of the) John 10
  O 44 2
Dipsas (?) Dt 8
  1.2.28 151 158
Eden Gn 2
  1.1.8 100 111
  1.2.10 468 477
  1.2.14 87
  E 4 5
  O 38 12
  O 45 8
  O 45 28
Eden (tree of life) Gn 2
  1.2.1 724 727
  1.2.3 65 66
  1.2.28 293
  1.2.29 127 134
  2.1.45 103 104
  2.1.46 6
  2.1.88 170 175
  O 10 2
  O 16 15
  O 19 14
  O 38 12
  O 39 7
  O 44 4
  O 44 6
  O 45 8
Egypt Ex
  2.1.1 352
  2.1.22 4 5
  E 120 2
  O 5 34
  O 6 17
  O 27 3
  O 37 9
  O 43 41
  O 45 35
Egypt (plagues) Ex 7
  1.1.14 1 12
  2.1.11 190
  2.1.11 740 745
  2.1.39 7
  O 4 18
  O 5 27
  O 6 17
  O 16 10 11
  O 21 16
  O 24 13
  O 25 11
  O 32 25
  O 38 2
  O 42 2
Egypt (tenth plague) Ex 11
  1.1.9 87 90
  O 1 3
  O 16 11
  O 43 54

Ekron 4Rg 1
O 5 29
Eleazar (cf. Aaron's sons)
Eleazar 2Mcc 6
O 15 4Mcc
Elijah 3Rg 17
O 2 52
O 21 3
O 22 5
O 39 15
Elijah (ardour) 3Rg 19
O 14 3
Elijah (chariot of fire) 4Rg 2
1.1.16 12
1.2.1 322 Sir 48
1,2,9 82 83
1,2.10 532
2.1.12 543
2.1.51 32
O 4 18
O 27 9
O 28 19
O 33 10
O 40 3
O 40 6
O 41 13
O 43 74
ept 92 1
ept100 1
Elijah by the Cherith 3Rg 17
O 21 7
O 26 12
Elijah (contest on Mount Carmel) 3Rg 18
1,1.16 7 8
2.1,11 292 293
E 99 1
O 10 1
O 14 4
O 26 7
O 28 28
O 41 4
O 42 5
O 43 29
Elijah fasts 40 days 3Rg 19
1.1,16 8 9
Elijah fed by ravens 3Rg 17
1,1.16 2
1.2.2 172
1.2.3 86
1.2,10 523 525
2.1.11 292 293
2,2.1 73 74
O 18 30
Elijah at Mount Horeb 3Rg 19
O 28 19
Elijah kills captains of fifty 4Rg 1
1,1,16 10
Elijah lets it rain 3Rg 18
2.2,2 1
Elijah (mantle cf. Elisha)
Elijah parts the Jordan 4Rg 2
1,1.16 11
Elijah and the prophets of Baal 3Rg 18
1.2.10 528
O 40 43
O 41 4
Elijah raising the child at Zarephat 3Rg 17
1.1,16 5 6
1.1.17 9 12
1,2,10 531
O 40 43
O 41 4
Elijah stops the rain 3Rg 17
1,1.16 6
1,2.10 526 527
2,2,2 1
Elijah and the widow of Zarephath 3Rg 17
1,1.16 2 4
1,1.17 1 8
1.2,2 172 176
1.2,3 85
1.2,6 49 50
1,2.10 529 530
O 14 4
O 26 12
O 40 34
O 43 35
Elihu speaks to Job Job 32
2.1,11 848 850
Elisha 4Rg 2
O 2 52
O 21 3
Elisha (iron axe head) 4Rg 6
1,1,16 25 26
Elisha (jar of oil) 4Rg 4
1.1,16 19 20
Elisha (mantle of Elijah) 4Rg 2
1,1.16 13 15
1,2.10 533 534
O 33 10
O 41 13
O 43 74
ept 62 2
Elisha (miracle of reviving bones) 4Rg 13

1.1.16 29 30
Elisha (multiplication of the loaves) 4Rg 4
1.1.16 22 23
Elisha (the curing of Naaman) 4Rg 5
1,1,16 24 25
2,2,2 3
Elisha (siege of Samaria) 4Rg 7
1,1,16 28 29
Elisha and the Shunammite 4Rg 4
1,1.16 20 21
O 26 17
O 41 4
Elisha (spoiled pottage) 4Rg 4
1,1.16 22
Elisha (spring of Jericho) 4Rg 2
1.1.16 16
Elisha (Syrian army blinded) 4Rg 6
1.1.16 27 28
Elisha (water from Edom) 4Rg 3
1.1.16 18 19
Elisha (young ribalds) 4Rg 2
1.1.6 67 68
1,1,16 17
O 33 8
Eli's sons 1Rg 2
1,2,2 406
1.2.6 57 58
2,1.1 432 436
2,1.13 128 133
E 206 2
O 2 93
O 5 34
O 20 3
Enoch Gn 5
1,2.1 305 309
Sir 44 Heb. 11 Hen 83
1.2.9 82 Heb. 11
O 4 18
O 14 2
O 21 3
O 28 18
O 41 4
O 43 70
ept 92 1 Heb. 11
Enosh Gn 4
O 28 18
O 43 70
Entry into Jerusalem Matt.21
O 21 29
Ephraim Hos 6
E 77 10
Esau and Jacob Gn 25
1.2.1 494 495
2,1.31 1
E 153 1
O 43 46
Escape to Egypt Matt.2
O 29 19
O 34 1
O 38 18
Esther Esth
1,2.29 291 295
Eve Gn 3
1,2.1 200
1.2.34 192 194
2,1.1 457 458
2,1.45 99 100
2,2,1 233 234
E 203 3
O 8 14
O 18 8
O 37 7
O 44 6
O 45 24
Eve (made from rib) Gn 2
1,1,3 33 41
O 31 11
Exiles Is
1.1.9 25 26
O 5 34
O 22 2
Exodus Ex
1,2,2 164 171
O 45 10
Exodus (crossing the Red Sea) Ex 14
1,1.36 3 4
1,1.38 1 2
1,2,2 167
1,2.25 193 194
2,1.3 8
2,1.11 188
2,1.11 746
2,1.22 6 9
O 4 12
O 4 18
O 6 17
O 11 2
O 13 2
O 15 6
O 18 14
O 24 13
O 29 19
O 32 16
O 39 17
O 43 7
O 43 57
O 45 21

Exodus (sending of hornets) Ex 23
O 27 9
O 45 21
Exodus (Israel murmurs) Ex 16
O 43 7
Exodus (manna and flesh) Ex 16
1,1,36 5
1,1,38 3
1,2,2 167
2,1,3 9
2,2,2 4
O 4 19
O 6 17
O 11 2
O 13 2
O 15 6
O 18 14
O 18 30
O 24 13
O 28 28
O 32 16
O 32 23
O 34 1
O 39 17
O 43 7
O 43 35
O 45 21
Exodus (passage of the Jordan) Jos 3
1,1,36 9 11
1,2,2 168 169
2,1,3 8
2,1,22 10
O 4 19
O 6 17
O 15 6
O 43 7
O 43 57
O 45 21
Exodus (passover) Ex 12
O 20 11
O 40 28
O 40 40
Exodus (pillar of cloud before Egypt) Ex 14
O 28 12
Exodus (pillar of fire and pillar of cloud) Ex 13
1,1,36 3
1,1,38 1
1,1,9b 25 26
1,2,2 165 166
1,2,15 161
2,1,3 7
2,1,12 724 726
2,1,22 1 2
O 4 19
O 6 17
O 15 6
O 18 14
O 32 16
O 38 2
O 39 17
O 40 6
O 40 45
O 45 21
Exodus (the hoarding of manna) Ex 16
1,2,28 159 168
2,1,13 92 95
O 40 24
Ezechiel (call) Ez 1
O 28 19
Ezechiel (vision of the dry bones) Ez 37
O 25 14
Field of Blood Matt.27
2,1,13 61 65
Fig tree cursed Matt.21
1,1,20 31 32
1,1,21 15 16 Mark 11
2,1,1 594 595
O 32 30
O 37 4
Flood (cf. Great flood)
Gadarene demoniacs Matt.8
1,1,20 7
1,1,21 6 Mark 5
1,1,22 8 Luke 8
1,2,25 531 541
2,1,1 585 586
2,1,44 38
2,1,45 168
2,1,55 7 9
2,1,55 13 14
2,1,56 4 5
2,2,3 226
2,2,7 168 169
O 14 2
O 24 10
O 27 6
O 29 20
O 40 35
Gall to drink Matt.27
O 29 20
O 38 18
Garments of skins Gn 3
2,1,88 107 108
Gath (inhabitants punished) 1Rg 5
2,1,13 149 150
Gethsemane Matt.26

1,1.2 74
O 14 3
Giants (Nephilim) Gn 6
1,2.2 491 493
O 13 2 1Rg
O 14 23
O 28 29 Ps 18
O 43 66 Ps 18
Gibeonites (cf. also Joshua) Jos 9
O 36 6
Gideon (fleece of wool) Jdc 6
O 4 19
Gideon (300 men lapping water) Jdc 7
O 4 19
O 42 7
Gift of the Spirit Act 2
1.1,3 30 31
O 31 26
O 41 11 12
O 41 15 17
O 42 22
Goliath (cf. David)
Gomorrah (cf. also Sodom) Gn 18
2,1.72 7
Great flood Gn 6
1.1,96 16 17
1.2,1 132
1.2,1 449 450
1.2,14 88
O 14 23
O 36 5
O 38 13
O 39 16
O 40 7
O 45 9
Habakkuk (cf. Daniel)
Hadad 3Rg 11
O 43 55
Hagar (cf. Ishmael)
Hannah (cf. Samuel)
Hannah (prophetess) Luke 2
O 39 14
ept 68 6
ept 69 6
Healing the blind man at Siloam John 9
1,1.23 8
2,1.12 663 665
Healing of an infirm woman Luke 13
2,1.19 95
2,1,50 75 76
O 40 33
Healing the lame man at Bethesda John 5
2,1.19 94
2,1.89 7 9
O 14 37
Healing a paralytic on his bed Matt.9
2.1.19 94
2,1,50 71 72
Healings N.T.
1.1,2 73
1.1,20 3 30
1,1.21 3 17
1,1.22 3 18
1,1.23 4 9
2.1.1 13 14
2.1.1 581 593
2,1.46 47 48
2,1,83 27 28
O 38 16
O 40 33 34
Hemorrhage (woman suffering from) Matt.9
1,1.20 9
1,1.21 6 7 Mark 5
1,1.22 9 Luke 8
1,2.2 510 512
2,1,1 584
2.1,46 25 26
2,1,50 73 74
2.2.1 239 240
O 8 18
O 14 37
O 40 33
Herod Antipas (cf. also Jesus) Matt.14
1,2.1 452 454
O 5 35
O 43 75
Herod (Massacre of the children) Matt.2
1.2,1 454
1.2,34 197
O 4 68
O 19 12
O 36 5
O 38 18
Hezekiah's illness and recovery 4Rg 20
O 18 29
Hezekiah prays for Jerusalem 4Rg 19
O 5 26
Incarnation N.T.
1.1,36 12 15
1.2,14 89 92
1.2,34 189
E 110 1
O 12 4
O 14 2
O 14 4

O 14 15
O 14 27
O 38 13
O 43 64
O 44 4
O 45 9
O 45 28
Isaac (cf. also Abraham) Gn 24
O 18 43
O 21 3
Isaac and Abimelech Gn 26
O 26 5
Isaac marries Rebekah Gn 24
O 43 71
Isaac (promised by Lord) Gn 18
O 43 71
Isaac (wells of water) Gn 26
O 36 2
Isaiah's call Is 6
1,2,9 82
O 1 1
O 2 114
O 9 1
O 18 14
O 28 19
Isaiah calls out to heaven Is 1
1,1,1 16 24
Isaiah's martyrdom Ascls 5
2,1,14 61
Ishmael and Hagar (desert) Gn 21
O 21 7
O 40 24
Israel (cf. Judah)
Israel (chosen people) Gn 12
E 147 1
Ithamar (cf. Aaron's sons)
Jacob (cf. also Esau, Joseph) Gn 27
O 21 3
Jacob blessed by Isaac Gn 27
E 121 2
O 2 103
O 12 3
O 43 71
Jacob's blessing on his twelve sons Gn 49
O 43 71
Jacob (ladder) Gn 28
2,2,1 183 185
O 28 18
O 43 71
Jacob (Mesopotamia) Gn 28
1,2,10 496 499
O 26 2
O 43 71
Jacob mourns for Joseph Gn 37
2,1,16 70
2,1,45 3
O 22 1
Jacob (stone in Bethel) Gn 28
O 28 18
O 43 71
Jacob endures heat and cold Gn 31
2,1,3 11 12
2,1,12 695
O 26 4
Jacob wrestles with an angel Gn 32
O 25 18
O 43 71
Jairus' daughter Matt.9
2,1,19 97
James (cf. also Peter) N.T.
O 4 69
Jannes and Jambres (cf. Pharaoh's magicians)
Jebus (Jerusalem) Jdc 19
O 42 26
Jephthah sacrificing his only daughter Jdc 11
O 15 11
ept 94 1 2
Jeremiah Jr
O 2 88
O 5 28
O 21 12
Jeremiah's call Jr 1
O 1 1
O 2 114
O 18 14
Jeremiah weeps for Jerusalem Jr
2,1,45 5
Jericho captured and destroyed Jos 6
2,1,11 192
O 4 19
O 6 17
O 13 2
O 41 4
O 45 21
Jeroboam vs. Rehoboam 3Rg 12
1,2,2 419
O 5 3
O 36 5
O 2 89
O 43 26
Jerusalem (cf. Jeremiah and Samaria)
Jezebel 3Rg 22
1,2,29 293 296
Jesus' baptism Matt.3
1,1,2 70 71

1,1,9 78 79
1,2,34 200 201
O 29 20
O 38 16
O 39 12
Jesus or Beelzebul Matt.12
O 22 5
Jesus' birth in a manger Luke 2
1,1,2 65
1,2,34 196
O 19 12
O 29 19
O 38 17
Jesus called a Samaritan John 8
O 4 78
O 14 4
O 26 12
O 29 20
O 37 1
O 38 15
O 45 27
Jesus eats with tax collectors and sinners Matt.9
2,1,46 45
O 38 14
O 43 64
O 45 26
Jesus' forty days of fasting Matt.4
2,1,34 5
O 14 3
O 40 30
Jesus before Herod Antipas Luke 23
O 38 18
Jesus increases in wisdom Luke 2
O 43 38
Jesus' legs not broken John 19
O 45 16
Jesus and Malchus cf. Malchus
Jesus' passion Matt.27
1,2,25 237 242
1,2,34 204 218
O 14 4
O 15 1
O 33 14
O 37 4
O 38 18
O 43 64
Jesus before Pilate Matt.27
O 43 56
Jesus prays by himself Matt.14
O 14 4
O 26 7
Jesus and Samaritans Luke 9
E 77 10
Jesus teaching in the temple Luke 19
O 38 18
Jesus' temptation Matt.4
1,1,2 67 68
1,1,9 56 59
1,2,2 213 219
1,2,3 81 83
1,2,10 636 641
1,2,34 202 203
O 14 3
O 24 9
O 29 20
O 38 15
O 38 116
O 39 2
O 40 10
O 45 27
Jesus' thirst on the cross John 19
O 29 20
O 38 15
O 45 27
Jesus threatened with stones John 10
O 29 20
O 31 1
O 37 4
O 38 18
Jesus' tunic (casting lots for) John 19
O 6 1
Jesus walks on water Matt.14
1,1,20 17 18
1,1,21 8 9 Mark 6
1,1,23 6 7 John 6
1,1,36 17 18
2,1,1 10 12
O 24 10
O 38 16
Jesus washes the disciples' feet John 13
1,2,33 140
O 14 4
O 38 14
O 39 15
O 40 39
O 43 35
O 43 64
O 45 26
Job (cf. also Noah and Elihu) Job
1,1,6 106
1,2,37 7 9
1,2,38 5 6
2,1,19 31 35
2,1,42 14 17
2,1,45 6
2,1,50 63 67
E 6 2

E 32 12
O 8 12
O 11 3
O 14 11
O 14 34
O 18 24
O 21 17 18
O 43 72
O 45 18
Job (dust and ashes) Job 42
1.2.25 432 434
Job in Satan's hands Job 1
O 24 9
John the Baptist Matt.3
1.1.9 72 74
1.2.1 323 324
1.2.2 187 189
1.2.10 540 548
2.1.11 294
2.1.88 105 107
E 99 1
O 2 52
O 10 1
O 14 4
O 14 4
O 19 11
O 21 3
O 22 5
O 26 7
O 29 20
O 33 10
O 34 13
O 37 4
O 38 2
O 39 14
O 43 29
O 43 75
O 45 18
John beheaded Matt.14
2.1.14 65
John (in womb) Luke 1
O 29 19
O 38 17
O 39 15
O 43 75
John (cf. also Peter) N.T.
O 4 69
John close to Jesus' breast John 13
O 32 18
O 43 76
Jonadab Jr 42
1.2.2 152 163
1.2.10 508 523
2.1.11 295
Jonah Jon 2
1.2.2 184 186
2.1.1 6 7
2.1.11 677
2.1.11 1838 1842
2.1.17 53 56
2.1.19 84
2.1.51 34
2.1.68 63 66
E 135 4
O 2 106 109
O 24 10
O 43 42
O 43 74
Jonathan (cf. David)
Jonathan tasted a little honey 1Rg 14
1.2.2 288
Jordan (twelve stones) (cf. also Exodus) Jos 4
O 2 49
Joseph (cf. also Jacob) Gn 37
O 4 18
O 22 5
Joseph (in Egypt) Gn 39
O 16 19
O 43 36
O 43 72
Joseph (to Egypt) Gn 38
O 24 13
O 42 5
Joseph (Pharaoh's dreams) Gn 41
O 24 13
O 34 3
Joseph (put in prison by Potiphar) Gn 39
E 101 58
O 24 13
Joseph (slave) Gn 39
O 33 10
Joseph (weeps over Jacob) Gn 50
2.1.45 4
Joseph of Arimathea Matt.27
O 14 40
O 45 24
Joshua and Caleb Nu 13
2.1.11 834 836
Joshua and the Gibeonites Jos 9
2.1.13 186 187
Joshua (cf. also Moses) Jos
O 2 52
O 2 88
O 21 3
O 43 72
Joshua makes the sun stand still Jos 10

1.1.36 9
1.2.1 317 318 Sir 46
1.2.2 169
2.1.11 192
O 4 19
O 15 6
O 22 13
O 43 7
O 45 21
Josiah 4Rg 22
O 33 2
Jotham (allegory of the bramble) Jdc 9
2.1.12 723
Judah vs. Israel 3Rg 12
O 2 89
O 6 7
O 32 4
Judas Matt.26
1.2.1 486
1.2.1 487
1.2.1 681 683
1.2.3 48
1.2.6 22 23
1.2.15 107 108
2.1.13 177
O 4 68
O 21 13
O 21 14
O 22 5
O 25 8
O 26 16
O 29 20
O 36 5
epg 22 2 3
Judas hangs himself Matt.27
2.1.11 932
Judges Jdc
O 2 52
O 21 3
Judith Jdth
E 44 4
Laban (flock divided) Gn 30
2.1.12 693 695
Lamech (avenged seventy-sevenfold) Gn 4
O 41 3
Last Supper Matt.26
O 40 30
O 41 12
O 45 16
Lazarus (raising of) John 11
1.1.23 9
2.1.1 593 594
2.1.19 98
2.1.50 69 70
2.1.68 77 79
O 25 14
O 29 20
O 40 33
Leah Gn 29
O 45 21
Lebanon Is 33
O 5 29
Levi in the loins of Abraham Gn 14
O 20 9 Heb. 7
O 29 9
Levites Nu 3
2.1.13 188 192
O 32 17
Levites (no land) Dt 18
1.2.10 500 507
Lot (hospitable) (cf. also Abram and Sodom) Gn 19
O 14 2
Lucifer Is 14
1.1.4 46 48
1.1.7 56 82
1.2.1 680 681
1.2.2 443 444
1.2.3 47
1.2.6 20 21
1.2.14 117 118
1.2.34 5 7
2.1.11 823
2.1.13 176
2.1.45 325 332
E 199 6
O 6 13
O 28 12
O 29 20
O 36 5
O 38 9
O 39 7
O 40 16
O 45 5
epg 22 1 2
Luke N.T.
O 4 69
Maccabees 2Mcc 6
O 5 40 4Mcc
O 15 4Mcc
O 43 72 4Mcc
Malchus' ear Matt.26
1.2.25 242 243 Luke 22 John 18
E 77 10
O 14 2
Manasseh 2Prl 33

2.1,26 41
2,2,3 123
E 77 9
O 13 1
O 19 8
O 39 17
Manna (cf. Exodus)
Manoah Jdc 13
O 9 1
O 20 4
O 28 19
O 39 9
Marah (bitter water) Ex 15
1,2,2 97
2,1.12 663 665
O 4 19
O 11 2
O 29 20
O 36 4
epg 14 1 2
Mark N.T.
O 21 8
Marvels at crucifixion Matt.27
O 45 29
Mary of Bethany (cf. anointing)
Mary (cf. also annunciation) N.T.
1,2,1 693 695
O 22 17
O 43 62
Mary (Miriam?) N.T.
ept 69 6
Mary (virgin mother) Matt.1
1,2,1 422 423
1.2,34 192 194
2,2.1 247 251
O 14 3
Matthew the tax collector Matt.10
2.1,12 220
2.1,19 92
O 24 8
O 41 14
Melchizedek Gn 14
O 38 2 Heb.5
Miriam leprous Nu 12
E 77 8
O 36 5
Miriam (timbrel) Ex 15
O 18 28
Moabites (cf. Ammonites)
Moses Ex
2,1,1 128
O 2 52
O 7 3
O 11 2
O 16 20
O 21 3
Moses (abstinence) Ex 19
1.2,3 23
Moses (allotment of land) Nu 32
1.2,10 504 505
Moses in the basket Ex 1
2.1,51 33
O 33 10
Moses (battle with the Amalekites) Ex 17
1.1,36 7 8
1,2,2 170 171
2,1,1 1 3
2,1,3 10 11
2,1.11 189
2,1,22 10 11
2,2,7 85
E 48 7
O 2 88
O 4 19
O 6 17
O 11 2
O 12 2
O 13 2
O 15 6
O 18 14
O 18 29
O 32 16
O 43 57
O 45 21
Moses (burning bush) Ex 3
E 101 50
O 1 1
O 2 114
O 18 14
O 25 6
O 30 18
O 38 7
O 40 6
O 41 12
O 43 74
O 45 3
O 45 19
Moses (cloud on Sinai) Ex 19
O 11 2
O 28 2
O 32 16
O 43 72
Moses dies before entry of Israel Dt 32
1.1,6 62 65
O 43 78
Moses (erection of the tabernacle) Ex 40
O 44 2

Moses (exodus) Ex 14
1.1,6 66
1.1,9b 22 24
1.2.1 313 314 Sir 45
2.1,15 23 26
O 1 3
O 4 18
O 11 2
O 32 16
O 33 10
O 42 5
O 43 72
Moses as God to Pharaoh Ex 7
E 101 44
O 11 2
O 18 1
O 28 3
O 32 16
Moses (heard by God) Ex 14
O 16 4
Moses (Joshua as successor) Nu 27
O 12 2
Moses kills an Egyptian Ex 2
2.1,15 23 26
E 77 8
Moses (meek) Nu 12
O 14 2
O 18 24
Moses (meek towards Egypt) Ex 7
1.2,25 190 195
Moses in Midian Ex 2
O 42 7
Moses (ordination of the priests) Ex 28
O 32 17
Moses (plagues of Egypt) Ex 7
O 11 2
O 16 11
O 43 72
Moses (reconnaissance of the land) Nu 13
2.1,11 834 835
Moses saw God Ex 20
1.1,6 65
1.1,9b 27 29
1.2.1 315 Sir 45
1.2,9 82
1.2,10 501 502
2.1,13 117 118
O 4 18
O 27 9
O 32 16
O 37 3
Moses (shining face) Ex 34
O 32 15
O 39 9
O 40 6
Moses (on Sinai) Ex 19
2.1,11 353 354
2.1,13 117 118
O 2 92
O 20 2
O 28 2 3
O 45 11
ept 57 1 2
Moses (song of) Dt 32
1.1,1 16 24
Moses (tablets of stone) Ex 31
1.1,6 66
1.1,15 1 10
1.1,9b 27 33
1.2,1 314 315 Sir 45
1.2,10 502 503
O 4 18
O 6 17
O 21 20
O 38 13
O 40 45
O 43 72
O 45 9
Moses (water from the rock at Massah) Ex 17
1.1,36 5 6
1.1,38 4
1.2,2 168
2.1,10 10
2.1,11 191
E 4 5
E 44 2
O 4 19
O 6 17
O 11 2
O 13 2
O 18 14
O 18 30
O 32 16
O 36 2
O 39 17
O 45 21
Mother of the sons of Zebedee Matt.20
O 37 14
Multiplication of the loaves Matt.14
1.1,2 68 69
1.1,20 15 16
1.1,21 8 Mark 6
1.1,22 10 12 Luke 9
1.1,23 6 John 6
1.2,1 610
1.2,3 90

1.2,6 51 52
2.1,1 591
O 29 20
O 34 1
O 38 16
O 41 4
O 43 35
Naaman (cf. Elisha)
Nadab and Abihu Lv 10
2.1,13 124 127
2.1,34 99 100
O 2 93
O 5 4
O 12 2
Nadab (cf. Aaron, ...)
Nathan (allegory of the poor man's lamb) 2Rg 12
2.1,12 684 685
Nazarites Nu 6
1.2,10 909 915 Jdc 13 1Rg 1
O 18 35
O 25 2
O 42 26
O 43 28
Nebuchadnezzar 4Rg 24
O 5 3
O 42 3
Nebuchadnezzar's dream Dn 2
2.1,11 1733 1736
Nebuzaradan 4Rg 25
O 33 3
O 43 47
Nicodemus John 19
O 14 40
O 45 24
Nimrod Gn 10
O 14 23
Nineveh Jon 3
2.1,46 43
2.2,3 124
E 77 9
O 16 14
O 16 16
O 39 17
Noah Gn 6
1.2,1 309 311 Sir 44
2.1,13 205 206
2.2,2 2
O 4 18
O 21 3
O 28 18
O 28 28
O 43 70
Noah's ark Gn 6
2.1,11 1081 1083
2.1,30 39 42
O 6 10
O 18 17
O 25 6
Noah, Job and Daniel Ez 14
O 2 89
Og Nu 21
O 4 1
Ox and ass Is 1
O 38 17
Patriarchs Gn 12
O 21 3
Paul (cf. also Peter) Act
1.2,1 485
1.2,1 488
2.1,12 238 244
O 2 52 56
O 2 84
O 4 69
O 10 3
O 14 2
O 20 5
O 20 12
O 26 4
O 28 21
O 36 10
Paul's apostleship recognized in Jerusalem Gal.2
O 42 1
Paul (ardour) 2Cor.11
O 14 3
Paul's ascesis 1Cor.19
O 14 3
Paul and Barnabas Act 11
O 43 32
Paul boasts a little 2Cor.11
2.1,11 1103
E 11 1
O 37 5
Paul's conversion Act 9
1.2,1 498 500
O 18 14
O 24 8
O 39 9
O 40 6
O 41 14
Paul in hunger and in cold ActPa 3
1.2,2 202 209
1.2,3 88
2.1,12 590
O 26 12
Paul's martyrdom ActPa 11

2.1.14 64
Paul (oath) Rom.1
1,2.24 225 232
Paul, Peter, Apollos 1Cor.1
2,1.11 680 683
2.1.13 154 156
E 6 6
O 6 7
O 13 1
O 19 8
O 32 5
Paul's shipwreck at the voyage to Malta Act 27
2.1,11 111 210
Paul has the spirit of God 1Cor.7
O 26 13
Paul (tentmaker) Act 18
1.2.10 549 550
Paul in the third heaven 2Cor.12
1.2,1 326
1.2.2 205
O 27 9
O 28 3
O 28 20
O 32 15
O 32 24
O 34 15
Peter (cf. also Paul, Simon) N.T.
2,1.13 177
O 4 69
O 34 3
Peter's call Matt.4
O 9 1
O 20 4
O 39 9
Peter's confession Matt.16
O 28 19
Peter criticized by Paul Act 11
1.2.25 222 230 Gal.2
Peter's denial Matt.26
O 26 17
O 39 18
Peter eating lupins
1.2.10 550 551
O 14 2
Peter on forgiveness Matt.18
E 77 11
Peter and John at the tomb John 20
O 40 25
O 45 24
Peter on the lake Matt.14
O 17 5
Peter's martyrdom ActPe 35
2,1.14 64
Peter and Paul Act
1,2.10 549 554
O 2 51
O 14 39
O 18 24
O 43 76
Peter (rock and keys) Matt.16
1,2.1 488 489
2,1.12 222
O 32 18
O 43 76
Pharaoh Ex 1
1,2,1 451
2,1,1 352 353
2.1,21 4
2.1,22 3
O 5 3
O 16 4
O 45 15
Pharaoh's magicians Ex 7
2.1,12 674 682
O 2 41 2Tim.3
Pharisees N.T.
O 2 70
Philip (Ethiopian baptized by) Act 8
O 40 26
Phinehas Nu 2
2.1.15 21 23
E 77 7 Ps 105
O 14 3
O 15 9
O 16 20
O 18 24
Pilate (cf. also Jesus) Matt.27
O 4 68
O 36 5
O 40 42
Potiphar (cf. Joseph)
Presentation in the temple Luke 2
1,1.9 69 71
Princes of Zoan Is 19
O 2 56
Prophets 3Rg
1.1.9 19 21
1.2,1 133
O 2 52
O 14 27
O 21 3
O 36 5
O 38 13
O 45 9
Queen of Sheba 3Rg 10
O 40 27 Matt.12
Rabshakeh sent by Sennacherib 4Rg18

O 4 110
Rachel (steals household gods) Gn 31
O 45 21
Rahab Jos 2
1,2,17 37 38
O 14 2
O 40 19
Ramathaim (Samuel's birthplace) 1Rg 1
O 33 10
Rebekah (cf. Isaac)
Rehoboam (cf. Jeroboam)
Rehoboam and the eldest 3Rg 12
O 36 7
Rehoboth (Euruchoria) Gn 26
2,1,11 1844 1845
O 23 13
Rich young man Matt.19
1,2,1 717 719
1,2,10 567 572
1,2,17 5
O 14 4
O 14 39
Samaria vs. Jerusalem 3Rg
1,2,2 419
2,1,13 178
O 2 89
O 6 7
Samaritan woman John 4
1,1,2 73
O 29 20
O 38 15
O 40 27
O 45 27
Samson Jdc 16
2,1,11 918 923
2,1,44 36
O 4 19
O 21 26
Samuel (cf. also Ramathaim, Saul) 1Rg
2,1,11 507 508
O 2 52
O 21 3
Samuel among the prophets 1Rg 19
O 43 26
O 43 52
Samuel (anointed kings) 1Rg 16
1,2,1 319 Sir 46
O 2 88
O 33 10
O 43 73
Samuel (ephod / apron) 1Rg 2
2,1,12 653
Samuel's farewell address 1Rg 12
O 42 19
Samuel forgives Saul 1Rg 15
1,2,25 197 201
Samuel (Hannah's prayer is granted) 1Rg 1
1,2,2 465
1,2,10 535 539
2,1,1 424 432
2,1,11 87 92
O 2 49
O 2 77
O 15 9
O 33 10
O 40 17
O 43 73
ept 68 4 5
ept 69 6
Samuel (seer) 1Rg 9
O 18 24
Sapphira (cf. Ananias)
Sarah (cf. also Abraham) Gn 16
O 2 103
O 8 4
O 18 41
ept 90 1
Sarah calls Abraham « lord » Gn 18
ept 68 1 1P 3
Sarah (late motherhood) Gn 21
2,1,1 442
Saul (cf. also David)
Saul consults the spirit of Samuel 1Rg 28
O 4 54
Saul hides himself 1Rg 10
O 2 111
Saul looks for asses 1Rg 9
O 33 10
O 43 14
Saul prophesies among the prophets 1Rg 10
2,1,12 401
2,1,13 99
2,1,41 21
O 2 8
O 9 2
O 43 26
Sea obeys Matt.8
1,1,2 72
1,1,20 6
1,1,21 5 Mark 4
1,1,22 8 Luke 8
1,2,25 61 63
2,1,1 591 592
2,1,11 200 201

2.1.46 49 50
2.1.50 77 78
2.1,69 1 3
2.1,83 25 26
E 44 3
E 80 2
O 4 13
O 29 20
O 37 2
ept119 16
Sennacherib (cf. Rabshakeh)
Sermon on the Mount Matt.5
1,2.25 254
1,2.25 304 353
E 77 11
O 37 2
Serpent Gn 3
1.1.7 65 66
1.1,10 16 18
1.2,1 439 440
1,2.28 344 345
2.1.45 101 102
2,1.50 60
2,1,51 10 11
2,1.55 3 4
2.2.3 289 291
2.2.7 184 187
O 7 11
O 8 14
O 14 26
O 19 14
O 24 4
O 38 12
O 44 7
O 45 8
Serpent (head and heel) Gn 3
2.1.58 5 6
O 4 13
Seth Gn 4
1.1.3 33 41
O 30 20
O 31 11
O 39 12
Seven thousand have not bowed to Baal 3Rg 19
O 4 65 R 11
O 11 5 R 11
O 42 7 R 11
Sharon Is 33
O 5 29
Shepherds (cf. also angels) Luke 2
O 38 17
O 39 12
O 40 6
Shiloh Jos 18
O 42 26
Shimei (cf. David)
Sihon Nu 21
O 4 1
Siloam (cf. healing)
Silvanus 2Cor. 1
O 10 3
Simeon Luke 2
O 39 14
Simon of Cyrene Matt.27
O 45 24
Simon Peter N.T.
2.1,12 430
Simon Magus Act 8
2.1,11 1167
2,1,12 430
Sinai (inaccessible) Ex 19
1,1.1 10 13
1,1.9b 30
1,2.6 44 45
2,1,13 117 123
O 2 92
O 18 13
O 20 2
O 28 2
O 31 1
O 32 16
O 40 45
O 45 11
Sinai (theophany at) Ex 19
O 41 12
Sodom Gn 18
1.1,9b 16 17
1,2,1 132
1.2.1 448
1,2.14 88
1,2.29 210
2,1.13 207 208
2.1.21 11 12
2.1.55 14
2.2,3 269 272
E 95 1
O 4 18
O 5 4
O 16 14
O 16 16
O 33 3
O 33 14
O 36 5
O 38 13
O 40 19
O 40 36
O 42 7

O 43 67
O 45 9
epg 47 6
Sodom (do not look back) Gn 19
1,2,2 51 57
1,2,3 33 34
1,2,6 58 59
2,1,1 479 483
O 4 18
O 16 14
O 45 17
Sodom and Gomorrah Gn 18
O 21 7
Solomon (cf. also temple) 3Rg
O 21 3
Solomon (unfaithfulness) 3Rg 11
1,2,1 496 497
1,2,15 106
O 16 19
O 36 5
O 43 73
Solomon (wisdom) 3Rg 3
1,2,1 321 Sir 47
O 20 5
O 28 21
O 43 73
Spirit (Holy) (cf. Gift)
Star of Bethlehem Matt.2
1,1,5 53 64
1,2,34 198
O 5 5
Stephen Act 7
1,2,25 231 236
O 4 69
O 14 2
O 15 3
O 18 24
O 33 13
O 43 76
Susannah Sus
1,2,2 194 201
O 24 10
ept 69 6
Sword (flaming sword), guardian of Eden Gn3
1,1,8 118 122
2,1,63 6
2,1,88 164 165
O 43 70
epg 16 13 14
Tablets of stone Ex 31
1,2,1 133
1,2,14 89
1,2,22 290 292 2Cor.3
1,2,25 254
2,1,11 1207 2Cor.3
2,1,45 177 179 2Cor.3
O 4 107
O 14 27
O 28 2
O 40 45 2Cor.3
O 43 43
O 45 12
Taxes (paying taxes to Caesar) Matt.22
O 19 11
Temple (cleansing of the) John 2
O 21 31
O 38 18
Temple of Solomon 3Rg 6
2,1,13 137 138
Temple tax (money for the) Matt.17
2,2,1 339 340
O 19 13
O 29 20
Thecla ActPa
2,1,11 548 549
O 4 69
O 24 10
Thecla saved from the fire ActPa [illegible]
1,2,2 190
1,2,3 87
Thecla saved from the lions ActPa 3
1,2,2 190 193
1,2,3 87
Thecla (virgin) ActPa
1,2,10 916 918
Thomas John 20
O 40 38
The three young men Dn 1
1,2,2 177 180
1,2,10 633 635
1,2,14 61
2,1,1 8 9
2,1,11 676
2,1,14 62
2,1,51 35
O 4 65
O 5 40
O 11 5
O 15 6
O 15 11
O 24 10
O 27 3
O 43 74
Timothy 2Cor.1
O 10 3
Titus 2Cor.2
O 10 3

- Tobias the Ammonite 2Esr 12
  - O 25 12
- Transfiguration Matt.17
  - 1,1,20 23 24
  - 1,1,21 13 Mark 9
  - 1,1,22 12 Luke 9
  - 2,1,1 592
  - O 29 19
  - O 32 18
  - O 32 18
  - O 40 6
  - ept 65 1
- Unfaithful kings 3Rg
  - 1,1,9 22 24
- Uzzah 2Rg 6
  - 2,1,13 136 137
  - 2,1,34 101 102
  - O 2 93
  - O 20 3
- Widow's offering Mark 12
  - 1,1,1 6 7
  - O 13 1
  - O 19 8
- Widow's son (raising of) Luke 7
  - 2,1,19 97
- Wise men Matt.2
  - 1,1,2 65 66
  - 1,1,9 62 63
  - 1,2,34 199
  - o 14 40
  - o 19 12
  - o 29 19
  - o 38 17
  - o 39 14
  - o 40 6
- Women at empty tomb Matt.28
  - 2,1,45 223 224
  - 2,2,1 251 254
  - O 24 17
  - O 45 24
- Zacchaeus Luke 19
  - 1,2,10 574 578
  - 2,1,12 457 461
  - 2,1,19 93
  - 2,2,3 125
  - O 14 4
  - O 20 4
  - O 39 9
  - O 40 31
- Zebedee's sons Matt.4
  - O 18 24
  - O 43 76
- Zechariah Luke 1
  - 1,2,1 418 421
  - 1,2,3 24
  - O 6 7
- Zerubbabel Zch 4
  - O 41 3
- Zion (roads to Zion mourn) Thr 1
  - 2,1,6 1 2

2) PARABLES

- Abraham's bosom Luke 16
  - 2,1,89 35 37
  - O 7 17
  - ept 90 2
  - ept111 1
- Ask, and it will be given you Matt.7
  - 1,1,27 95 98 Luke 11
- Barren fig tree Luke 13
  - 1,1,26 13
  - 1,1,27 80 81
  - E 77 13
  - O 32 30
  - O 40 9
- Creditors Matt.18
  - 1,1,24 11
  - 1,1,27 86 87
  - E 77 11
  - O 17 11
  - O 40 31
- Two debtors Luke 7
  - 1,1,26 3 4
- Dishonest steward Luke 16
  - 1,1,26 17 18
  - 1,1,27 88 89
  - O 45 20
- Dragnet Matt.13
  - 1,1,24 9
  - 1,1,27 24 31
- Good Samaritan Luke 10
  - 1,1,26 5 6
  - 1,1,27 75 77
  - 2,1,1 367 392
  - O 14 37
  - O 29 20
- Hireling vs. good shepherd John 10
  - 2,1,11 1076 1077
- House built on rock / sand Matt.7
  - 1,1,24 2
  - 1,1,26 2 Luke 6
  - 1,1,27 1 2
  - 1,2,2 371 372
  - O 2 73

Labourers in the vineyard Matt.20

1,1,24	12	
1,1,27	32	35
2,1,45	219	220
O 40	20	21
ept 60	3	4

Leaven Matt.13

1,1,24	5	6
1,1,26	14	Luke 13

Lost coin Luke 15

1,1,26	15	
1,1,27	82	85

Lost sheep Matt.18

1,1,24	10	
1,1,26	15	Luke 15
1,1,27	82	85 Luke 15
2,1,46	46	
2,2,3	111	115

Marriage feast Matt.22

1,1,24	15	
1,1,26	14	Luke 14
1,1,27	43	50 Luke 14
1,2,2	389	396 Luke 14
O 2	77	
O 3	4	
O 40	46	

Master returns when not expected Matt.24

1,1,26	11	12 Luke 12
1,1,27	62	66 Luke 12
1,2,2	397	401 Luke 12

Mustard seed Matt.13

1,1,24	5	
1,1,25	4	Mark 4
1,1,26	14	Luke 13
1,1,27	15	17
O 42	9	

Pearl of Great Price Matt.13

1,1,24	7	8
1,1,27	18	22
2,2,3	273	274
2,2,7	331	
O 6	5	
O 17	7	
O 19	1	

Pharisee and tax collector Luke 18

1,1,26	20	
1,1,27	92	93
1,2,17	39	40
2,1,1	393	413
2,1,19	92	
2,2,3	116	120
O 19	8	
O 39	17	
O 40	19	
O 43	64	

Prodigal son Luke 15

1,1,26	16	
1,1,27	82	85
2,1,46	44	
2,2,3	105	110
2,2,3	147	

Ten pounds Luke 19

1,1,26	21	
1,1,27	101	106

Rich fool Luke 12

1,1,26	9	10
1,1,27	98	100
1,2,28	70	84
O 14	18	
O 16	18	

Rich man and Lazarus Luke 16

1,1,26	18	
1,1,27	90	91
1,2,2	138	140
1,2,28	362	369
2,1,1	577	581
2,2,2	14	
2,2,3	148	151
O 14	34	
O 16	9	
O 19	11	
O 26	6	
O 36	12	
O 40	31	
O 41	12	

Seven unclean spirits Matt.12

1,1,26	8	9
1,1,27	78	79 Luke 11
O 40	35	
O 43	44	

Sheep and goats Matt.25

1,1,24	18	
1,1,27	67	70
2,2,1	212	224

Sower Matt.13

1,1,24	3	
1,1,25	2	Mark 4
1,1,26	4	5 Luke 8
1,1,27	3	6
1,2,2	373	375
2,1,11	1258	1272
O 2	73	
O 4	11	
O 28	1	

Two sons and the vineyard Matt.21

1,1,24	13	
1,1,27	36	41

Talents Matt.25		
1,1,24	17	
1,1,27	101	106
E 183	6	
O 6	9	
O 10	3	
O 26	5	
O 32	1	
Tares Matt.13		
1,1,24	4	
1,1,25	3	Mark??
1,1,27	7	14
1,2,2	376	377
O 9	3	
O 19	14	
O 32	6	
O 40	34	
Treasure hidden in a field Matt.13		
1,1,24	6	7
1,1,27	20	23
1,2,17	5	
Unexpected question Luke 11		
1,1,26	6	7
Vineyard and wicked tenants Matt.21		
1,1,24	14	Matt.21
1,1,25	4	Mark 12
1,1,26	22	Luke 20
1,1,27	42	
Ten virgins Matt.25		
1,1,24	16	
1,1,27	51	61
1,2,2	378	388
1,2,3	97	99
2,2,1	225	228
2,2,4	201	
2,2,5	262	
O 5	30	
O 16	9	
O 40	46	
O 43	62	
Widow and the unjust judge Luke 18		
1,1,26	19	
1,1,27	94	95
E 186	4	

3) CHRISTIAN HISTORY

Constantine		
1,2,15	95	
Constantius		
1,2,25	290	303
Diaspora		
O 6	16	18
O 36	5	
Julian		
1,2,1	457	460
O 36	5	
Marcion		
O 41	2	
Martyrs		
1,2,10	697	732
O 15	11	
Persecutors of Christians		
1,2,1	455	456
O 4	96	
Simon		
O 41	2	

PAGAN MATERIAL

1) HISTORICAL

Academy		
1,2,10	207	
O 7	20	
O 25	6	
Aglaophon		
O 28	25	
Alcmaeon with Croesus		
1,2,10	294	305
Alexander and Porus		
O 4	41	
Alexander and the female slaves		
1,2,10	818	822
Alexander spares the city		
1,2,25	270	277
Alexander vs. Athenians		
E 189	1	
Alexander's death		
1,2,15	91	92
Anaxagoras		
O 4	72	
O 7	20	
Anaxarchus' martyr's death		
1,2,10	688	691
2,1,17	60	
E 32	8	9
O 4	70	
epg 4	2	4
Antimachus		

E 54 1
Antisthenes
2,1,11 1032
O 4 72
O 25 7
Aphrodite (worship)
1,2,10 844 845
2,2,7 277 278
Apollo (oracle in Delphi)
O 4 121
Archelaus (cf. Aristippus)
Archelaus, Sophocles, Euripides
1,2,10 335 340
Arganthonius
E 240 2
Aristagoras (cf. Histiaeus)
Aristaeus
2,2,7 286 290
O 4 59
ept 70 2 3
Aristides (Dikaios)
1,2,10 341 349
Aristippus, Plato, Archelaus
1,2,10 323 334
Aristippus smells of myrrh
1,2,10 319 322
Aristotle
1,2,10 47 49
2,1,12 304
O 4 72
O 7 20
O 23 12
O 27 10
O 32 25
Aristotle restrains anger
1,2,25 261 270
Artaxerxes (cf. Cyrus)
Artemis' cult in Sparta
2,2,7 272 273
O 4 70
O 4 103
O 39 4
Artemis' cult in Tauris
2,2,7 275
O 4 70
O 4 103
O 14 29
O 28 15
O 39 4
O 43 8
Artimisium of Ephesus
O 43 63
epg 50 2
Athenian choice of profession
E 178 1 2
Athenian delegation to Sparta
E 90 1 2
Babylon (gardens)
epg 50 2
Babylon (walls)
O 43 63
epg 1 1
epg 50 1
Calais
2,1,12 742 743
Callimachus (painter)
2,1,12 742 745
Callimachus (soldier)
E 233 1
E 235 4
Carus
O 5 8
Cassotis
2,1,41 18
Castalia
2,1,41 18
2,2,7 256
O 5 32
O 39 5
Celts test offspring in Rhine
1,2,29 221
2,2,4 141 143
Cercidas
1,2,10 595 600
Charmides (eromene Socrates)
1,2,10 288
Chrysippus
2,1,12 304
O 4 43
O 32 25
Cleanthes
1,2,10 604 611
O 7 20
Cleanthes drawing water from a well
1,2,10 286
O 4 72
Cleobulus (one of the wise men)
2,1,11 1239
Cleombrotus' suicide
1,2,10 680 683
O 4 70
Colossus of Rhodes
O 43 63
epg 50 1
Crates
2,1,11 1033
Crates «liberated himself»
1,2,10 228 235

  - O 4 72
  - O 43 60
- Crates (polygamy)
  - O 25 7
- Crates (possessions overboard)
  - 1.2.10 236 243
  - 2.1.11 671 673
  - 2.1.12 596 597
- Crates (simplicity)
  - O 7 10
- Croesus (cf. also Alcmaeon)
  - O 4 72
  - 1.2.10 33
  - 1.2.15 89
  - 2.1.12 435
- Cynegirus
  - E 233 1
  - E 235 4
- Cynics
  - O 25 6
  - O 27 10
- Cynic (possessions overboard)
  - 1.2.10 244 258
- Cyrnus (cf. Theognis)
- Cyrus
  - 1.2.10 34 35
  - 1.2.15 89
  - 2.1.12 434 435
- Cyrus and Artaxerxes
  - O 5 13
- Cyrus and Zopyrus
  - O 5 11
- Cyrus (?) opens tomb
  - epg 84 1 3
- Daphne (oracle)
  - 2.1.41 17
  - 2.2.7 256
- Darius (cf. Cyrus?)
- Democritus
  - O 7 20
  - O 27 10
  - O 42 22
- Democritus the laughing philosopher
  - 1.2.15 79 80
- Demosthenes
  - 1.2.10 40
- Diogenes
  - 2.1.11 1032
  - E 98 1
- Diogenes endures fever
  - E 32 2
- Diogenes lived in a barrel
  - 1.2.10 218 227
  - O 4 72
  - O 43 60
- Diogenes (sesame bread)
  - 1.2.10 276 281
  - O 25 7
- Diogenes taunts prostitutes
  - 1.2.25 494 497
- Dion the stinking mouth
  - 1.2.10 808 817
- Dodona
  - 2.2.7 256
  - O 5 32
  - O 39 5
- Eleusis
  - 2.2.7 260 261
- Empedocles' suicide
  - 2.2.7 281 290
  - O 4 59
  - ept 69 1 2
- Empedotimus' sham deification
  - 2.2.7 286 290
  - O 4 59
  - ept 70 1 3
- Epaminondas
  - O 4 71
- Epidaurus (Asclepius)
  - 2.2.7 259
- Epictetus' martyr's death
  - 1.2.10 684 687
  - E 32 10
  - O 4 70
  - epg 4 1 3
- Epicurus
  - O 4 72
  - O 7 20
  - O 25 6
  - O 27 10
  - O 28 8
- Epicurus lived in a controlled way
  - 1.2.10 787 792
- Eristics
  - 1.2.10 45 46
- Euclides
  - 1.2.25 285 289
  - O 7 20
  - O 28 25
- Euphranor
  - 2.1.12 740 741
- Euphron as model
  - 1.2.10 869
- Euripides (cf. Archelaus)
- Fabricius and Pyrrhus
  - 1.2.10 350 364
- Galen
  - O 7 20

Galloi (cult Cybele)
O 22 12
Gyges
1,2,10 31 33
2,1,88 7 12
O 4 94
O 43 21
Hadrian
O 5 8
Helicon
epg 25 3
Heraclitus
O 7 20
Heraclitus the weeping philosopher
1,2,15 79 80
O 4 72
Hermas
2,2,7 136
Herodotus
O 4 92
Heron
O 7 20
Hesiod
2,1,41 15 17
2,2,7 241 242
O 4 115
Hippocrates
O 7 20
Histaeus and Aristagoras
O 5 15
Holy Games
1,2,10 758 763
2,2,5 254 256
O 15 9
O 24 19
O 25 2
Homer
1,2,10 42
1,2,10 396 406
2,1,41 15 16
2,2,7 242
E 54 1
E 71 5
O 4 72
Lais as model
1,2,10 871 872
Lamachus
E 233 1
Leaina as model
1,2,10 869
Lycurgus
1,2,10 41
Lysias
E 180 2
Marathon
E 235 4
E 233 1
Mausolus' grave
O 43 63
epg 50 2
epg 57 1 2
Midas
1,2,10 392
1,2,10 407 411
1,2,28 148 150
2,1,12 435
2,1,88 13 17
epg 34 1 3
O 43 21
Milon
1,2,25 126
Miltiades
E 233 1
Olympias (cf. Zeus, mythol.)
Orphici
O 27 10
Parrhasius
O 28 25
Pericles
1,2,25 278 284
Peripatus
1,2,10 206
O 4 43
O 25 6
Perses (cf. Hesiod)
Phalaris
E 32 7
O 4 91
Phidias
O 28 25
Phidias' inscription
1,2,10 863 864
Phryne as model
1,2,10 869
Plato (cf. also Aristippus and Cleombrotus)
1,2,10 43 44
2,1,11 1033 1034
2,1,12 305
O 4 43
O 7 20
O 27 10
O 28 16
O 28 30
O 32 25
Plato redeemed
1,2,10 315 318
Plato swears by a plane tree

- 1,2,24 306 310
- Plato? (trader in oil)
  - 1,2,10 306 312
- Plato with Dionysius
  - 1,2,10 313 314
  - O 4 72
- Polemon and the prostitute
  - 1,2,10 793 807
- Polygnotus
  - O 28 25
- Polycletus
  - 2,1,12 740 741
- Polycrates
  - 2,1,34 193 204
  - 2,2,3 42 46
- Porus (cf. Alexander)
- Ptolemaeus
  - O 7 20
- Pyramids
  - O 43 63
  - epg 1 2
  - epg 50 2
- Pyrrhon
  - 2,1,12 303
  - O 7 20
  - O 21 12
  - O 32 25
- Pyrrhus (cf. Fabricius)
- Pythagoras
  - E 198 1
- Pythagoreans
  - O 4 70
  - O 4 102
  - O 27 10
  - O 41 2
- Pythia
  - 2,1,11 1036 1037
  - 2,1,41 17
  - O 5 32
  - O 39 5
  - epg 25 4
- Salamis
  - E 233 1
  - E 235 4
- Sardanapalus
  - 1,2,10 612 616
- Sceptics
  - 1,2,10 47 49
  - 1,2,10 207 208
- Scipio
  - O 4 71
- Sextus Empiricus
  - 2,1,12 303
  - O 21 12
- Socrates (pederasty)
  - 1,2,10 286 293
  - O 4 72
- Socrates (poisoned cup)
  - 1,2,10 692 693
  - E 32 11
  - O 4 70
- Socrates (Potidaea)
  - O 4 72
- Socrates refuses exile
  - 1,2,28 355
- Socrates (wisest man)
  - 2,1,11 1035 1037
- Solon
  - 1,2,10 41
  - O 4 72
- Sophocles (cf. Archelaus)
- Speusippus? (oil trade)
  - 1,2,10 308 312
- Stoa
  - 1,2,10 206
  - 2,1,11 1034
  - O 4 43
  - O 7 20
  - O 25 6
  - O 27 10
  - O 28 8
- Theano
  - O 4 70
- Thebe
  - O 43 63
- Theognis (teaches Cyrnus)
  - 1,2,10 393 395
- Thucydides
  - O 4 92
- Trajan
  - O 5 8
- Trophonius
  - 2,2,7 286 290
  - O 4 59
  - O 39 5
  - ept 70 1 3
- Valerianus
  - O 5 8
- Xenocrates and the prostitute
  - 1,2,10 778 786
- Xenocrates' gluttony
  - O 4 72
- Xerxes (bridged Hellespont)
  - E 5 5
  - O 43 45
  - epg 1 3
- Xerxes (golden plane tree)
  - E 6 5

Xerxes (ships over land)
  epg 1 3 4
  O 43 45
Zeno
  O 4 72
Zeus' statue in Olympia
  epg 50 2
Zeuxis
  2.1,12 740 741
  O 28 25
Zopyrus (cf. Cyrus)

2) FABLES

H = Aesop, ed. HAUSRATH
P = Babrius and Phaedrus, ed. PERRY
PA = idem, appendix (*Aesopica*)
Hes. = Hesiod, *Erga* vv.202-211
Chr. = aetiological legend with closest parallel in Choeroboscus, cfr. LEFHERZ pp.46-52.
? = origin unknown or Gregory's creation

Aphrodite and Momus PA 455
  1,2,2 246 247
Bee and its sting H 172
  1.2.25 299 303
Bending lobster P 109
  1,2.28 338 339
Blush of shame ?
  1.2.29 187 210
Cat as bride H 50 P 44-46
  2.1.12 698 708
Crow loses feathers H 103
  1.2.29 55 58
  O 4 107
Dung beetle H 3
  2.1,12 170 171
Eagle is most beautiful ?
  O 51 7
Fat and lean cow H 270
  1.1,6 88 96
Nightingale and hawk Hes.
  2.2,3 92 96
Nobleman and virtuous one ?
  1,2,26 1 6
Oak and reed-stem H 71
  1,2,8 89 90
Old woman creates verses Chr.
  O 4 108
Owl is mocked ?
  1,2,28 232 249
Serpent and farmer H 62
  2,1,88 136 140
Swallows and swans ?
  E 114 2 5

3) MYTHOLOGY

Abaris
  1,2,10 50 51
  E 2 1
  O 43 21
Acheron
  O 5 38
Achilles
  1.2,2 129 133
  2,2,3 134 136
  E 176 3
  O 43 12
Achilles and Patroclus
  E 71 5
Achilles' death
  1.2.15 86
Achilles' horses
  E 166 2
  E 240 3
Acis (cf. Polyphemus)
Actaeon
  2,2,3 60 61
  O 43 8
Actoriones (= Molionids)
  E 156 2
Adonis (garden of)
  1,2,29 53
Aeacids
  1,2,15 85 86
  2,2,4 122 123
  O 43 3
Aeneas carries Anchises
  2,2,5 85 86
Agamemnon
  1,2,10 36
  1,2,15 86
  1,2,15 94
  2,2,4 129
Agave and Pentheus
  2,2,3 54 57
Aias the Great's death

1.2.15 85 86
Aias the Lesser?
1.2.15 86
Alcinous
1,2,2 131
2,2,3 140 141
E 5 2
Alcmaeonidae
O 43 3
Alcmene (cf. also Zeus)
ept 27 4
Aloadae
E 12 3
Alpheus
1.2.2 596 599
1.2.9 22 24
1.2,10 826
2.1,11 217 218
O 43 21
Ammon
2,2.7 258
Amphion
2,1,41 47
2,2.5 195 196
Anchises (cf. Aeneas)
Antiope (cf. Zeus)
Aphrodite
1,2.10 588
1,2.10 861 862
1.2.29 185
O 4 103
O 5 32
O 39 4
Aphrodite (ribbon)
E 52 2
Apis
2,2,7 271
O 5 32
O 34 5
O 39 5
Apollo
1,2.10 375
2.2.7 93
2.2.7 253 255
O 5 32
O 21 36
Apollo Loxias
O 4 122
Ares
1.2,2 496
2.2,11 753
2.1,51 9
2.1,88 48
2,2,7 93
E 48 6
O 4 122
O 28 15
Ares and Aphrodite
1,2.10 838 839
2.2.7 94
O 4 116
O 5 32
O 28 15
Argo
2.1,34 71
Ariadne
O 28 25
Ariadne (wreath)
O 5 5
Arion
2,2,5 234 237
Artemis
O 4 122
O 21 36
O 43 8
Asclepius Ophiouchos
O 5 5
Astarte
O 16 19
O 40 42
Athena
O 5 32
Athena's birth (cf. also Zeus)
O 39 4
Athena (eyes of an owl)
1,2,28 238
Athena (flute)
O 5 22
Athena and Tydeus
1,2,2 271
Augias
E 5 5
Baubo
O 4 115
Berenice (lock of hair)
O 5 5
Branchidae
2.2,7 259
Briareos
2,1,17 70
O 4 115
O 18 6
Brontes
ept 5 4
Byblis
ept 18 2
Callisto (cf. Zeus)
Calydonian hunt

  1.2.15 83 84
  2.1.34 72
Cecropids
  2.2.4 130 131
  O 43 3
Cecrops
  ept 5 1
Celeus & Triptolemus
  1.2.10 846 847
  E 96 1
  O 4 108
  O 5 31
  O 39 4
Cerberus
  O 4 94
  O 4 115
Charites
  ept 31 3
  ept 33 3
  ept 34 2
  ept 35 1 5
  ept 36 4
  ept105 3
Charybdis (cf. also Odysseus)
  1.2.28 140
  O 4 94
Chimaera
  O 4 94
  O 4 115
Chiron
  2.2.3 168
  2.2.6 99
  O 43 12
Cimmerians
  1.2.2 605
  E 4 4
Circe (cf. also Odysseus)
  1.2.29 104 106
Cocytus
  O 5 38
Comaetho and Cydnus
  1.2.29 157 160
  2.1.1 91
Corybants
  2.2.7 263
Cottus
  O 4 115
Ctesippus (cf. Odysseus)
Cybele
  2.2.7 267
Cydnus (cf. Comaetho)
Cyclopes
  O 4 108
Daedalus
  O 28 25
Daedalus and Pasiphae
  1.2.29 165 168
Danae (cf. also Zeus)
  1.2.29 139 141
Daphne
  O 5 32
Demeter
  E 96 1
  O 4 108
  O 39 4
Deucalion (cf. Prometheus)
Diallage
  O 21 36
Dike
  2.1.11 828
  epg 44 3
  epg 45 1
  epg 69 5
  epg 94 2
  epg 94 3
  ept 53 2
Dike leaves the earth
  1.2.2 485
  2.1.13 174
  epg 86 4
  epg 87 3 4
Diomedes (cf. Glaucus)
Dionysus
  1.2.2 496
  2.2.7 94
  O 4 122
  O 5 32
  O 28 15
  O 39 4
Dionysus' birth
  O 39 4
Dionysus (thiasus)
  1.2.10 846 856
  2.2.7 104 105
  2.2.7 264
  O 39 4
Echetus
  O 4 91
Echo (cf. Pan)
Egyptian gods
  2.1.11 838 843
Eirene
  O 21 36
Elysian Fields
  O 5 20
  O 43 23
  ept 36 8
Empusa

2,1,47 1 2
Enceladus
2,1,11 1404 1406
O 4 85
O 4 115
epg 43 1 2
Enyo
2,2,3 232
Erebus
ept 40 4
Erichthonius
2,2,7 104
Ericapeus
O 4 115
Erinus
2,2,3 13
2,2,3 228
2,2,3 303
O 18 31
Erinyes
epg 71 1
Eros
1,2,1 588 591
1,2,2 501
2,2,7 33 36
2,2,7 97
ept 34 4
Erotes
E 231 3
ept 29 3
Euboule (cf. Leos)
Eumaeus (cf. Odysseus)
Eumelius
E 10 8
Eunomius
E 175 2
Europa (cf. Zeus)
Eurystheus
E 52 2
Galatea (cf. Polyphemus)
Ganymedes (cf. Zeus)
Giants
1,2,1 303
E 12 1
O 4 115
O 27 9
O 43 26
epg 1 6
epg 74 1
Glaucus (sea-god)
E 28 1 2
Glaucus and Diomedes
1,2,2 127
Golden generation
ept 31 1
Gorgons
O 4 115
Gyges (» giant «)
O 4 115
Hades (cf. also Zeus)
1,2,2 144
1,2,16 20
1,2,25 527
1,2,34 220
2,1,11 1249
2,1,32 27
2,1,38 41
2,1,47 22
2,1,62 4
E 4 5
O 6 1 Ps 140,7
O 16 7
O 43 75
O 45 1
O 45 24
ept 18 6
ept 40 6
Hades' helmet
O 4 94
Hecabe
1,2,29 42
O 15 4
Hecabe's imprisonment?
2,1,1 229 234
Hecate
2,2,7 265
O 39 5
Helen (cf. also Trojan war)
1,2,29 42
O 4 116
Helen with Polydamna
2,2,5 200 202
E 70 4
Heliads, Phaethon's sisters
ept 18 1
Hephaestus
2,2,7 93
O 4 122
O 5 32
Hera (cf. also Zeus)
O 21 36
Heracles
2,1,11 975
2,1,32 20 21
2,1,34 72
2,1,88 50
2,1,93
2,2,7 286 290

  E 52 2
  E 156 1
  epg 88 1 2
  ept 70 1 3
Heracles and the lion
  O 5 5
Heracles and Thestius' daughters
  O 4 77
  O 4 122
Heracles Bouthoinas
  2.2.7 278
  O 4 77
  O 4 103
  O 4 122
Heracles (delirious)
  O 5 32
Heracles' dog discovers purple
  O 4 108
Heracles Melampygus
  O 4 77
Heracles' pillars
  1.2.28 334 335
  O 5 42
Heracles (stake)
  1.2.15 87 88
  O 4 70
Heracles Triesperus
  O 4 77
Heraclides
  O 43 3
Hermaphroditus
  1.2.10 851
  O 5 32
Hermes
  1.2.2 496
  2.2.7 94
  O 4 101
  O 4 121
  O 5 32
  O 14 29
  O 21 36
Hermes (moly)
  2.2.5 196 199
Hermes Trisaristus
  2.2.7 245 246
Hermes Trismegistus
  O 28 4
Homeric heroes
  2.1.32 17 24
Hundred-handed giants
  O 5 19
Hydra
  2.1.11 1178 1179
  E 156 1
  O 4 94
  O 4 115
Hymenaeus
  ept 33 3
Icarius
  O 4 108
Icarus
  1.1.1 2 3
  1.2.1 377 379
  1.2.2 314
  O 32 24
  epg 88 1
Io
  2.1.11 350 351
Iolaus
  E 156 1
Iphigenia
  2.1.11 863
  O 4 70
  O 43 8
Irus
  1.2.15 94
Isis
  2.2.7 269
  O 5 32
  O 34 5
  O 39 5
Ithaca (cf. Odysseus)
Itys (cf. Tereus)
Ixion
  1.1.8 38
  O 5 38
Kore
  O 39 4
Kouretes
  O 39 4
Kronos (cf. also Zeus)
  1.2.2 497
  O 4 115
  O 31 16
Kronos (castrates Ouranos)
  O 4 121
Labyrinth
  O 43 23
Leda (cf. also Zeus)
  O 5 3
Leos' daughters
  1.2.10 676 677
Lethe
  2.1.10 25
Linus
  2.2.7 243 244
Lotophagi
  E 5 2

Lyssa		
1,2,2	39	
Maenad		
1,2,29	8	
2,1,47	1	2
Medea		
2,2,3	58	59
Melampus		
2,1,12	729	731
O 4	82	
Meleager		
2,2,4	122	123
Menoeceus		
1,2,10	678	679
O 4	70	
Minos		
O 4	79	
O 43	23	
Mithras		
2,2,7	265	266
O 39	5	
Moira		
ept 26	3	
Molionids		
O 43	22	
Momos		
1,2,2	31	36
1,2,2	246	
2,1,12	542	
2,2,1	368	
E 10	2	
O 43	28	
epg 15	12	
epg 16	16	
Musaeus		
2,2,7	243	244
Muses		
1,2,10	42	
2,1,41	15	16
2,2,3	211	
E 10	1	
ept 30	2	
ept 33	3	
ept 34	1	
ept 35	1	5
ept105	3	
Narcissus		
1,2,29	155	156
2,2,3	52	53
Nausicaa (cf. Odysseus)		
Nestor		
2,1,1	127	
E 52	1	
E 239	2	

Niobe		
O 43	9	
ept 18	1	
Oceanus and Tethys		
O 4	115	
O 31	16	
Odysseus		
1,2,2	138	140
2,1,12	746	
E 5	2	
E 10	8	
E 190	1	
E 209	1	
Odysseus and Circe		
2,2,5	196	199
Odysseus and Ctesippus		
O 5	39	
Odysseus and Eumaeus		
1,1,1	6	7
Odysseus and Nausicaa		
1,2,10	401	406
2,2,5	203	213
Odysseus and the Sirens		
1,2,33	65	66
Odysseus (underworld)?		
epg 88	1	
Odysseus via Scylla and Charybdis to Ithaca		
2,2,7	148	150
Orestes and Pylades		
O 43	22	
Orion		
O 43	8	
Orpheus		
1,2,29	169	170
2,1,41	46	
2,2,3	212	214
2,2,5	193	194
2,2,7	241	
O 4	115	
O 5	31	
O 39	5	
Orpheus (underworld)?		
epg 88	1	
Osiris		
2,2,7	269	
O 34	5	
O 39	5	
Pactolus		
2,2,1	263	264
Palamedes		
O 4	107	
O 28	25	
Pan		

  1,2,10 851 852
  2,2,7 104
  O 4 77
  O 5 32
Pan and Echo
  1,2,29 153 154
  2,2,3 207 210
Pandion (cf. Tereus)
Pandora
  1,2,1 627
  1,2,29 115 126
Pasiphae (cf. Daedalus)
Patroclus
  E 166 2
  O 7 16
Patroclus (burial games)
  1,2,1 430 431
Pegasus
  1,2,10 50
  O 43 21
Peirithous
  O 4 77
Peirithous (underworld)?
  epg 88 1
Pelopids
  2,2,4 128
  O 43 3
Pelops
  E 38 1
  O 4 70
  O 39 5
Penelope
  1,2,2 3
Penelope's loom
  1,2,29 41
Pentheus (cf. Agave)
Persephone (cf. Zeus)
Phaethon
  1,2,9 94
  2,1,38 15 16
  2,2,7 49
Phaeacians (cf. Odysseus)
Phanes
  O 4 115
  O 31 16
Phasithea (cf. Leos)
Philoctetes?
  2,1,1 235 240
Philoetius
  O 5 39
Philomela (cf. Tereus)
Phoenix
  1,2,2 526 530
  O 31 10
Phthonos
  1,2,2 50
  1,2,9 38
  2,1,10 7
  2,1,11 1506
  2,1,17 51
  2,1,18 3
  2,1,34 189
  2,1,36 6
  2,1,37 5
  2,2,1 119 120
  epg 14 6
  ept 5 7
  ept 6 6
  ept 11 3
  ept 21 3
  ept 28 5
  ept 30 4
  ept 33 4
  ept 35 3
Plutus
  1,2,10 389 390
  1,2,10 443 445
  1,2,28 377
Polydamna (cf. Helen)
Polyphemus
  O 5 39
Polyphemus, Acis, Galatea
  1,2,25 135 138
Poseidon (cf. Zeus)
  O 5 31
Priam?
  2,1,1 127
Priam at Achilles
  2,1,17 65 66
Priapus
  O 5 32
Procne (cf. Tereus)
  O 31 16
Prometheus
  2,1,13 85
  O 5 38
Prometheus (?) (liver)
  ept 40 3
Prometheus and Deucalion
  epg 88 2
Prosymnus
  2,2,7 276 277
  O 5 32
  O 39 4
Proteus
  2,1,11 808
  2,1,12 728
  2,1,83 10

  O 4   62
  O 4   82
Pylades (cf. Orestes)
Pyriphlegethon
  1.2.14   103
  2.1.43   29
  2.1.76   3
  O 5   38
  ept 40   4
Rhadamanthys
  O 5   20
  O 43   23
Rhea (Cybele)
  2.2.7   262
  O 4   103
  O 28   15
  O 39   4
Rhodes (rain of gold)
  epg 90   1
Salmoneus
  O 5   8
Sarapis
  2.2.7   270
  O 34   5
Sciron
  epg 43   1
Scylla (cf. also Odysseus)
  O 4   94
Selloi
  O 4   71
Semele (cf. also Dionysus)
  O 5   32
  O 39   4
Sibylla
  2.2.7   246   247
Signs of the zodiac
  1.2.27   17
Sirens (cf. Odysseus)
Sisyphus
  ept 46   4
Scedasus' daughters
  O 4   70
Spartoi
  2.2.4   127   128
  E 38   1
  O 27   9
Tantalus
  2.2.7   152
  O 5   38
  O 40   24
Tantalus (boulder)
  E 4   11
  ept 40   2
Tantalus (thirst)
  ept 40   1
  E 5   1
  E 70   1
Tartarus
  1.1.35   9
  1.2.14   103
  1.2.25   531
  1.2.28   341
  2.1.73   3
  2.2.5   125
  epg 93   31
  epg 94   1
  epg 94   3
  ept 40   5
Telchines
  E 190   4
  O 4   101
Telephus
  1.2.10   289
  2.1.11   1240
  2.1.12   662
  2.1.39   102
  E 165   7
Tereus, Procne, Philomele
  E 114   3
Themis
  ept 42   4
  ept 46   1
Theopea (cf. Leos)
Thersites
  O 5   32
Theseus (bull)
  O 5   5
Theseus (underworld)?
  epg 88   1
Thestius (cf. Heracles)
Thon (cf. Polydamna)
Titans
  O 4   115
  epg 75   1
Tityus
  O 5   38
Tityus (?) (liver)
  ept 40   3
Triptolemus (cf. Celeus)
  O 4   108
Trojan war
  1.2.15   81   82
  2.1.34   71
  O 4   107
Tyche
  1.2.10   242
Typhoeus
  1.2.25   134

  - epg 43 1 4
- Zalmoxis
  - 2,2,7 274 275
- Zeus
  - 1,2,1 103
  - O 4 115
  - O 4 117
  - O 21 36
- Zeus against Kronos
  - 1,2,2 497
  - 2,2,7 93
  - O 4 121
  - O 39 4
- Zeus and Alcmene
  - 1,2,2 500
  - 1,2,10 841
  - 2,2,7 96
- Zeus and Antiope
  - 1,2,10 841
- Zeus and Callisto
  - 2,2,7 96
- Zeus and Danae
  - 1,2,2 500
  - 1,2,10 842
  - 2,2,7 96
- Zeus and Europa
  - 1,2,2 500
  - 1,2,10 841
  - 2,2,7 96
- Zeus and Ganymedes
  - 1,2,2 500
  - 1,2,10 833 837
  - 2,2,7 94
  - O 4 122
- Zeus and Hera
  - O 4 115
- Zeus and Leda
  - 1,2,2 500
  - 1,2,10 841
  - 2,2,7 96
- Zeus and Olympias
  - 1,2,2 500
  - 1,2,10 842
  - 1,2,15 91
  - 2,2,7 96
- Zeus and Persephone
  - 1,2,2 500
  - 1,2,10 842
  - 2,2,7 96
  - O 5 31
  - O 39 4
- Zeus at Ethiopians
  - O 4 122
- Zeus (birth Athena)
  - 1,2,28 237
- Zeus Ephestius
  - 1,2,2 344
- Zeus, Hades, Poseidon
  - O 28 15
  - O 31 16
- Zeus (metamorphoses)
  - O 4 122
  - O 5 32
  - O 28 15
  - O 39 4
- Zeus throws thunderbolts
  - 1,2,25 119
  - 1,2,25 239
- Zeus Xenius
  - O 21 36
  - epg 65 1

4) LITERARY CHARACTERS

- Agoracritus
  - E 178 7
- Hecale
  - 1,2,2 172 176
- Thrasonides
  - 2,1,12 137 138

INVENTORY III

TRADITIONAL ORDER OF THE BIBLE (LXX AND N.T.)

In the preceding inventory, the biblical material was subdivided (historical and parable) and alphabetically classified; this can be useful for retrieving characters who occur in several Bible books, or of whom one does not immediately know the correct location in the Bible. The disadvantage of this order is of course that episodes which belong together are separated, and that the traceability of an episode depends on the chosen keyword: dependent on Gregory's line of approach. I have sometimes attached several keywords to one and the same Bible reminiscence, e.g. *Adam (Creation)* = *Creation of man; The rich man and Lazarus* = *Abraham's bosom*. When departing from a Bible passage (in the above cases respectively Gn 1,26–28 and Luke 16,19–31), one will find the (possibly divergent) keywords here. Moreover, this classification provides a clear survey of the Bible books and histories which were used most by Gregory.

Inventory 3 includes the following information:

* the *complete biblical reference* (for the O.T. to the LXX!); the four columns with numbers refer to respectively (opening) chapter, (opening) verse, closing chapter, closing verse. Genesis 1 26 3 thus signifies Gn chpt 1,26 to chpt 3;

1	26		28	Gn 1,26–28;
2	9	3	6	Gn 2,9 - 3,6;
12		15		Gn chpt 12 to chpt 15.

* the chosen *keyword(s)* for the passage in question;

* possible *other Bible passages* (only book and chapter) in which the character / history is the subject of the story or is merely mentioned and which have been used by Gregory in certain parts of his text as an (additional) source of inspiration (see also inventory 2). As a rule, in these cases, the main entry (with full reference) is the earliest location in the traditional order of the Bible books: this explains why, of all synoptics, Matthew provides most entries (the first impression about Luke and especially Mark who would be used only rarely by Gregory, should hence be thoroughly modified).

* an indication of the *locations* in Gregory: only poem, epistle or oration, especially to give an idea of the frequency in Gregory's œuvre: for the precise indication of verse or chapter, inventory 2 provides the necessary information.

SEPTUAGINT

GENESIS

1				Creation 1,1,31; O 5; O 41
1	26	3		Adam (the first) 1,1,10; 2,1,46; O 45
1	26		28	Adam (creation) **Gn 2** 1,1,2; O 29; O 31; O 39; O 43
				Creation of man **Gn 2** 1,1,8; 1,2,1; 1,2,12; 2,1,46; 2,2,5; O 38; O 45
2	7		17	Adam (alone) 1,2,1; 1,2,3
2	7		25	Eden 1,1,8; 1,2,10; 1,2,14; E 4; O 38; O 45; O 45
2	9	3	6	Tree of life 1,2,1; 1,2,3; 1,2,28; 1,2,29; 2,1,45; 2,1,46; 2,1,88; O 10; O 16; O 19; O 38; O 39; O 44; O 44; O 45
2	21		22	Eve (made from rib) 1,1,3; O 31
2	23		24	Adam and Eve 1,2,1
3				Eve 1,2,1; 1,2,34; 2,1,1; 2,1,45; 2,2,1; E 203; O 8; O 18; O 37; O 44; O 45
3	1		6	Adam (seduced) 1,1,4; 1,1,8; 1,1,9; 1,1,9; 1,2,14; 1,2,15; 2,1,11; 2,1,12; 2,1,13; 2,1,45; 2,1,54; 2,1,58; 2,1,60; 2,1,63; 2,1,83; 2,1,88; O 24; O 36; O 37; O 37; O 39; O 43; O 44; O 45
3	1		15	Serpent 1,1,7; 1,1,10; 1,2,1; 1,2,28; 2,1,45; 2,1,50; 2,1,51; 2,1,55; 2,2,3; 2,2,7; O 7; O 8; O 14; O 19; O 24; O 38; O 44; O 45
3	7			Adam and Eve (fig leaves) 1,2,2; 1,2,34
3	15			Serpent (woman's heel) 2,1,58; O 4
3	17		23	Adam (curse) 1,1,8; 1,2,1; 1,2,10; 1,2,10; 2,1,1; 2,1,45; 2,1,63; 2,2,1; O 19; O 38; O 45; O 45; O 45
3	21			Garments of skins 2,1,88
3	24			Flaming sword, guardian of Eden 1,1,8; 2,1,63; 2,1,88; O 43; epg 16

4	1		16	Cain and Abel	1,2,1: 1,2,1; O 4; O 16: O 36
4	15			Cain (avenged sevenfold)	O 41
4	24			Lamech (avenged seventy-sevenfold)	O 41
4	25			Seth	1,1,3; O 30; O 31: O 39
4	26			Enosh	O 28: O 43
5	21		24	Enoch **Sir 44 Heb. 11 Hen**	1,2,1; 1,2,9; O 4: O 14; O 21: O 28; O 41: O 43; ep 92
6	1		4	Giants (Nephilim) **1Rg Ps 18**	1,2,2; O 13; O 14: O 28; O 43
6	5	8		Noah **Sir 44**	1,2,1; 2,1,13; 2,2,2; O 4; O 21; O 28: O 28; O 43
				Noah's ark	2,1,11; 2,1,30; O 6; O 18: O 25
6	5	8	5	The great flood	1,1,9b; 1,2,1; 1,2,1; 1,2,14; O 14: O 36: O 38; O 39; O 40; O 45
10	8		9	Nimrod	O 14
11	1		9	The tower of Babel	1,1,9b: 1,2,1: 1,2,1; 2,1,11; O 21; O 23: O 32; O 41; O 43
12		50		Patriarchs	O 21
12		25		Abraham	2,1,11; O 1; O 2; O 8; O 18; O 21; O 28; O 33; O 41; O 43
12		13		Abram (nomad)	O 33
12	1		7	Abram (journey to Canaan)	1,2,10; O 14; O 42
12	1		3	Israel (chosen people) **passim**	E 147
13	1		12	Abram and Lot	2,1,11
14	17			Levi in the loins of Abraham **Heb. 7**	O 20; O 29
14	1		16	Abram leaves Chedorlaomer	O 42
14	17		20	Melchizedek **Heb.**	O 38
15	16			Amorites	O 4; O 16
16		23	2	Sarah	O 2; O 8; O 18; cpt 90
18	1		8	Abraham (Lord's visit)	E 101

				Abraham (hospitality) O 28
18	10		14	Isaac (promised by the Lord) O 43
18	12			Sarah (calls Abraham 'lord') **1Pet. 3** ept 68
18	16	19	29	Gomorrah 2.1.72
				Sodom 1.1.9b; 1.2.1; 1.2.1; 1.2.14; 1.2.29; 2.1.13; 2.1.21; 2.1.55; 2.2.3; E 95; O 4; O 5; O 16; O 16; O 33; O 33; O 36; O 38; O 40; O 40; O 42; O 43; O 45; epg 47
				Sodom and Gomorrah O 21
18	27			Abraham (dust and ashes) 1.2.25
19	1		8	Lot (hospitable) O 14
19	17		26	Sodom (do not look back) 1.2.2; 1.2.3; 1.2.6; 2.1.1; O 4; O 16; O 45
21	1		7	Abraham (late fatherhood) O 4
				Sarah (late motherhood) 2.1.1
21	14		19	Ishmael and Hagar (desert) O 21; O 40
22				Abraham offering Isaac **Sir 44** 1.2.1; 2.1.1; 2.2.1; O 1; O 4; O 8; O 15; O 17; O 28; O 43; O 45; ept 94
23	1		2	Abraham (weeps for Sarah) 2.1.45
24		35		Isaac O 18; O 21
24				Isaac marries Rebekah O 43
25	21		34	Esau and Jacob **Gn 27** 1.2.1; 2.1.31; E 153; O 43
26	1		14	Isaac and Abimelech O 26
26	15		22	Isaac (wells of water) O 36
26	22			Rehoboth (Euruchoria) 2.1.11; O 23
27		49		Jacob O 21
27	1		30	Jacob blessed by Isaac E 121; O 2; O 12; O 43
28		30		Jacob (Mesopotamia) 1.2.10; O 26; O 43
28	12			Jacob (ladder) 2.2.1; O 28; O 43
28	18		22	Jacob (stone in Bethel) O 28; O 43

29	16	30	21	Leah O 45
30	29		43	Laban (flock divided) 2,1,12
31	19			Rachel (steals household gods) O 45
31	40			Jacob endures heat and cold 2,1,3; 2,1,12; O 26
32	24		33	Jacob wrestles with an angel O 28; O 43
37		50		Joseph O 4; O 22
37	28		36	Joseph (to Egypt) O 24; O 42
37	34		35	Jacob mourns for Joseph 2,1,16; 2,1,45; O 22
39		50		Joseph (in Egypt) O 16; O 43; O 43
39				Joseph (slave) O 33
39	7		20	Joseph (put in prison by Potiphar) E 101; O 24
41	1		36	Joseph (Pharaoh's dreams) O 24; O 34
49	1		28	Jacob's blessing on his twelve sons O 43
50	1		14	Joseph (weeps over Jacob) 2,1,45

EXODUS

				Egypt 2,1,1; 2,1,22; E 120; O 5; O 6; O 27; O 37; O 43; O 45
				Exodus 1,2,2; O 45
				Moses 2,1,1; O 2; O 7; O 11; O 16; O 21
1		14		Pharaoh 1,2,1; 2,1,1; 2,1,21; 2,1,22; O 5; O 16; O 45
1	15	2	10	Moses in the basket 2,1,51; O 33
2	11		12	Moses kills an Egyptian 2,1,15; E 77
2	11		21	Moses (in Midian) O 42
3	1	4	17	Moses (the burning bush) E 101; O 1; O 2; O 18; O 25; O 30; O 38; O 40; O 41; O 43; O 45; O 45
4	27			Aaron (mission) O 1; O 2

7		12		The ten plagues 1.1,14: 2,1,11; 2,1.11; 2,1,39; O 4; O 5; O 6; O 16: O 21; O 24: O 25; O 32: O 38; O 42
				Moses (plagues of Egypt) O 11; O 16: O 43
7		12		Aaron (meek towards Egypt) 1,2,25
				Moses (meek towards Egypt) 1,2,25
7	1			Moses as God to Pharaoh E 101; O 11: O 18; O 28; O 32
7	10		12	Pharaoh's magicians **2Tim. 3** 2,1,12: O 2
11				Egypt (tenth plague) 1.1,9: O 1; O 16; O 43
12				Exodus (Passover) O 40; O 40: O 40
13	21			Exodus (pillar of fire and pillar of cloud) 1,1,36; 1,1,38; 1,1,9b; 1,2,2: 1,2,15; 2,1,3: 2,1,12; 2,1,22; O 4; O 6; O 15: O 18; O 32; O 38; O 39; O 40: O 40; O 45
14		15		Moses (exodus) **Sir 45** 1.1,6; 1,1,9b; 1,2,1; 2,1,15: O 1; O 4; O 11: O 32; O 33; O 42: O 43
14	15			Moses (heard by God) O 16
14	19		20	Exodus (pillar of cloud before Egypt) O 28
14	21			Exodus (crossing the Red Sea) 1,1,36; 1,1,38; 1,2,2; 1,2,25; 2,1,3; 2,1,11: 2,1,11; 2,1,22; O 4; O 4; O 6; O 11: O 13; O 15; O 18; O 24; O 29; O 32; O 39; O 43: O 43: O 45
15	20			Miriam (timbrel) O 18
15	22		23	Marah (bitter water) 1,2,2; 2,1,12; O 4; O 11; O 29; O 36: epg 14
16	2		3	Exodus (Israel murmurs) O 43
16	4		16	Exodus (manna and flesh) 1,1,36; 1,1,38: 1,2,2; 2,1,3; 2,2,2: O 4; O 6: O 11: O 13: O 15: O 18; O 18; O 24: O 28; O 32; O 32; O 34; O 39; O 43; O 43: O 45
16	19		21	Exodus (the hoarding of manna) 1,2,28; 2,1,13; O 40
17	6			Moses (water from the rock at Massah) **Nu 20** 1,1,36; 1,1,38; 1,2,2: 2,1,10: 2,1,11; E 4; E 44; O 4; O 6: O 11; O 13: O 18; O 18; O 32; O 36; O 39; O 45
17	8		16	Moses (the battle with the Amalekites) 1,1,36; 1,2,2; 2,1,1; 2,1,3; 2,1,11; 2,1,22; 2,2,7; E 48; O 2; O 4; O 6: O 11; O 12: O 13; O 15; O 18; O 18; O 32: O 43; O 45
19		31		Moses (on Sinai) 2,1,11: 2,1,13; O 2; O 20; O 28; O 45; ept 57

19				The theophany at Sinai O 41
19	9			Moses (cloud on Sinai) O 11; O 28; O 32; O 43
19	10		13	Sinai (inaccessible) 1.1.1; 1.1.9b; 1.2.6; 2.1.13; O 2; O 18; O 20; O 28; O 31; O 32; O 40; O 45
19	15			Moses (abstinence) 1,2,3
20	21		25	Moses saw God **Ex 24 Ex 33 Ex 34 Nu 12 Sir 45** 1.1,6; 1.1.9b; 1.2,1; 1.2.9; 1.2.10; 2.1.13; O 4; O 27; O 32; O 37
23	28			Exodus (sending of hornets) **Dt 7 Jos 24** O 27; O 45
24	1		11	Aaron, Nadab and Abihu O 28; O 32
25		35		The ark of the covenant O 18; O 19; O 28; O 32; O 42
28				Aaron **Lv 8 Sir 45** 1,2,1; 2,1,1; 2,1,11; 2,1.12; 2,1,98; 2,2,1; O 2; O 7; O 11; O 12; O 16; O 21; O 32; O 43
28				Aaron's sons (ordained) **Lv 8** O 12; O 16; o 32
28		29		Moses (ordination of the priests) O 32
31	18			Moses (tablets of stone) **Ex 34 Sir 45** 1,1,6; 1,1,15; 1.1,9b; 1,2.1; 1,2,10; O 4; O 6; O 21; O 38; O 40; O 43; O 45
				Tablets of stone **2Cor. 3** 1,2,1; 1,2,14; 1,2.24; 1,2,25; 2.1,11; 2,1,25; O 4; O 14; O 28; O 40; O 43; O 45
32	1		6	Aaron (golden calf) 1.1,9b
34	29		35	Moses (shining face) O 32; O 39; O 40
35	30		35	Bezalel E 19; O 41; O 43; O 44
40				Moses (the erection of the tabernacle) O 44

LEVITICUS

10	1		2	Nadab and Abihu 2,1.13; 2.1,34; O 2; O 5; O 12

NUMERI

3		4		Levites 2,1,13; O 32
6	1		8	Nazarites **Jdc 13 1Rg 1** 1,2.10; O 18; O 25; O 42; O 43
12				Miriam leprous E 77; O 36

12	3			Moses (meek) O 14; O 18
13		14	10	Joshua and Caleb 2,1,11
13				Moses (reconnaissance of the land) 2,1,11
13	28			Anakites O 14
16				Dathan and Abiram E 58; O 13; O 32; O 36
17	16		25	Aaron (rod) E 6
21	6		9	The bronze serpent 2,1,58; O 4; O 45
21	26			Sihon O 4
21	33		35	Og O 4
22		24		Balaam O 4
25				Baal of Peor (Israel's apostasy) 2,1,30
25	1		8	Phinehas **Ps 105** 2,1,15; E 77; O 14; O 15; O 16; O 18
27	12		23	Joshua to be Moses' successor O 12
32		34		Moses (the allotment of land) 1,2,10

DEUTERONOMIUM

8	15			Dipsas (?) 1,2,28
18	1		2	Levites (no land) 1,2,10
23	4			Ammonites and Moabites 2,1,11; 2,1,13; O 2; O 42
32	1			The song of Moses 1,1,1
32	48		52	Moses dies before entry of Israel **Nu 20 Nu 27** 1,1,6; O 43

IOSUE

				Joshua O 2; O 2; O 21; O 43
2				Rahab 1,2,17; O 14; O 40
3	15		16	Exodus (passage of the Jordan) 1,1,36; 1,2,2; 2,1,3; 2,1,22; O 4; O 6; O 15; O 43; O 43; O 45
4	4		9	Jordan (twelve stones) O 2

6				Jericho captured and destroyed 2,1,11; O 4; O 6; O 13; O 41; O 45
7				Achan 1.2,2; 1.2,6; O 34
9				Gibeonites O 36
9				Joshua (and Gibeonites) 2,1,13
10	12		14	Joshua makes the sun stand still **Sir 46** 1,1,36; 1,2,1; 1,2,2; 2,1,11; O 4; O 15; O 24; O 43; O 45
18	1			Shiloh O 42

IUDICUM

				Judges O 2; O 21
6	36		38	Gideon (fleece of wool) O 4
7	5		6	Gideon (300 men lapping water) O 4; O 42
9	7		15	Jotham (allegory of the bramble) 2,1,12
11	29		40	Jephthah (sacrificing his only daughter) O 15; ept 94
13	19		23	Manoah O 9; O 20; O 28; O 39
16	17		22	Samson 2,1,11; 2,1,44; O 4; O 21
19	10			Jebus (Jerusalem) **1Prl 11** O 42

REGNORUM I-II

				David **Sir 47** 1.2,1; E 223; O 2; O 18; O 21; O 21; O 25; O 41; O 43

REGNORUM I

				Samuel 2,1,11; O 2; O 21
1	1			Ramathaim (Samuel's birthplace) O 33
1	9		28	Samuel (Hannah's prayer is granted) 1.2,2; 1.2,10; 2,1,1; 2,1,11; O 2; O 2; O 15; O 33; O 40; O 43; ept 68; ept 69
2	12		34	Eli's sons 1,2,2; 1,2,6; 2,1,1; 2,1,13; E 206; O 2; O 5; O 20
2	18			Samuel (ephod / apron) 2,1,12
4	11	5		The ark among the Philistines 2,1,16; O 22; O 42

5	8		9	Gath (inhabitants punished) 2,1,13
9				Saul (looks for asses) O 33; O 43
9	9			Samuel (seer) O 18
10	10		12	Saul prophesies among the prophets **1Rg 19** 2,1,12; 2,1,13; 2,1,41; O 2; O 9; O 43
10	22			Saul hides himself O 2
12	1		3	Samuel's farewell address O 22
14	24		45	Jonathan tasted a little honey 1,2,2
15	27		31	Samuel forgives Saul 1,2,25
16	11		13	David (shepherd) O 33
16	12		13	The anointing of David O 44
16	13			Samuel anointed kings **Sir 46** 1,2,1; O 2; O 33; O 43
16	14		23	David plays the lyre 1,2,25; 2,1,39; 2,1,64; O 2; O 5; O 9; O 24; O 43
17				David kills Goliath O 2; O 5; O 13; O 40; O 40
19	20			Samuel among the prophets O 43; O 43
21	2		7	David eats bread of the Presence 1,2,6
24				David spares Saul's life **1Rg 26** 1,2,25
28	4		20	Saul consults the spirit of Samuel O 4

REGNORUM II

1	19		27	David's elegy over Saul and Jonathan O 22
5	6		8	David, the blind and the lame E 45
6	1		14	David making merry before the ark O 5; O 38
6	6		7	Uzzah 2,1,13; 2,1,34; O 2; O 20
11		12		David and Bathsheba 1,1,6; 2,1,12; 2,1,46; O 39
12	1		4	Nathan (allegory of the poor man's lamb) 2,1,12
12	15		25	David's child dies O 43
13		19	9	Absalom 2,2,3; O 21

16	5		13	David and Shimei **2Rg 19** **1,2,25**
18		19	9	David and Absalom 1,2,25; 2,2,3; O 22
23	13		17	David pours out water when thirsty **4Mcc 3** 1,2,10; O 14

REGNORUM III

				Unfaithful kings 1,1,9
				Prophets 1,1,9; 1,2,1; O 2; O 14; O 21; O 36; O 38; O 45
				Solomon O 21
				Samaria vs. Jerusalem 1,2,2; 2,1,13; O 2; O 6
3				Solomon (wisdom) **Sir 47** 1,2,1; O 20; O 28; O 43
6		8		Temple of Solomon 2,1,13
10	1		13	The queen of Sheba **Matt. 12** O 40
11	1		13	Solomon (unfaithfulness) 1,2,1; 1,2,15; O 16; O 36; O 43
11	5			Chemosh 1,2,28; O 16; O 40
11	14			Hadad O 43
12		14		Jeroboam vs. Rehoboam 1,2,2; O 2; O 5; O 36; O 43
12	6		15	Rehoboam and the eldest O 36
12	16		20	Judah vs. Israel O 2; O 6; O 32
16	29		34	Ahab 1,2,1; O 5; O 33
17		22		Elijah O 2; O 21; O 22; O 39
17	1			Elijah stops the rain 1,1,16; 1,2,10; 2,2,2
17	3		6	Elijah by the Cherith O 21; O 26
17	6			Elijah fed by ravens 1,1,16; 1,2,2; 1,2,3; 1,2,10; 2,1,11; 2,2,1; O 18
17	7		16	Elijah and the widow of Zarephath 1,1,16; 1,1,17; 1,2,2; 1,2,3; 1,2,6; 1,2,10; O 14; O 26; O 40; O 43
17	17		24	Elijah raising the child at Zarephath 1,1,16; 1,1,17; 1,2,10; O 40; O 41
18	17		40	Elijah and the prophets of Baal 1,2,10; O 20; O 41

18	20		46	Elijah and the contest on Mount Carmel 1,1,16; 2,1,11; E 99; O 10; O 14; O 26; O 28; O 41; O 42; O 43
18	41		46	Elijah lets it rain 2,2,2
19	8		18	Elijah at Mount Horeb O 28
19	8			Elijah fasts 40 days 1,1,16
19	14			Elijah (ardour) O 14
19	18			7000 have not bowed to Baal **R 11** O 4; O 11; O 42
22	38			Jezebel **4Rg 9** 1,2,29

REGNORUM IV

1	2			Ekron O 5
1	9		12	Elijah kills captains of fifty 1,1,16
2		9		Elisha O 2; O 21
2	8			Elijah parts the Jordan 1,1,16
2	8		15	Elisha (mantle of Elijah) 1,1,16; 1,2,10; O 33; O 41; O 43; ept 62
2	11			Elijah (chariot of fire) **Sir 48** 1,1,16; 1,2,1; 1,2,9; 1,2,10; 2,1,12; 2,1,51; O 4; O 27; O 28; O 33; O 40; O 40; O 41; O 43; ept 92; ept 100
2	19		22	Elisha (spring of Jericho) 1,1,16
2	23		24	Elisha (young ribalds) 1,1,6; 1,1,16; O 33
3	9		20	Elisha (water from Edom) 1,1,16
4	1		7	Elisha (the jar of oil) 1,1,16
4	8		37	Elisha and the Shunammite 1,1,16; O 26; O 41
4	38		41	Elisha (the spoiled pottage) 1,1,16
4	42		44	Elisha (multiplication of the loaves) 1,1,16
5				Elisha (the curing of Naaman) 1,1,16; 2,2,2
6	1		7	Elisha (the iron axe head) 1,1,16
6	8		20	Elisha (the Syrian army blinded) 1,1,16
7				Elisha (siege of Samaria) 1,1,16

13	21			Elisha (miracle of reviving bones) 1,1,16
17		19		Assyria **Is 1** 1,2,1; O 16; O 25; O 27; O 37
17		19		Assyria (exile) **Is 1** 2,1,1; 2,1,16
18	13		35	Rabshakeh sent by Sennacherib O 4
19				Hezekiah prays for Jerusalem **Is 37** O 5
20	1		11	Hezekiah's illness and recovery **Is 38** O 18
22		23	30	Josiah O 33
24		25		Nebuchadnezzar O 5; O 42
25	8		20	Nebuzaradan O 33; O 43

PARALIPOMENON II

33	1		20	Manasseh 2,1,46; 2,2,3; E 77; O 13; O 19; O 39

ESDRAE II

12	10		19	Tobias the Ammonite O 25

ESTHER

				Esther 1,2,29

IUDITH

				Judith E 44

MACHABAEORUM II

6		7		Eleazar **4Mcc** O 15 Maccabees **4Mcc** O 5; O 15; O 43

PSALMI

68	10			David (ardour) O 14
72	3		20	David (psalmist) 1,1,6
131	1			David (meek) O 14; O 43
140	7			Hades O 6

IOB

				Job 1,1.6; 1.2,37; 1.2,38; 2.1.19; 2.1.42; 2.1.45; 2.1.50; E 6; E 32; O 8; O 11; O 14; O 14; O 18; O 21; O 43; O 45
1	6	2	7	Job in Satan's hands O 24
32	18		19	Elihu speaks to Job 2,1,11
42	6			Job (dust and ashes) 1,2,25

OSEE

6	4			Ephraim E 77

AMOS

				Amos O 41
1	1			Amos (shepherd) O 33

IONAS

2				Jonah 1.2.2; 2.1,1; 2,1.11; 2,1,11; 2.1,17; 2,1,19; 2.1,51; 2.1,68; E 135; O 2; O 24; O 43; O 43
3				Nineveh 2,1,46; 2.2,3; E 77; O 16; O 16; O 39

ZACHARIAS

4				Zerubbabel O 41

ISAIAS

				Exiles 1.1,9; O 5; O 22
1	2			Isaiah calls out to heaven 1.1,1
1	3			Ox and ass O 38
6				Isaiah's call 1.2,9; O 1; O 2; O 9; O 18; O 28
14	12			Lucifer **Luke 10** 1.1.4; 1,1,7; 1.2.1; 1.2.2; 1.2.3; 1,2.6; 1,2,14; 1,2.34; 2.1.11; 2.1.13; 2.1,45; E 199; O 6; O 28; O 29; O 36; O 38; O 39; O 40; O 45; epg 22
19	11			The princes of Zoan O 2
33	9			Lebanon **Is 46** O 5

33	9			Sharon O 5
40		55		Babel (exile) **Ps 136** 2.1,1; 2.1,21; O 6; O 44
46	1			Bel and Dagon O 5

IEREMIAS

				Jeremiah O 2; O 5; O 21 Jeremiah weeps for Jerusalem 2,1,45
1	6			Jeremiah's call O 1; O 2; O 18
42	1		19	Jonadab 1,2,2; 1,2,10; 2,1,11

THRENI SEU LAMENTATIONES

1	4			The roads to Zion mourn 2,1,6

EZECHIEL

1		2		Ezekiel's call O 28
14	14		20	Noah, Job and Daniel O 2
37	1		10	Vision of the valley of the dry bones O 25

SUSANNA

				Susannah 1,2,2; O 24; ept 69
	44		61	Daniel as judge 2,1,12; O 39; O 41

DANIEL

1		3		The three young men 1,2,2; 1,2,10; 1,2,14; 2.1,1; 2,1.11; 2.1.14; 2.1,51; O 4; O 5; O 11; O 15; O 15; O 24; O 27; O 43
2	31		45	Nebuchadnezzar's dream 2,1,11
5	1		4	Belshazzar O 33
5	12 (6)			Daniel interprets dreams O 28
6	17		23	Daniel in the lion's den 1,2,10; 2.1,1; 2.1,11; 2.1.14; 2.1,51; 2,1.68; O 5; O 15; O 24; O 43
7				Daniel's vision of four beasts 2,1.43

BEL ET DRACO

	31	39	Daniel and Habakkuk 1.2.2: O 18

APOCRYPHA O.T.

ASCENSIO ISAIAE

5	1	14	Isaiah's martyrdom 2.1.14

NOVUM TESTAMENTUM

Andrew
O 4
Apostles
1,2.1; O 2; O 21; O 21; O 32: O 36; O 43
Pharisees
O 2
Healings
1,1.2; 1.1,20; 1,1,21; 1,1,22; 1,1,23: 2,1,1; 2,1,1; 2,1,46: 2.1,83; O 38; O 40
Incarnation
1.1.36; 1,2,14; 1.2,34; E 110; E 249; O 12: O 14; O 14; O 14; O 38; O 43; O 44; O 45; O 45
James
O 4
John
O 4
Cross and resurrection
1,1,2; 1,1,9; 1.1,33; 1,2,2; 1.2,34; O 1; O 8; O 12
Luke
O 4
Mark
O 21
Mary
1.2.1; O 24: O 43; ept 69
Peter
2.1.12; 2,1,13; O 4: O 34

SECUNDUM MATTHAEUM

1	18	25	Mary (virgin mother) 1.2,1: 1.2,34; 2,2,1; O 14
2	1	12	The three wise men 1,1,2; 1,1,9; 1.2,34; O 14: O 19. O 29; O 38; O 39; O 40
2	2	10	Star of Bethlehem 1,1,5: 1.2,34; O 5

2	6			Bethlehem **Mich 5** 2,1,16; 2,2,1; O 3; O 18; O 33; O 38; ept 63
2	13		15	Escape to Egypt O 29; O 34; O 38
2	16			Herod (Massacre of the children) 1,2,1: 1,2,34: O 4: O 19; O 36; O 38
3				John the Baptist **Mc 1 Luke 1** 1,1,9; 1,2,1; 1,2,2; 1,2,10; 2,1,11; 2,1,88; E 99; O 2; O 10; O 14; O 14; O 19; O 21; O 22; O 26; O 29; O 33; O 34; O 37; O 38; O 39; O 43; O 43; O 45
3	13		17	Jesus' baptism **Mc 1 Luke 3** 1,1,2; 1,1,9; 1,2,34; O 29; O 38; O 39
4	1		11	Jesus' temptation **Mc 1 Luke 4** 1,1,2; 1,1,9; 1,2,2; 1,2,3; 1,2,10; 1,2,34; O 14; O 24; O 29; O 38; O 38; O 39; O 40; O 45
4	2			Jesus' forty days of fasting **Mc 1 Luke 4** 2,1,34; O 14; O 40
4	18		22	Apostles (call) **Mc 1 Luke 5** 1,2,10; 2,1,12; 2,2,7; O 41
4	18		20	Peter's call O 9; O 20; O 39
4	19			Apostles (fishermen) O 16; O 33
4	21		22	Zebedee's sons O 18; O 43
5		7		The sermon on the Mount 1,2,25; 1,2,25; E 77; O 37
7	7		11	Ask, and it will be given you **Luke 11** 1,1,27
7	24		27	House built on rock / sand **Luke 6** 1,1,24; 1,1,26; 1,1,27; 1,2,2; O 2
8	1		13	Centurion O 9; O 20; O 39
8	23		27	Sea obeys **Mc 4 Luke 8** 1,1,2; 1,1,20; 1,1,21; 1,1,22; 1,2,25; 2,1,1; 2,1,11; 2,1,46; 2,1,50; 2,1,69; 2,1,83; E 44; E 80; O 4; O 29; O 37; ept 119
8	28		34	The Gadarene demoniacs **Mc 5 Luke 8** 1,1,20; 1,1,21; 1,1,22; 1,1,25; 2,1,1; 2,1,44; 2,1,45; 2,1,55; 2,1,55; 2,1,56; 2,2,3; 2,2,7; O 14; O 24; O 27; O 29; O 40
9	1		8	Healing a paralytic on his bed **Mc 2 Luke 5** 2,1,19; 2,1,50
9	10		11	Jesus eats with tax collectors and sinners **Luke 15** 2,1,46; O 38; O 43; O 45
9	18		25	Jairus' daughter **Mc 5 Luke 8** 2,1,19
9	20		22	Woman suffering from hemorrhage **Mc 5 Luke 8** 1,1,20; 1,1,21; 1,1,22; 1,2,2; 2,1,1; 2,1,46; 2,1,50; 2,2,1; O 8; O 14; O 40
10	3			Matthew the tax collector 2,1,12; 2,1,19; O 24; O 41

10	5	23	Twelve apostles (mission) 1,2,10; 1,2,28; 2,1,12; E 203; O 2; O 33; O 45
12	27		Jesus or Beelzebul **Mc 3** O 22
12	43	45	Seven unclean spirits **Luke 11** 1,1,26; 1,1,27; O 40; O 43
13	1	9	The sower **Mc 4 Luke 8** 1,1,24; 1,1,25; 1,1,26; 1,1,27; 1,2,2; 2,1,11; O 2; O 4; O 25
13	24	30	The tares **Mc?** 1,1,24; 1,1,25; 1,1,27; 1,2,2; O 9; O 19; O 32; O 40
13	31	32	Mustard seed **Mc 4 Luke 13** 1,1,24; 1,1,25; 1,1,26; 1,1,27; O 42
13	33		Leaven 1,1,24; 1,1,26
13	44		Treasure hidden in a field 1,1,24; 1,1,27; 1,2,17
13	45	46	The Pearl of Great Price 1,1,24; 1,1,27; 2,2,3; 2,2,7; O 6; O 17; O 19
13	47	50	The dragnet 1,1,24; 1,1,27
14	3	12	Herod Antipas **Mc 6** 1,2,1; O 5; O 43 John beheaded **Mc 6** 2,1,14
14	13	21	Multiplication of the loaves **Mc 6 Luke 9 John 6** 1,1,2; 1,1,20; 1,1,21; 1,1,22; 1,1,23; 1,2,1; 1,2,3; 1,2,6; 2,1,1; O 29; O 34; O 38; O 41; O 43
14	23		Jesus prays by himself **Luke 5** O 14; O 26
14	24	33	Jesus walks on water **Mc 6 John 6** 1,1,20; 1,1,21; 1,1,23; 1,1,36; 2,1,1; O 24; O 38
14	28	32	Peter on the lake O 17
15	21	28	The Canaanite woman 2,1,50; O 39; O 40
16	13	20	Peter's confession O 28
16	17	19	Peter (rock and keys) 1,2,1; 2,1,12; O 32; O 43
17	1	9	The transfiguration **Mc 9 Luke 9** 1,1,20; 1,1,21; 1,1,22; 2,1,1; O 29; O 32; O 32; O 40; ept 65
17	24	27	Money for the temple tax 2,2,1; O 19; O 29
18	12	13	The lost sheep **Luke 15** 1,1,24; 1,1,26; 1,1,27; 2,1,46; 2,2,3
18	21		Peter on forgiveness E 77
18	23	35	Creditors 1,1,24; 1,1,27; E 77; O 17
19	16	22	The rich young man **Mc 10 Luke 18** 1,2,1; 1,2,10; 1,2,17; O 14; O 14

20	1	16	Labourers in the vineyard 1,1,24; 1.1,27; 2,1.45; O 40; ept 60
20	20	23	Mother of the sons of Zebedee O 37
21	1	9	Entry into Jerusalem **Mc 11 Luke 19 John 12** O 21
21	18	19	Fig tree cursed **Mc 11** 1,1,20; 1,1,21; 2.1,1: O 32; O 37
21	28	32	Two sons and the vineyard 1,1.24; 1.1,27
21	33	46	The vineyard and the wicked tenants **Mc 12 Luke 20** 1.1,24; 1.1.25; 1,1,26; 1,1,27
22	1	14	The marriage feast **Luke 14** 1.1.24: 1,1,26; 1,1,27: 1.2.2; O 2: O 3: O 40
22	15	22	Paying taxes to Caesar O 19
24	43	51	Master returns when not expected **Mc 13 Luke 12** 1.1.26; 1,1,27; 1,2.2
25	1	13	Ten virgins 1,1,24; 1,1,27; 1,2,2; 1,2.3; 2.2,1; 2.2.4; 2,2.5; O 5; O 16; O 40; O 43
25	14	30	The talents 1,1,24; 1,1,27; E 183; O 6; O 10; O 26; O 32
25	32	33	Sheep and goats 1,1,24; 1.1,27; 2,2,1
26	17	30	The Last Supper **1Cor. 10** O 40; O 41; O 45
26	36	46	Gethsemane **Mc 14 Luke 22** 1,1.2; O 14
26	47	56	Judas **Mc 14 Luke 22** 1.2,1; 1.2,1; 1,2.1: 1,2,3; 1,2,6; 1,2,15: 2,1,13; O 4; O 21; O 21; O 22; O 25; O 26; O 29; O 36; epg 22
26	51	52	Malchus' ear **Mc 14 Luke 22 John 18** 1.2,25: E 77; O 14
26	57	66	Caiaphas O 21: O 22
26	69	75	Peter's denial O 26; O 39
27			Jesus' passion **Mc 15 Luke 23 John 19** 1.2,25; 1,2,34; O 14; O 15; O 33; O 37; O 38; O 43
27	1	26	Jesus before Pilate O 43
			Pilate O 4; O 36; O 40
27	5		Judas hangs himself 2,1.11
27	6	10	Field of Blood 2,1,13
27	32		Simon of Cyrene O 45
27	34		Gall to drink O 29; O 38

27	51	53	Marvels at crucifixion O 45
27	57	60	Joseph of Arimathea O 14; O 45
28	9	10	Women at empty tomb **Mc 16 Luke 24 John 20** 2.1,45; 2.2,1; O 24; O 45

SECUNDUM MARCUM

12	41	44	The widow's offering **Luke 21** 1,1,1; O 13; O 19

SECUNDUM LUCAM

1	5	25	Zechariah 1,2,1; 1,2,3; O 6
1	26	38	The Annunciation 1,1,9
1	40	44	John (in womb) O 29; O 38; O 39; O 43
2	1	3	The census of Augustus 1,2,34; 2,2,1; 2,2,2; O 19; O 38
2	6	7	Jesus' birth in a manger 1,1,2; 1,2,34; O 19; O 29; O 38
2	8	20	Shepherds O 38; O 39; O 40
2	13	14	Angels with the shepherds 1,1,9
2	22	40	The presentation in the temple 1,1,9
2	25	35	Simeon O 39
2	36	38	Anna (prophetess) O 39; ept 68; ept 69
2	52		Jesus increases in wisdom O 43
7	11	15	Raising of the widow's son 2.1,19
7	36	50	Anointing by a sinful woman 1,1,22; O 8
7	41	43	Two debtors 1,1,26
9	54	56	Jesus and Samaritans E 77
10	18	19	Apostles tread upon scorpions 2,1,89
10	30	37	The Good Samaritan 1,1,26; 1,1,27; 2,1,1; O 14; O 29
11	5	8	Unexpected question 1,1,26
12	16	21	The rich fool 1,1,26; 1,1,27; 1,2,28; O 14; O 16
13	6	9	The barren fig tree 1,1,26; 1,1,27; E 77; O 32; O 40

13	10	17	Healing of an infirm woman 2,1.19; 2,1.50; O 40
15	8	9	The lost coin 1.1,26; 1,1.27
15	11	32	The prodigal son 1,1,26; 1.1.27: 2.1.46; 2.2,3; 2.2.3
16	1	8	The dishonest steward 1,1,26; 1,1,27: O 45
16	19	31	The rich man and Lazarus 1,1.26; 1.1,27; 1,2,2: 1,2.28; 2,1.1; 2,2.2; 2,2,3; O 14; O 16: O 19; O 26; O 36: O 40; O 41
16	22	31	Abraham's bosom 2,1.89: O 7; ept 90: ept111
18	1	8	The widow and the unjust judge 1,1,26: 1,1,27; E 186
18	10	14	Pharisee and tax collector 1.1,26; 1,1,27; 1,2.17; 2.1.1; 2,1.19: 2.2.3; O 19: O 39; O 40; O 43
19	2	10	Zacchaeus 1,2,10; 2.1,12: 2,1.19; 2,2,3; O 14; O 20: O 39: O 40
19	11	27	The ten pounds 1,1,26; 1.1,27
19	47		Jesus teaching in the temple O 38
23	7	12	Jesus before Herod Antipas O 38
23	39	42	Criminals on the cross 2.1,63: O 45

SECUNDUM IOANNEM

2	1	10	The wedding at Cana 1.1,2; 1.1,23; 1.2,1; E 232; O 29; O 40
2	13	16	The cleansing of the temple O 21; O 38
4	1	26	The Samaritan woman 1,1.2; O 29: O 38; O 40: O 45
5	1	8	Healing the lame man at Bethesda 2,1,19; 2.1,89; O 14
8	48		Jesus called a Samaritan O 4: O 14; O 26: O 29; O 37; O 38: O 45
9	1	12	Healing the blind man at Siloam 1.1,23; 2.1.12
10	11	13	Hireling vs. good shepherd 2,1.11
10	22		Feast of the Dedication O 44
10	31	39	Jesus threatened with stones O 29; O 31; O 37: O 38
11	38	44	The raising of Lazarus 1,1,23: 2.1.1; 2.1.19; 2.1.50; 2,1.68; O 25: O 29; O 40
12	3	8	Anointing by Mary at Bethany O 14

13	1		20	Jesus washes the disciples' feet 1,2,33; O 14; O 38; O 39; O 40; O 43; O 43; O 45
13	25			John close to Jesus' breast O 32; O 43
18	12		24	Annas and Caiaphas 1,2,1; 1,2,1
19	24			Casting lots for Jesus' tunic O 6
19	28			Jesus' thirst on the cross O 29; O 38; O 45
19	31		36	Jesus' legs not broken O 45
19	39			Nicodemus O 14; O 45
20	3		4	Peter and John at the tomb O 40; O 45
20	24		29	Thomas O 40

ACTUS APOSTOLORUM

				Paul 1,2,1; 1,2,1; 2,1,12; O 2; O 2; O 4; O 10; O 14; O 20; O 20; O 26; O 28; O 36
				Peter and Paul 1,2,10; O 2; O 14; O 18; O 43
1	9		11	The ascension 1,2,34
2	1		13	The gift of the Spirit 1,1,3; O 31; O 41; O 41; O 42
5	1		11	Ananias and Sapphira 1,2,2; 1,2,33; O 31; O 34
7	54		60	Stephen 1,2,25; O 4; O 14; O 15; O 18; O 33; O 43
8	9		24	Simon Magus 2,1,11; 2,1,12
8	26		39	Ethiopian baptized by Philip O 40
9	1		19	The conversion of Paul 1,2,1; O 18; O 24; O 39; O 40; O 41
10				Cornelius O 34
11		15		Barnabas O 10; O 43
11		15		Paul and Barnabas O 43
11	1		3	Peter criticized by Paul **Gal. 2** 1,2,25
17	21			Athenians O 21
18	2		3	Paul (tentmaker) 1,2,10

27 Paul's shipwreck at the voyage to Malta
2,1,11

AD ROMANOS

1 9 Paul (oath) **2Cor. 1 Phil. 1**
1,2,24

AD CORINTHIOS I

1 12 13 Paul, Peter, Apollos
2,1,11; 2,1,13; E 6; O 6; O 13; O 19; O 32
3 2 Corinthians (fed with milk)
O 32
7 40 Paul has the Spirit of God
O 26
9 27 Paul's ascesis
O 14

AD CORINTHIOS II

1 19 Silvanus
O 10
1 19 Timothy **1Tim.**
O 10
2 13 Titus **Titus**
O 10
11 2 Paul (ardour)
O 14
11 16 Paul boasts a little
2,1,11; E 11; O 37
12 2 4 Paul in the third heaven
1,2,1; 1,2,2; O 27; O 28; O 28; O 32; O 32; O 34

AD GALATAS

2 Paul's apostleship recognized in Jerusalem
O 42

APOCRYPHA N.T.

TRADITION

Apostles' division of the mission areas
O 33

??? *(see* D*EMOEN*, *Apocryphes)*

Peter eating lupins
1,2,10; O 14

ACTA PETRI

35 40 Peter's martyrdom
2,1,14

ACTA PAULI ET THECLAE

			Thecla 2,1,11; O 4; O 24
			Thecla (virgin) 1,2,10
3	22		Thecla saved from the fire 1,2,2; 1,2,3
3	23		Paul in hunger and in cold **2K 11** 1,2,2; 1,2,3; 2,1,12; O 26
3	28	36	Thecla saved from the lions 1,2,2; 1,2,3
11			Paul's martyrdom 2,1,14

BIBLIOGRAPHY

In the footnotes, works are quoted only with the name of the author and possibly the abbreviated title (the abbreviation used follows the full reference in this bibliography).

ABBREVIATIONS IN THE BIBLIOGRAPHY

For abbreviations not listed here see p.463, reference works, or *L'Année Philologique*.

Forschungen zu Gregor = Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums; Reihe 2, Forschungen zu Gregor von Nazianz.

PG = Patrologiae cursus completus, accurante J.-P. Migne, series graeca. Paris 1857-1866.

SC = Sources Chrétiennes.

Symp.Naz. = Mossay, J. (ed.), Symposium Nazianzenum II (Louvain 1981). *Forschungen zu Gregor* 2. Paderborn 1983.

Teologo e scrittore = Moreschini, C. - Menestrina, G. (ed.), Gregorio Nazianzeno teologo e scrittore. *Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di Scienze Religiose in Trento* 17. Bologna 1992.

PRIMARY SOURCES (GREGORY)

Only the editions that have been consulted are added. Secondary studies or anthologies adopting texts from previous editions (mostly from the *PG*), are listed along with the secondary works.

Editions of texts other than Gregory's are not included. When quoted, these are referred to *ad locum* with the name of the editor.

I POEMS

Beckby, H., Anthologia Graeca. Buch VIII. München 1957.

Billius, J., S. Patris nostri Gregorii Nazianzeni Theologi opera. Tomus II. Paris 1611.

CAILLAU, A.B., S. Patris nostri Gregorii Theologi carmina. Paris 1840. Reprinted in *PG* 37, 397-1600 and 38, 9-338. <*PG* 37 and 38>

CHRIST, W. - PARANIKAS, M., Anthologia graeca carminum Christianorum. Leipzig 1871.

CRIMI, C. - KERTSCH, M., Gregorio Nazianzeno, Sulla virtù carme giambico [I,2,10]. Introduzione, testo critico e traduzione di C. Crimi, commentario di M. Kertsch. Pisa 1995. This work was forthcoming when I finished this book. C. Crimi kindly sent me a copy of his critical text as a *proekdosis*, which I have used for all quotations from I,2,10.

ΦΑΝΟΥΡΓΑΚΗΣ, Β., Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου τὰ δώδεκα ἐπιγράμματα εἰς τὸν Μ. Βασίλειον. *Τόμος ἑόρτιος χιλιαστῆς ἑξακοσιοστῆς ἐπετείου Μεγάλου Βασιλείου (379-1979)* (Thessaloniki 1981) 171-184.

JUNGCK, C., Gregor von Nazianz. De vita sua. Heidelberg 1974.

KNECHT, A., Gregor von Nazianz. Gegen die Putzsucht der Frauen. Heidelberg 1972.

MEIER, B., Gregor von Nazianz: Über die Bischöfe (Carmen 2,1,12). Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar. *Forschungen zu Gregor* 7. Paderborn 1989.

MURATORI, L.A., Anecdota graeca. Carmina, sive epigrammata CCXXVIII s. Gregorii Nazianzeni. *Opere tutte* tom.12 = vol.16 (Arezzo 1771) 85-310.

PALLA, R. - KERTSCH, M., Gregor von Nazianz. Carmina de virtute IA-IB. Graz 1985.

ΣΑΚΚΕΛΙΩΝ, Ι., Πατμιακὴ Βιβλιοθήκη. Athene 1890.

SYKES, D.A. - MORESCHINI, C., Gregory of Nazianzus *Poemata Arcana* edited with a textual introduction by C. Moreschini, introduction, translation and commentary by D.A. Sykes. Oxford, forthcoming (mid-'95; I quoted some of D.A. Sykes' translations, by permission of Oxford University Press). <Sykes, *translation*>

WALTZ, P., Anthologie grecque. Tome VI: Anthologie Palatine. Livre VIII. Paris 1960^{2}.

WERHAHN, H.M., Gregorii Nazianzeni Σύγκρισις βίων. *Klassisch-Philologische Studien* Heft 15. Wiesbaden 1953. <Werhahn, Σύγκρισις>

Wyss, B., Zu Gregor von Nazianz. *Phyllobolia für P. Von der Mühll* (Basel 1946) 153-183. <Wyss, *Phyllobolia*> (contains the text of I,1,9b)

II ORATIONS

Bernardi, J., Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 1-3. *SC* 247. Paris 1978. <Bernardi, *SC 247*>

Bernardi, J., Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 4-5. Contre Julien. *SC* 309. Paris 1983. <Bernardi, *SC 309*>

Bernardi, J., Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 42-43. *SC* 384. Paris 1992. <Bernardi, *SC 384*>

Boulenger, F., Grégoire de Nazianze. Oraisons funèbres de Césaire et de Basile de Césarée. Texte grec, traduction française, introduction et index. Paris 1908.

Gallay, P. - Jourjon, M., Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 27-31. Discours théologiques. *SC* 250. Paris 1978. <Gallay-Jourjon, *Discours*>

Mason, A.J., The Five Theological Orations of Gregory of Nazianzus. Cambridge 1899.

Mossay, J. - Lafontaine, G., Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 20-23. *SC* 270. Paris 1980. <Mossay-Lafontaine, *SC 270*>

Mossay, J. - Lafontaine, G., Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 24-26. *SC* 284. Paris 1981. <Mossay-Lafontaine, *SC 284*>

Moreschini, C. - Gallay, P., Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 32-37. *SC* 318. Paris 1985. <Moreschini-Gallay, *SC 318*>

Moreschini, C. - Gallay, P., Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 38-41. *SC* 358. Paris 1990. <Moreschini-Gallay, *SC 358*>

III LETTERS

Gallay, P., Saint Grégoire de Nazianze. Lettres. 2 vol. Paris 1964 - 1967. <Gallay, *Lettres 1 - 2*>

Gallay, P. - Jourjon, M., Grégoire de Nazianze. Lettres théologiques. *SC* 208. Paris 1974. <Gallay-Jourjon, *Lettres*>

IV SCHOLIASTS

BROCK, S., The Syriac Version of the **Pseudo-Nonnos** Mythological Scholia. Cambridge 1971.

CREUZER, F., **Nonni** narrationes viginti ad Gregorii Nazianzeni orationem in laudem Basilii Magni. *Meletemata e disciplina antiquitatis.* (Leipzig 1817) Pars I pp.58-97.

DECLERCK, J., Five Unedited Greek Scholia of **Ps.-Nonnos**. *AC* 45 (1976) 181-189. <Declerck, *Five*>

DECLERCK, J., Les commentaires mythologiques du **PS-Nonnos** sur l'homélie XLIII de Grégoire de Nazianze. Essai d'édition critique. *Byzantion* 47 (1977) 92-112. <Declerck, *Commentaires*>

DRONKE, E., Sancti Gregorii Nazianzeni carmina selecta. Accedit **Nicetae Davidis** paraphrasis. Göttingen 1840.

GAISFORD, T., Catalogus sive notitia manuscriptorum. qui a cel. E.D. Clarke comparati in Bibliotheca Bodleiana adservantur. Vol.I, pp.23-56. Oxford 1812.

HOESCHEL, D., S. Gregorii Nazianzeni Theologi arcana seu de principiis versus CCCCXXCII cum paraphrasi graeca. Leiden 1591.

MAI, A., **Cosmae Hierosolymitani** commentarii in sancti Gregorii Nazianzeni carmina. *Spicilegium Romanum* II,2 (Roma 1839) 1-373. <Mai, *Cosmas*; page numbers in this book refer to the reprint in *PG* 38, 339-680>

MAI, A., **Nonni Abbatis** collectio et interpretatio historiarum graecarum. *Spicilegium Romanum* II,2 (Roma 1839) 374 sqq. <Mai, *Nonnos*: page numbers in this book refer to the reprint in *PG* 36, 1057-1072>

MONTACUTIUS, R., S. Gregorii Nazianzeni in Iulianum invectivae duae cum scholiis graecis nunc primum editis. Etonae 1610. (Page numbers in this book refer to the reprint in *PG* 36, 985-1058.)

MORESCHINI, C. - COSTA, I., **Niceta David**. Commento ai « Carmina Arcana » di Gregorio Nazianzeno. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione italiana, note e indici. Napoli 1992.

Nimmo Smith, J., **Pseudo-Nonniani** in IV orationes Gregorii Nazianzeni commentarii. *Corpus Christianorum. Series Graeca* 27 = *Corpus Nazianzenum* 2. Turnhout 1992.

REFERENCE WORKS

Altaner, B., Patrologie. Freiburg 1966^7.

Bachmann, H. - Slaby, W.A., Computer-Konkordanz zum NT Graece von Nestle-Aland. Berlin 1980.

Bardenhewer, O., Geschichte der altkirchliche Literatur. Band III. Freiburg 1923.

Baus, K. - Ewig, E., Die Reichskirche nach Konstantin dem Großen. Die Kirche von Nikaia bis Chalkedon. *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte* II.1. Freiburg 1973.

Beck, H.-G., Kirche und theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich. *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft* XII,2,1. München 1959. <Beck, *Kirche*>

Biblia Patristica. Index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la littérature patristique. 5. Basile de Césarée, Grégoire de Nazianze, Grégoire de Nysse, Amphiloque d'Iconium. Paris 1991. <*Biblia Patristica*>

Bogaert, P.-M., Delcor, M., e.a. (ed.), Dictionnaire Encyclopédique de la Bible. CIB Maredsous-Turnhout 1987. <*DEB*>

Campenhausen, H. von, Les Pères grecs (traduit de l'allemand par O. Marbach). Paris 1963.

Fliche, A. - Martin, V. (ed.), Histoire de l'Église. Vol.3. De la paix constantinienne à la mort de Théodose, par J.-R. Palanque, G. Bardy et P. de Labriolle. Paris 1936.

Geerard, M., Clavis Patrum Graecorum. Volumen II. Ab Athanasio ad Chrysostomum. Turnhout 1974.

Halkin, F., Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca I. Brussel 1957^3. <Halkin, *BHG*>

Halkin, F. Auctarium Bibliothecae Hagiographicae Graecae. Brussel 1969. <Halkin, *Auctarium*>

Hatch, E. - Redpath, H.A., A Concordance to the Septuagint. Oxford 1886-1906.

Hild, F., Das Byzantinische Strassensystem in Kappadokien. Wien 1977.

Hild, F. - Restle, M., Tabula Imperii Byzantini 2. Kappadokien. Wien 1981.

Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik. Ed. G. Ueding. Tübingen 1992-. <*Hist.Wört.Rhet.*>
Some important articles are mentioned in the list of secondary works.

Hunger, H., Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie. Wien 1959^6.

Jones, A.H.M. - Martindale, J.R., - Morris, J., The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire. Vol.I: A.D. 260-395. Cambridge 1971.

Judge, E.A., 'Antike und Christentum'. Towards a Definition of the Field. A Bibliographical Survey. *ANRW* 23.1 (1979) 3-58.

Lampe, G.W.H., A Patristic Greek Lexicon. Oxford 1968^2. <*PGL*>

Liddell, H.G. - Scott, R. - Jones, H.S., A Greek-English Lexicon. Oxford 1966^9. <*LSJ*>

Lausberg, H., Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. München 1973^2.

Lietzmann, H., Geschichte der alten Kirche. Bd.4. Die Zeit der Kirchenväter. Berlin 1944.

Lurker, M., Wörterbuch biblischer Bilder und Symbole. München 1973.

Martin, J., Antike Rhetorik. Technik und Methode. *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft* II.3. München 1974.

Mossay, J. - Coulie, B., Thesaurus sancti Gregorii Nazianzeni. Turnhout 1990 (Orationes, Epistulae, Testamentum) - 1991 (Carmina, Christus Patiens, Vita).

Nestle-Aland, Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine. Stuttgart 1984^{26}.

Quasten, J., Patrology. Vol.III. The Golden Age of Greek Patristic Literature from the Council of Nicea to the Council of Chalcedon. Utrecht-Antwerpen 1960.

Rahlfs, A., Septuaginta. Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes. Stuttgart 1935.

Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum. Stuttgart 1950 - . <*RLAC*>
Some important articles are mentioned in the list of secondary works.

Roscher, W.H., Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie. 6 Bd. Leipzig-Berlin 1884-1937.

Sieben, H.J., Exegesis Patrum. Saggio bibliografico sull' esegesi biblica dei Padri della Chiesa. *Sussidi patristici* 2. Roma 1983.

Sparks, H.F.D. (ed.), The Apocryphal Old Testament. Oxford 1984.

Spengel, L., Rhetores Graeci. 3 Vol. Leipzig 1853-1856.

Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. 9 Bd. & Register. Stuttgart 1933-1978. <*ThWNT*>

Walz, C., Rhetores Graeci. 9 vol. Stuttgart-Tübingen 1832-1836.

SECONDARY STUDIES

Accorinti, D., Sull'autore degli scoli mitologici alle orazioni di Gregorio di Nazianzo. *Byzantion* 60 (1990) 5-24.

Ackermann, W., Die didaktische Poesie des Gregorius von Nazianz. Diss. Leipzig 1903.

ΑΓΑΘΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ, Τὰ Ἱστορικὰ Ἔπη τοῦ Γρηγορίου τοῦ Ναζιανζηνοῦ. Athene 1955.

Aldama, J.A. de, La tragedia *Christus patiens* y la doctrina mariana en la Capadocia del siglo IV. *Epektasis. Mélanges offerts à Jean Daniélou* (Paris 1972) 417-423.

Alewell, K., Über das rhetorische παράδειγμα. Theorie, Beispielsammlungen. Verwendung in der römischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit. Diss. Kiel. Leipzig 1913.

Althaus, H., Die Heilslehre des heiligen Gregor von Nazianz. Münster 1972.

Anastasijewić, D.N., Die paränetischen Alphabete in der griechischen Literatur. Diss. München 1905.

ANTTILA, R., Analogy. [Trends in Linguistics. State-of-the-Art Reports 10]. Den Haag 1977.

ΑΝΤΟΝΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, Μ., Ὁ «περὶ ἀρετῆς» ὕμνος τοῦ Γρηγορίου Ναζιανζηνοῦ. Ἀκτῖνες Ἀθηνῶν 24 (1961) 18-24. 63-70.

ARMSTRONG, G.T., The Cross in the Old Testament according to Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem and the Cappadocian Fathers. *C. ANDERSEN - G. KLEIN (ed.), Theologia crucis, signum crucis. Festschrift E. Dinkler* (Tübingen 1979) 17-38.

ASMUS, R., Die Invektiven des Gregorius von Nazianz im Lichte der Werke des Kaisers Julian. *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 31 (1910) 325-367.

AUERBACH, E., Figura. *Archivum Romanicum* 22 (1938) 436-489.

BACCI, L., Sui rapporti fra Gregorio Nazianzeno e Naumachio. *Vetera Christianorum* 27 (1990) 417-421.

BACHEM, R., Analyse, rhetorische. *Hist.Wört.Rhet.* 1 (1992) 514-542.

BAKER, D.L., Two Testaments, One Bible. A study of some modern solutions to the theological problem of the relationships between the Old and New Testaments. Leicester 1976.

BALDWIN, B., An Anthology of Byzantine Poetry. *London Studies in Classical Philology* 14. Amsterdam 1985.

BARBEL, J., Gregor von Nazianz. Die fünf theologischen Reden. Text und Übersetzung mit Einleitung und Kommentar. *Testimonia. Schriften der altchristlichen Zeit* 3. Düsseldorf 1963.

BARTELINK, G.J.M., Het vroege christendom en de antieke cultuur. Muiderberg 1986. <Bartelink, *Antieke cultuur*>

BARTELINK, G.J.M., *Tibi nomina mille* (Vergilius, Aeneïs 7,337). Een hoofdstuk uit de semantiek van het oudchristelijk Grieks en Latijn. *Lampas* 20 (1987) 292-304. <Bartelink, *nomina mille*>

BARTHES, R., L'ancienne rhétorique. *Communications* 16 (1970), 172-229.

BECK, H.-G., Rede als Kunstwerk und Bekenntnis - Gregor von Nazianz. *Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte* 1977, Heft 4. München 1977. <Beck, *Rede*>

BELLINI, E., Bibliografia su san Gregorio Nazianzeno. *La scuola cattolica* 98 (1970) Suppl. bibl., 164-186.

Bernardi, J., La prédication des pères cappadociens. Montpellier 1968. <Bernardi, *Prédication*>

Bernardi, J., Nouvelles perspectives sur la famille de Grégoire de Nazianze. *Vigiliae Christianae* 38 (1984) 352-359. <Bernardi, *Nouvelles perspectives*>

Bernardi, J., La composition et la publication du Discours XLII de Grégoire de Nazianze. *Mémorial Gribomont. Studia ephemerida Augustiniana* 27 (1989) 131-143. <Bernardi, *Composition*>

Beuckmann, U., Gregor von Nazianz: Gegen die Habsucht (Carmen 1,2,28). Einleitung und Kommentar. *Forschungen zu Gregor* 6. Paderborn 1988.

Bidez, J., L'empereur Julien. Oeuvres complètes I,2: lettres et fragments. Paris 1924. <Bidez, *Lettres*>

Bidez, J., La vie de l'empereur Julien. Paris 1930. <Bidez, *Vie*>

Biedermann, H.M., Die Bedeutung der drei Kappadokier und des Johannes Chrysostomos als Fundament der byzantinischen Geisteshaltung. *OS* 32 (1983) 281-293.

Bouvy, E., Poètes et mélodes. Etude sur les origines du rythme tonique dans l'hymnographie de l'Eglise grecque. Nîmes 1886.

Bowersock, G. W., Hellenism in Late Antiquity. Cambridge 1990.

Bremond, C. - Le Goff, J. - Schmitt, J.-C., L'« Exemplum ». *Typologie des sources du Moyen Âge occidental* 40. Turnhout 1982. <Bremond-Le Goff>

Browne, C.G. - Swallow, J.E., S. Gregory Nazianzen, Select Orations and Letters. *P. Schaff - H. Wace (ed.), A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Second Series. Vol.VII: Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory Nazianzen.* Oxford - New York 1893, reprint 1952.

Buffière, F., Les mythes d'Homère et la pensée grecque. Paris 1956.

Camelot, P.-Th., Amour des lettres et désir de Dieu chez s. Grégoire de Nazianze: les logoi au service du Logos. *Littérature et religion. Mélanges J. Coppin* (Lille 1966) 23-30.

Cameron, A., Gregory of Nazianzus and Apollo. *JTS* 70 (1969) 240-241.

Canter, H.V., The Mythological Paradigm in Greek and Latin Poetry. *AJPh* 54 (1933) 201-224.

Casel, O., Mysteriengegenwart. *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 8 (1928) 145-224.

Cataudella, Q., Le poesie di Gregorio Nazianzeno. *A&R* s.2. 8 (1927) 88-96. <Cataudella, *Poesie*>

Cataudella, Q., Il prologo degli Αἴτια e Gregorio Nazianzeno. *RFIC* n.s. 6 (1928) 509-510. <Cataudella, Αἴτια>

Cataudella, Q., Cronologia e attribuzione del *Christus patiens*. *Dioniso* 43 (1969) 405-412. <Cataudella, *Cronologia*>

Colaclides, P., Sur le modèle possible d'une épigramme de Grégoire de Nazianze. *C&M* 30 (1969) 387-388.

Coman, J., Grégoire de Nazianze et Némésius. Rapports du christianisme et du paganisme dans un poème littéraire du IV^{e} siècle de notre ère. *Izledvanija v čest na akad. D. Dečev* (Sofia 1958) 707-726.

Condamin, A., Le texte de saint Grégoire de Nazianze sur Jonas. Or. II Apol. (Migne, *P.G.*, XXXV. 505-508). *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 12 (1922) 216-218.

Conley, T., Byzantine Teaching on Figures and Tropes. *Rhetorica* 4 (1986) 335-374.

Consolino, F.E., Σοφίης ἀμφοτέρης πρύτανιν: gli epigrammi funerari di Gregorio Nazianzeno (AP VIII). *Athenaeum* n.s. 65 (1987) 407-425.

Corsaro, F., Gregorio Nazianzeno. Poesie scelte. *Miscellanea di Studi di Letteratura cristiana antica* 5 (1955) 1-42. <Corsaro, *Poesie*>

Corsaro, F., Gregorio Nazianzeno - poeta. *Miscellanea di Studi di Letteratura cristiana antica* 6 (1956) 5-21.

Costanza, S., Su alcune risonanze classiche nel carme I,2,10 di Gregorio di Nazianzo. Archiloco. Solone. Saffo. *Sileno* 2 (1976) 203-219. <Costanza, *risonanze classiche*>

Costanza, S., La scelta della vita nel carme 1,2,10 di Gregorio di Nazianzo. La Priamel dei valori e delle professioni e il topos *ἄλλοι μὲν - ἐγὼ δέ*. *Studi in onore di Anthos Ardizzoni* (Roma 1978) 231-280. <Costanza, *La scelta*>

Costanza, S., Gregorio di Nazianzo e l'attività letteraria. *Lirica greca da Archiloco a Elitis. Studi in onore di F.M. Pontani* (Padova 1984) 219-242. <Costanza, *attività letteraria*>

Coulie, B., La mythologie dans les discours IV et V de Grégoire de Nazianze. Contribution à l'étude du IVe siècle. Mémoire de licence, Louvain-la-Neuve 1981 (unpublished). <Coulie, *Mythologie*>

Coulie, B., Chaînes d'allusions dans les discours IV et V de Grégoire de Nazianze. *JŒByz* 32/3 (1982) 137-143. <Coulie, *Chaînes*>

Coulie, B., Les richesses dans l'œuvre de Saint Grégoire de Nazianze. Etude littéraire et historique. *Publications de l'Institut orientaliste de Louvain, 32*. Louvain-la-Neuve 1985. <Coulie, *Richesses*>

Crimi, C.U., Il problema delle « false quantities » di Gregorio Nazianzeno alla luce della tradizione manoscritta di un carme: I,2,10 De Virtute. *SicGymn* 25 (1972) 1-26. <Crimi, *« false quantities »*>

Crimi, C.U., Dione di Prusa, *χρυσόστομος ὁ ὀζόστομος? Studi classici in onore di Q. Cataudella II* (Catania 1972) 389-393. <Crimi, *Dione*>

Crimi, C.U., Allusioni e citazioni di testi teatrali nell'epistolario di Gregorio Nazianzeno. Catania 1981. <Crimi, *Allusioni*>

Crimi, C.U., Nazianzenica I. *Orpheus n.s.* 12 (1991) 204-209. <Crimi, *Nazianzenica*>

Criscuolo, U., Sull' epistola 10 di Gregorio di Nazianzo. Κοινωνία 9 (1985) 115-120. <Criscuolo, *epistola 10*>

Criscuolo, U., Gregorio di Nazianzo e Giuliano. *U. Criscuolo (ed.)*, Ταλαρίσκος. *Studia graeca Antonio Garzya sexagenario a discipulis oblata* (Napoli 1987) 165-208. <Criscuolo, *Gregorio e Giuliano*>

Criscuolo, U., *Imititatio* e tecnica espressiva in Gregorio di Nazianzo. *Teologo e scrittore* pp.117-150. <Criscuolo, *Imitatio*>

Crouzel, H., La distinction de la « typologie » et de l'« allégorie ». *BLE* 65 (1964) 161-174.

Cummings, J.T., Lexical Notes on St. Gregory Nazianzen. *GRBS* 9 (1968) 183-191.

Dagron, G., Naissance d'une capitale. Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451. *Bibliothèque Byzantine* 7. Paris 1974. <Dagron, *Naissance*>

Dagron, G., Vie et Miracles de sainte Thècle. Texte grec, traduction et commentaire. *Subsidia Hagiographica* 62. Brussel 1978. <Dagron, *Thècle*>

Daniélou, J., Sacramentum futuri. Etudes sur les origines de la typologie biblique. Paris 1950. <Daniélou, *Sacramentum*>

Daniélou, J., Message évangélique et culture hellénistique aux IIe et IIIe siècles. Paris-Tournai 1961. <Daniélou, *Message*>

Daniélou, J., La démythisation dans l'école d'Alexandrie. *Il problema della demitizzazione. Archivo di filosofia* (Padova 1961) 45-49. <Daniélou, *démythisation*>

Daniélou, J., Mythes païens, mystère chrétien. Paris 1967. <Daniélou, *Mythes*>

Davids, H.L., De gnomologieën van sint Gregorius van Nazianze. Nijmegen-Amsterdam 1940.

Day, M.S., The Many Meanings of Myth. Lanham/New York/London 1984.

de Block, R., Evhémère, son livre et sa doctrine. Mons 1876.

de Jonge, L.F.M., De s. Gregorii Nazianzeni carminibus quae inscribi solent περὶ ἑαυτοῦ. Amsterdam 1910.

de Ley, H., Ἀριστοτέλης. Inleiding tot de lektuur van zijn « Ars Rhetorica ». Gent 1987.

Delfgaauw, B., Gregor von Nazianz: Antikes und Christliches Denken. *Eranos-Jahrbuch* 36 (1967) 113-163.

Del Ton, I., Natura e pregi della poetica di S. Gregorio Nazianzeno. *Quaderni dell'Umanesimo* 3 (1974) 110-120.

Demoen, K., The Date of the Cyzicene Epigrams. An Analysis of the Vocabulary and Metrical Technique of *AP*,III. *AC* 57 (1988) 231-248.

Demoen, K., Biblical vs. Non-biblical Vocabulary in Gregorius Nazianzenus. A Quantitative Approach. *Bible et Informatique: méthodes, outils, résultats. Actes du deuxième colloque de l'A.I.B.I., Jérusalem, 9-13 Juin 1988* (Genève 1989) 243-253.

Demoen, K., Saint Pierre se régalant de lupins. A propos de quelques traces d'apocryphes concernant Pierre dans l'œuvre de Grégoire de Nazianze. *Sacris Erudiri* 32 (1991) 96–106. <Demoen, *apocryphes*>

Demoen, K., The Attitude towards Greek Poetry in the Verse of Gregory Nazianzen. *Early Christian Poetry. A Collection of Essays*. edd. J. den Boeft and A. Hilhorst. *Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae* XXII. (Leiden - New York - Köln 1993) 235-252. <Demoen, *Attitude*>

Den Boer, W., De allegorese in het werk van Clemens Alexandrinus. Diss. Leiden 1940.

ΔΕΤΟΡΑΚΗΣ, Θ.Ε., Προσθῆκαι εἰς τὸ Πατερικὸν Λέξικον τοῦ Lampe ἐκ τῶν ἔργων Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου. Ἐπετηρὶς τῆς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν 45 (1984) 133-156.

Devolder, E., Saint Grégoire de Nazianze. Textes choisis. (Poèmes et lettres traduits par Paul Gallay). Namur 1960. <Devolder, *Poèmes*>

Devolder, E., Saint Grégoire de Nazianze. Homélies 38, 39, 40, 1, 45, 41. Textes introduits par Dom Th. Becquet. Choisis, présentés et traduits par E. Devolder. Namur 1962.

Dihle, A., Die Anfänge der griechischen akzentuierenden Verskunst. *Hermes* 82 (1954) 182-199.

Dölger, F.J., Nonna. Ein Kapitel über christliche Volksfrömmigkeit des vierten Jahrhunderts. *Antike und Christentum* 5 (1936) 44-73. <Dölger, *Nonna*>

Dölger, F.J., Beiträge zur Geschichte des Kreuzzeichens. 12. Das Kreuzzeichen in den poetischen Beschwörungsgebeten Gregors von Nazianz. *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 6 (1963) 18-23. <Dölger, *Kreuzzeichen*>

Döring, K., Exemplum Socratis. Studien zur Sokratesnachwirkung in der kynisch-stoischen Popularphilosophie der frühen Kaiserzeit und im frühen Christentum. *Hermes. Einzelschriften* 42. Wiesbaden 1979.

Dörrie, H., Spätantike Symbolik und Allegorese. *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 3 (1969) 1-12. <Dörrie, *Symbolik*>

Dörrie, H., Die Epiphanias-Predigt des Gregor von Nazianz (Hom.39) und ihre geistesgeschichtliche Bedeutung. *Kyriakon*.

Festschrift Johannes Quasten vol.I (Münster 1970) 409-423. <Dörrie, *Epiphanias*>

Dörrie, H., Sinn und Funktion des Mythos in der griechischen und der römischen Dichtung. *Rheinisch-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Geisteswissenschaften. Vorträge G 230.* Opladen 1978. <Dörrie, *Sinn*>

Donders, A., Die heilige Schrift in den Predigten des Kirchenlehrers Gregor von Nazianz. *Kirche und Kanzel* 4 (1921) 290-302.

Dostálová, R., Christentum und Hellenismus. Zur Herausbildung einer neuen kulturellen Identität im 4. Jahrhundert. *ByzSlav* 44 (1983) 1-12.

Dubedout, E., De s. Gregorii Nazianzeni carminibus. Paris 1901.

Duval, Y.-M., Le livre de Jonas dans la littérature chrétienne grecque et latine. Vol.I. Paris 1973.

Dziech, De Gregorio Nazianzeno diatribae quae dicitur alumno. Poznań 1925.

Egan, J., Gregory of Nazianzus and the Logos Doctrine. *J. Plevnik (ed.), Word and Spirit. Essays in Honor of D.M. Stanley.* (Willowdale 1975) 281-322.

Ellverson, A.-S., The Dual Nature of Man. A Study in the Theological Anthropology of Gregory of Nazianzus. Uppsala 1981.

Esper, M.N., Allegorie und Analogie bei Gregor van Nyssa. Diss. Bonn 1979.

Ettlinger, G.H., *Θεὸς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως* (Gregory of Nazianzus, Oratio XXXVII): The Dignity of the Human Person according to the Greek Fathers. *Studia Patristica* 16.2 (1985) 368-372. <Ettlinger, *Dignity*>

Ettlinger, G.H., The Orations of Gregory of Nazianzus: A Study in Rhetoric and Personality. *D.G. Hunter (ed.), Preaching in the Patristic Age. Studies in Honor of W. Burghardt.* (New York 1989) 101-118. <Ettlinger, *Personality*>

Fenster, E., Laudes Constantinopolitanae. München 1968.

Fleury, E., Saint Grégoire de Nazianze et son temps. Paris 1930.

Focken, J., De Gregorii Nazianzeni orationum et carminum dogmaticorum argumentandi ratione. Berlin 1912.

Frangeskou, V., Gregory Nazianzen's Usage of the Homeric Simile. Ἑλληνικά 36 (1985) 12-26. <Frangeskou, *Simile*>

Frangeskou, V., Observations on the Disputed *Hymnus ad Deum* (Carm. I.I.29 in M.37 507-8). *Studia Patristica* 18,2 (1989) 9-13. <Frangeskou, *Observations*>

Freise, R., Zur Metaphorik der Seefahrt in den Gedichten Gregors von Nazianz. *Symp.Naz.* pp.159-163.

Freytag, W., Allegorie, Allegorese. *Hist.Wört.Rhet.* 1 (1992) 330-393.

ΦΥΤΡΑΚΗΣ, Α.Ι., Τὸ ποιητικὸν ἔργον Γρηγορίου τοῦ Ναζιανζηνοῦ. Athens 1967.

Galavaris, G., The Illustrations of the Liturgical Homilies of Gregory Nazianzenus. *Studies in Manuscript Illumination* 6. Princeton 1969.

Gallay, P., Langue et style de saint Grégoire de Nazianze dans sa correspondance. Paris 1933. <Gallay, *Langue*>

Gallay, P., La vie de saint Grégoire de Nazianze: Thèse Lyon 1943. <Gallay, *Vie*>

Gallay, P., Grégoire de Nazianze. Traductions. Paris 1959. <Gallay, *Traductions*>

Gallay, P., La Bible dans l'œuvre de Grégoire de Nazianze le Théologien. *C. MONDESERT (ed.), Le monde grec ancien et la Bible* (Paris 1984) 313-334. <Gallay, *Bible*>

Gaullyer, D., Gregorii Nazianzeni plurima poemata in latinum conversa, cum notis grammaticis. Paris 1718.

Geffcken, J., Kynika und Verwandtes. I. Untersuchungen zur kynisch-stoischen Diatribe. Heidelberg 1909.

Genette, G., La rhétorique restreinte. *Communications* 16 (1970) 158-171.

Gerber, W.E., Exegese III. NT und Alte Kirche. *RLAC* 6 (1966) 1211-1229.

Gero, S., Jonah and the Patriarch. *VChr* 29 (1975) 141-146.

Gertz, N., Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Gedichte Gregors von Nazianz. 2. Die Gedichtgruppe I. Mit Beiträgen von Martin Sicherl. *Forschungen zu Gregor* 4. Paderborn 1986.

Ghedini, G., La poesia di s. Gregorio Nazianzeno. *La Scuola Cattolica* 60 (1932) 256-260.

Giet, S., Sasimes, une méprise de saint Basile. Paris 1941.

Gilbert, M., Grégoire de Nazianze et le Siracide. *Mémorial Gribomont. Studia ephemerida Augustiniana* 27 (1989) 307-314.

Gnilka, C., Χρῆσις. Die Methode der Kirchenväter im Umgang mit der antiken Kultur. I. Der Begriff des « rechten Gebrauchs ». Basel 1984.

Goppelt, L., Τύπος, ἀντίτυπος, τυπικός, ὑποτύπωσις. *ThWNT* 8 (1969) 246-260.

Grant, R.M., The Letter and the Spirit. London 1957. <Grant, *Letter*>

Grant, R.M., A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible. New York 1963. <Grant, *History*>

Grimme, H., Der Strophenbau in den Gedichten Ephraems des Syrers, mit einem Anhange über den Zusammenhang zwischen syrischer und byzantinischer Hymnenform. *Collectanea Friburgensia* II. Freiburg 1893.

Grützmacher, G., Hieronymus. Eine biographische Studie zur alten Kirchengeschichte. I. Hälfte. Leipzig 1901.

Guida, A., Un nuovo testo di Gregorio Nazianzeno. *Prometheus* 2 (1976) 193-226.

Guignet, M., Saint Grégoire de Nazianze et la rhétorique. Thèse Paris 1911. <Guignet, *Rhétorique*>

Guignet, M., Les procédés épistolaires de saint Grégoire de Nazianze comparés à ceux de ses contemporains. Thèse supplémentaire. Paris 1911. <Guignet, *Procédés*>

Guinot, J.-N., La typologie comme technique herméneutique. *P. Maraval (ed.) Figures de l'Ancien Testament chez les Pères.* [*Cahiers de Biblia Patristica* 2] (Strasbourg 1989) 1-34.

Gutzen, D. - Ottmers, M., Christliche Rhetorik. *Hist. Wört.Rhet.* 2 (1994) 197-222.

Guzie, T.W., Patristic Hermeneutics and the Meaning of Tradition. *Theological Studies* 32 (1971) 647-658.

Haeuser, Ph., Des heiligen Bischofs Gregor von Nazianz Reden aus dem griechischen übersetzt und mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen versehen. Rede 1-20. *Bibliothek der Kirchenväter*, Bd. 1. München 1928.

Hanfmann, G.M.A., The Continuity of Classical Art: Culture, Myth and Faith. *K. WEITZMANN (ed.), Age of Spirituality. A Symposion.* (New York 1980) 75-99.

Hanriot-Coustet, A., Grégoire de Nazianze et un agraphon attribué à Barnabé. *RHPhR* 63 (1983) 289-292.

Hanssen, F., Ueber die unprosodischen Hymnen des Gregor von Nazianz. *Philologus* 44 (1885) 228-235.

Harl, M., Origène et les interprétations patristiques grecques de l'« obscurité » biblique. *VChr* 36 (1982) 334-371.

Harnisch, W., Die Gleichniserzählungen Jesu: eine hermeneutische Einführung. Göttingen 1985.

Hauser-Meury, M.-M., Prosopographie zu den Schriften Gregors von Nazianz. Bonn 1960.

Herzog, R., Metapher - Exegese - Mythos. Interpretationen zur Entstehung eines biblischen Mythos in der Literatur der Spätantike. *M. FUHRMANN (ed.), Terror und Spiel. Probleme der Mythenrezeption. [Poetik und Hermeneutik IV]* (München 1971) 157-185. <Herzog, *Metapher*>

Herzog, R., e.a., Diskussion. Literarisierung der Bibel und mythische Figur. *ibidem* 593-616. <Herzog, *Literarisierung*>

Höllger, W., Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Gedichte Gregors von Nazianz. 1. Die Gedichtgruppen XX und XI. *Forschungen zu Gregor* 3. Paderborn 1984.

Hörling, E., Mythos und Pistis. Zur Deutung heidnischer Mythen in der christlichen Weltchronik des Johannes Malalas. Diss. Lund 1980.

Horstmann, A., Der Mythosbegriff vom frühen Christentum bis zur Gegenwart. *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte* 23 (1979) 7-54.

Hunger, H., On the Imitation (μίμησις) of Antiquity in Byzantine Literature. *DOP* 23-24 (1969-1970) 14-38. <Hunger, *Imitation*>

Hunger, H., Byzantinische Rhetorik. *Hist.Wört.Rhet.* 2 (1994) 92-118. <Hunger, *Rhetorik*>

Ivánka, E., Hellenisches und Christliches im frühbyzantinischen Geistesleben. Wien 1948.

Jacks, L.V., St. Basil and Greek Literature. Washington 1922.

Jaeger, W., Early Christianity and Greek Paideia. Cambridge Mass. 1961.

Joosen, J.C. - Waszink, J.H., Allegorese. *RLAC* 1 (1950) 283-293.

Junod, E., Remarques sur la composition de la « Philocalie » d'Origène par Basile de Césarée et Grégoire de Nazianze. *RHPhR* 52 (1972) 149-156. <Junod, *Remarques*>

Junod, E., Basile de Césarée et Grégoire de Nazianze sont-ils les compilateurs de la Philocalie d'Origène? Réexamen de la lettre 115 de Grégoire. *Mémorial Gribomont. Studia ephemerida Augustiniana* 27 (1989) 349-360. <Junod, *Réexamen*>

Kaiser, E., Odyssee-Szenen als Topoi. *Museum Helveticum* 21 (1964) 109-136 / 197-224.

Kazhdan, A.P., Kosmas of Jerusalem. 3. The Exegesis of Gregory of Nazianzos. *Byzantion* 61 (1991) 396-412.

Kennedy, G.A., Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors. Princeton 1983. <Kennedy, *Rhetoric*>

Kennedy, G.A., New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism. Chapel Hill - London 1984. <Kennedy, *Interpretation*>

Kertsch, M., Bildersprache bei Gregor von Nazianz. Ein Beitrag zur spätantiken Rhetorik und Popularphilosophie. Graz 1978. <Kertsch, *Bildersprache*>

Kertsch, M., Stilistische und literarische Untersuchungsergebnisse aus Gregor von Nazianz' « Carmen de virtute » II. *Symp.Naz.* pp.165-178. <Kertsch, *Carmen de virtute*>

Kertsch, M., Eine Libanius-Reminiszenz bei Gregor von Nazianz, or.4,99? *Vigiliae Christianae* 46 (1992) 80-82. <Kertsch, *Eine Libanius-Reminiszenz*>

Kertsch, M., L'esegesi di Mt 19,11-12 in Gregorio Nazianzeno e Giovanni Crisostomo. *Teologo e scrittore* pp.103-114. <Kertsch, *esegesi*>

Keydell, R., Die Unechtheit der Gregor von Nazianz zugeschriebenen *Exhortatio ad virgines*. *ByzZ* 43 (1950) 334-337. <Keydell, *Unechtheit*>

Keydell, R., Ein dogmatisches Lehrgedicht Gregors von Nazianz. *ByzZ* 44 (1951) 315-321. <Keydell, *Lehrgedicht*>

Keydell, R., Die literaturhistorische Stellung der Gedichte Gregors von Nazianz. *Atti VII Congr. Int. di Studi Bizantini = Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici* 7 (1953) 134-143. <Keydell, *Stellung*>

Keydell, R., Epigramm. *RLAC* Bd.5 (1961) 539-577. <Keydell, *Epigramm*>

Kirk, G.S., The Nature of Greek Myths. Harmondsworth (Penguin Books) 1974.

Klein, J., Beispiel. *Hist.Wört.Rhet.* 1 (1992) 1430-1435.

Knaack, G., Zu Gregor von Nazianz. *Neue Jahrbücher für Philosophie und Pädagogik* 135 (1887) 619-620.

Knecht, A., Gregor von Nazianz. Gegen die Putzsucht der Frauen. Heidelberg 1972.

Kopecek, T.A., The Social Class of the Cappadocian Fathers. *Church History* 42 (1973) 453-466.

Kurmann, A., Gregor von Nazianz. Oratio 4 gegen Julian. Ein Kommentar. *Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft* 19. Basel 1988.

Leeman, A.D. - Braet, A.C., Klassieke retorica. Groningen 1987.

Lefherz, F., Studien zu Gregor von Nazianz. Mythologie, Überlieferung, Scholiasten. Diss. Bonn 1958.

Le Nain de Tillemont, S., Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles. Paris 1693-1712. Vol. IX, pp.305-560 en 692-731.

Link, F., Möglichkeiten einer literarischen Typologie des Alten Testaments. *F. LINK (ed.), Paradeigmata. Literarische Typologie des Alten Testaments. [Schriften zur Literaturwissenschaft 5]* (Berlin 1989) 11-31.

List, J., Zwei Zeugnisse für die Lobrede bei Gregor von Nazianz. *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher* 6 (1928) 25-31.

Loose, D., Voor een theologie van de metafoor. *RBPh* 68 (1990) 576-596.

Lorenz, B., Zur Seefahrt des Lebens in den Gedichten des Gregor von Nazianz. *VChr* 33 (1979) 234-241.

Lubac, H. de, Histoire et Esprit. L'intelligence de l'Ecriture d'après Origène. *Théologie* 16. Paris 1950. <de Lubac, *Histoire*>

Lubac, H. de, A propos de l'allégorie chrétienne. *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 47 (1959) 5-43. <de Lubac, *allégorie*>

Lubac, H. de, Exégèse médiévale. Les quatre sens de l'Ecriture. 4 Vol. Mesnil 1959-1964. <de Lubac, *Exégèse*>

Ludwich, A., Nachahmer und Vorbilder des Dichters Gregorios von Nazianz. *RhM* 42 (1887) 233-238.

Lumpe, A., Exemplum. *RLAC* Bd.6 (1966) 1229-1257.

Maas, P., Das Kontakion. *ByzZ* 19 (1910) 285-306.

Madec, G., La christianisation de l'hellénisme. Thème de l'histoire de la philosophie patristique. *Humanisme et foi chrétienne. Mélanges scientifiques du Centenaire de l'Institut Catholique de Paris* (Paris 1976) 399-406.

Malin, A.N., Οἱ ἐπιτάφιοι λόγοι Γρηγορίου τοῦ Ναζιανζηνοῦ ἐν σχέσει πρὸς τὴν ἐθνικὴν ῥητορείαν. Diss. Athens 1929 (unaccessible to me, but see summary Trisoglio *1973* pp.200-206).

Malingrey, A.M., « Philosophia ». Etude d'un groupe de mots dans la littérature grecque des Présocratiques au IVe siècle après J.-C. Paris 1961.

Malingrey, A.M., Le personnage de Socrate chez quelques auteurs chrétiens du IV^{e} siècle. *Forma Futuri. Studi in onore del cardinale Michele Pellegrino* (Torino 1975) 159-178. <Malingrey, *Socrate*>

Malingrey, A.M., Jean Chrysostome. Lettres à Olympias / Vie anonyme d'Olympias. *SC* 13bis. Paris 1988. <Malingrey, *Olympias*>

Maraval, P. (ed.), Figures de l'Ancien Testament chez les Pères. *Cahiers de Biblia Patristica* 2. Strasbourg 1989.

Marcos, N.F., Observaciones sobre los himnos de Gregorio Nacianceno. *Emerita* 36 (1968) 231-245.

Martroye, M.F., Le testament de saint Grégoire de Nazianze. *Mémoires de la société nationale des antiquaires de France* 76 (1924) 219-263.

Masson, M.-P., Le discours 35 de Grégoire de Nazianze: questions de l'authenticité. *Pallas* 31 (1984) 179-188.

Masson-Vincourt, M.-P., Les Allusions à la Mythologie et à la Religion Païennes dans les Œuvres de Grégoire de Nazianze. Thèse de troisième cycle, Lille 1973 (unpublished).

Masson-Vincourt, M.-P., Interprètation d'un passage du discours 39 de Grégoire de Nazianze sur Eleusis. *MSR* 33 (1976) 155-162. <Masson-Vincourt, *Eleusis*>

Mathieu, J.-M., Authenticité de l'« Exhortatio ad virgines » (Carmen I,II,3). *Symp.Naz.* pp.145-158. <Mathieu, *Authenticité*>

Mathieu, J.-M., Remarques sur l'anthropologie philosophique de Grégoire de Nazianze (Poemata dogmatica, VIII, 22-32; 78-96) et Porphyre. *Studia Patristica* 17,3 (1982) 1115-1119.

Mayer, G., Exegese II. Judentum. *RLAC* 6 (1966) 1194-1211.

McCall, M.H., Ancient Rhetorical Theories of Simile and Comparison. Cambridge, Mass. 1969.

McCauley, L.P. et al., Funeral Orations by Saint Gregory Nazianzen and Saint Ambrose. *The Fathers of the Church, a new translation*, vol.22. Washington 1953.

McGuckin, J., Saint Gregory Nazianzen: Selected Poems. Translated with an Introduction. Oxford 1986.

Meehan, D., St. Gregory Nazianzen and Hellenistic Humanism. *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* 62 (1943) 255-264. <Meehan, *Humanism*>

Meehan, D., Saint Gregory of Nazianzus. Three Poems. Translated by D.M. Meehan. Supplementary Notes by T.P. Halton. Washington 1987. <Meehan, *Three Poems*>

Mercati, G.S., Di un carme anacreontico spurio e mutilo di Gregorio Nazianzeno. *ByzZ* 17 (1908) 389-396.

Méridier, L., L'influence de la seconde sophistique sur l'œuvre de Grégoire de Nysse. Thèse Paris, Rennes 1906.

Mersch, E., Le corps mystique du Christ. Etude de theologie historique. Paris-Bruxelles 1951^3.

Meyendorff, J., Initiation à la théologie byzantine. L'histoire et la doctrine (traduit de l'anglais par A. Sanglade). Paris 1975.

Meyer, W., Die beiden rythmischen Gedichte des Gregor von Nazianz. *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur mittellateinischen Rythmik* (Berlin 1905) Bd.2 pp.48-51; Beilage I pp.141-152.

ΜΗΤΣΑΚΗΣ, Κ., Βυζαντινὴ Ὑμνογραφία. Α. Ἀπὸ τὴν Καινὴ Διαθήκη ἕως τὴν εἰκονομαχία. Thessaloniki 1971.

Michels, T., Macht des Mysteriums. Sechs geistliche Reden an den Hochtagen der Kirche. Düsseldorf 1956.

Milovanovic-Barham, C., Three Levels of Style in Augustine of Hippo and Gregory of Nazianzus. *Rhetorica* 11 (1993) 1-25.

Misch, G., Geschichte der Autobiographie I.II. Frankfurt 1950³.

Mitchell, J.F., Consolatory Letters in Basil and Gregory Nazianzen. *Hermes* 96 (1968) 299-318.

Monselewski, W., Der barmherzige Samariter. Eine auslegungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Lukas 10,25-37. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese* 5. Tübingen 1967.

Moos, P. von, Geschichte als Topik: das rhetorische Exemplum von der Antike zur Neuzeit und die historiae im Policraticus Johanns von Salisbury. Hildesheim 1988.

Moreschini, C., Il platonismo cristiano di Gregorio Nazianzeno. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Classe di lettere e filosofia* 4 (1974) 1347-1392. <Moreschini, *platonismo*>

Moreschini, C., Influenze di Origene su Gregorio di Nazianzo. *Atti dell'Accademia La Colombaria* n.s. 30 (1979) 33-57. <Moreschini, *Origene*>

Mossay, J., La date de l'Oratio II de Grégoire de Nazianze et celle de son ordination. *Muséon* 77 (1964) 175-186. <Mossay, *Date*>

Mossay, J., La mort et l'au-delà dans saint Grégoire de Nazianze. Louvain 1966. <Mossay, *Mort*>

Mossay, J., Gregor von Nazianz in Konstantinopel. *Byzantion* 47 (1977) 223-238. <Mossay, *Konstantinopel*>

Mossay, J., Note sur Héron-Maxime, écrivain ecclésiastique. *AB* 100 (1982) 229-236. <Mossay, *Maxime*>

Mossay, J., La collection des Discours « non-lus-à-date-fixe » dans le Ms. de New York Gordon Goodhart Gr.44. *Symp.Naz.* pp.15-21. <Mossay, *Collection*>

Mossay, J., Gregor von Nazianz. *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* Bd. 14 (1985) 164-173. <Mossay, *Gregor*>

ΜΠΩΝΗΣ, Κ., Περὶ τῆς μητρὸς τῆς ἁγίας Ὀλυμπιάδος. *Studi bizantini e neoellenici* 8 (1953) 3-10. <Μπώνης, Περὶ τῆς μητρὸς>

ΜΠΩΝΗΣ, Κ., Γρηγόριος ὁ Θεολόγος ἤτοι τὸ γενεαλογικὸν δένδρον Γρηγορίου τοῦ Ναζιανζηνοῦ. Athene 1953. <Μπώνης, γενεαλογικὸν δένδρον>

Mühlenberg, E., Das Gleichnis von den Arbeitern im Weinberg (Matthäus 20,1-16) bei den Vätern. *H. Eisenberger (ed.)*, ΕΡΜΗΝΕΥΜΑΤΑ. *Festschrift für Hadwig Hörner zum sechzigsten Geburtstag* (Heidelberg 1990) 11-26.

Munier, Ch., La femme de Lot dans la littérature juive et chrétienne des premiers siècles. *P. Maraval (ed.) Figures de l'Ancien Testament chez les Pères. [Cahiers de Biblia Patristica 2]* (Strasbourg 1989) 123-142.

Musurillo, H., The Poetry of Gregory of Nazianzus. *Thought* 45 (1970) 45-55.

Nardi, C., Note al *primo carme teologico* di Gregorio Nazianzeno. *Prometheus* 16 (1990) 153-174.

Nautin, P., La date du « De Viris Inlustribus » de Jérôme, de la mort de Cyrille de Jérusalem et de celle de Grégoire de Nazianze. *RHE* 56 (1961) 33-35.

Nicastri, L., Ricerche sull'elegia ellenistico-romana: la tradizione alessandrina nel carme I,2,14 di Gregorio Nazianzeno. *I. Gallo (ed.), Studi Salernitani in memoriam R. Cantarella* (Salerno 1981) 413-460.

Niedermeier, L., Untersuchungen über die antike poetische Autobiographie. München 1919.

Norden, E., Die antike Kunstprosa II. Leipzig / Berlin 1918^3.

Noret, J., Grégoire de Nazianze, l'auteur le plus cité, après la Bible, dans la littérature ecclésiastique byzantine. *Symp.Naz.* pp.259-266.

Norris, F.W., Of Thorns and Roses. The Logic of Belief in Gregory Nazianzen. *ChHist* 53 (1984) 455-464. <Norris, *Thorns and Roses*>

Norris, F.W., Faith Gives Fullness to Reasoning. The Five Theological Orations of Gregory Nazianzen. Introduction and Commentary by F.W.Norris. Translation by L. Wickham and F. Williams. *Vigiliae Christianae, Supplements* 13. Leiden 1991. <Norris, *Faith*>

North, H., Sophrosyne. Self-Knowledge and Self-Restraint in Greek Literature. New York 1966.

Nolailhat, R., Remarques méthodologiques à propos de la question de « l'hellénisation du christianisme ». *F. Dunand - P. Lévêque (edd.), Les syncrétismes dans les religions de l'antiquité. Colloque de Besançon, 22-23 oct. 1973.* (Leiden 1975) 212-232.

Oberg, E., Amphilochii Iconiensis Iambi ad Seleucum. Berlin 1969.

Oberhaus, M., Gregor von Nazianz. Gegen den Zorn (Carmen 1,2,25). Einleitung und Kommentar. *Forschungen zu Gregor* 8. Paderborn 1991.

Oehler, R., Mythologische Exempla in der älteren griechischen Dichtung. Diss. Basel 1925.

Oosthout, H.F.R.M., Wijsgerig taalgebruik in de redevoeringen van Gregorius van Nazianze tegen de achtergrond van de neoplatoonse metafysica. Diss. doct. Nijmegen 1986.

Opelt, I., Griechische und lateinische Bezeichnungen der Nichtchristen. Ein terminologischer Versuch. *VChr* 19 (1965) 1-22.

Otis, B., The Throne and the Mountain. An Essay on St. Gregory Nazianzus. *CJ* 56 (1961) 146-165.

Palla, R., Ordinamento e polimetria delle poesie bibliche di Gregorio Nazianzeno. *WS* 102 (1989) 169-185. <Palla, *Ordinamento*>

Palla, R., Gli *Anecdota Graeca* di Ludovico Antonio Muratori e il testo degli epigrammi di Gregorio Nazianzeno. *Teologo e scrittore* pp.171-197. <Palla, *epigrammi*>

Payr, Th., Enkomion. *RLAC* Bd.5 (1962) 332-343.

Pellegrino, M., La poesia di s. Gregorio Nazianzeno. Milano 1932.

Pépin, J., Mythe et allégorie. Les origines grecques et les contestations judéo-chrétiennes. Paris 1976^2. <Pépin, *Mythe*>

Pépin, J., Grégoire de Nazianze, lecteur de la littérature hermétique. *VChr* 36 (1982) 251-260. <Pépin, *lecteur*>

Pépin, J., La tradition de l'allégorie de Philon d'Alexandrie à Dante. Etudes historiques. Paris 1987. <Pépin, *allégorie*>

Pétré, H., L'exemplum chez Tertullien. Diss. Paris. Dijon 1940.

Petzl, G., Die Epigramme des Gregors von Nazianz über Grabräuberei und das Hierothesion des Kommagenischen Königs Antiochos I. *EA* 10 (1987) 117-130.

Pinault, H., Le Platonisme de s. Grégoire de Nazianze. La Roche-sur-Yon 1925.

Plagnieux, J., Saint Grégoire de Nazianze Théologien. Thèse Paris 1952.

Pouchet, J.-R., La date de l'élection épiscopale de Saint Basile et celle de sa mort. *RHE* 87 (1992) 5-33.

Prestige, G.L., Hades in the Greek Fathers. *JThS* 24 (1923) 476-485.

Price, B.J., Παράδειγμα and *Exemplum* in Ancient Rhetorical Theory. Ph.D. Berkeley 1975.

Przychocki, G., Historia listów św. Grzegorza z Nazjanzu. *Polska Akademia Umiejetności, Rozprawy Wydzialu Filologicznego*, ser. III, 22,3. Kraków 1946. (Accessible to me via Trisoglio, 1973 pp.106-108.)

Pyykkö, V., 'Mythos' und 'Wahrheit' bei Basileios von Kaisareia. *H. KOSKENNIEMIE e.a. (ed.) Literatur und Philosophie in der Antike. Annales Universitatis Turkuensis, ser.B, tom.174* (Turku 1986) 119-125. <Pyykkö, *Mythos*>

Pyykkö, V., Die griechischen Mythen bei den grossen Kappadokiern und bei Johannes Chrysostomos. *Annales Universitatis Turkuensis, ser.B, tom.193*. Turku 1991.

Quéré, F., Réflexions de Grégoire de Nazianze sur la parure féminine. Etude du poème sur la coquetterie, I.II.29. *RSR* 42 (1968) 62-71.

Rahner, H., Symbole der Kirche. Die Ekklesiologie der Väter. Salzburg 1964. <Rahner, *Symbole*>

Rahner, H., Griechische Mythen in christlicher Deutung. Zürich 1966³. <Rahner, *Mythen*>

Rapisarda, E., Il pessimismo di Gregorio Nazianzeno. *Nuovo Didaskaleion* 18 (1968) 157-173.

Regali, M., Forme e motivi dell'epitalamio nella poesia di s. Gregorio Nazianzeno. *Le Muséon* 96 (1983) 87-96.

Regali, M., La datazione del carme II 2,3 di Gregorio Nazianzeno. *SCO* 38 (1989) 373-381. <Regali, *datazione*>

Ritter, A.-M., Das Konzil von Konstantinopel und sein Symbol. Göttingen 1965.

Rousse, J., Grégoire de Nazianze. *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* 6 (1967) 932-971.

Ruether, R.R., Gregory of Nazianzus. Rhetor and Philosopher. Oxford 1969.

Rzach, A., Zu den Nachklängen hesiodischer Poesie. *WS* 21 (1899) 198-215.

Sajdak, J., Quaestiones Nazianzenicae. Pars prima: Quae ratio inter Gregorium Nazianzenum et Maximum Cynicum intercedat. *Eos* 15 (1909) 18-48. <Sajdak, *Quaestiones*>

Sajdak, J., Die Scholiasten der Reden des Gregor von Nazianz. *ByzZ* 30 (1929-30) 268-274. <Sajdak, *Scholiasten*>

ΣΑΚΚΑΛΗΣ, Ι., Γρηγορίου Θεολόγου Ἔργα. Τομ.8,9,10. Thessaloniki 1976–1977.

Salvatore, A., Tradizione e originalità negli epigrammi di Gregorio Nazianzeno. In appendice: Antologia di epigrammi gregoriani. Napoli 1960.

Schäublin, C., Untersuchungen zur Methode und Herkunft der antiochenischen Exegese. Bonn 1974. <Schäublin, *Untersuchungen*>

Schäublin, C., Zur paganen Prägung der christlichen Exegese. *J. van Oort - U. Wickert (ed.), Christliche Exegese zwischen Nicaea und Chalcedon.* (Kampen 1992) 148-173. <Schäublin, *Prägung*>

Scheidweiler, F., Zu den Gedichten Gregors von Nazianz bei Cantarella und Soyter. *ByzZ* 49 (1956) 345-348.

Schissel, O., review of Pellegrino. *Philologische Wochenschrift* 55 (1935) 70-73.

Schnayder, G., Editionis Gregorianae ab academia litterarum Cracoviensi institutae fata quae fuerint. *Studia Theologica Varsoviensia* 9 (1971) 5-19. (The publication of this volume was prohibited; professor J. Mossay provided me with a printer's proof of this article.)

SCHNEIDER, T., Wesen und Bedeutung des Symbols in der Patristik. *M. LURKER (ed.), Symbolbegriff und Symbolforschung. [Bibliographie zur Symbolik, Ikonographie und Mythologie Bd.1]* (Baden Baden 1982) 153-161.

SCHNEIDERHAN, A., Die Exempla bei Hieronymus. Diss. München 1921. (unpublished)

SCHUBACH, M., De Sancti Patris Gregorii Nazianzeni Carminibus Commentatio Patrologica. Diss. Koblenz 1865.

ŠEVČENKO, I., A Shadow Outline of Virtue: the Classical Heritage of Greek Christian Literature (second to seventh Century). *K. WEITZMANN (ed.) Age of Spirituality: A Symposium* (New York 1980) 53-73.

SICHERL, M. - MOSSAY, J. - LAFONTAINE, G., Travaux préparatoires à une édition critique de Grégoire de Nazianze. *RHE* 74 (1979) 626-640.

SICHERL, M., Bericht über die Arbeit an den Gedichten Gregors von Nazianz seit Koblenz (1976). *Symp.Naz.* pp. 137-140. <Sicherl, *Bericht*>

SICHERL, M., Ein neuplatonischer Hymnus unter den Gedichten Gregors von Nazianz. *J. DUFFY - J. PERADOTTO (edd.) Gonimos. Neoplatonic and Byzantine Studies Presented to L.G. Westerink at 75* (New York 1988) 61-83. <Sicherl, *Hymnus*>

SIMON, M., Hercule et le christianisme. Paris 1955.
The first chapter (pp.17-45) resumes an earlier article: Les dieux antiques dans la pensée chrétienne. *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 6 (1954) 97-114.

SINKO, T., Studia Nazianzenica. Pars I. De collationis apud Gregorium Nazianzenum usu et de Terrae et Maris contentione quadam Pseudo-Gregoriana. Krakau 1906. <Sinko, *De collatione usu*>

SINKO, T., De Gregorii Nazianzeni laudibus Macchabaeorum. *Eos* 13 (1907) 1-29. <Sinko, *De laudibus*>

ΣΙΩΤΗΣ, M.A., Οἱ Τρεῖς Ἱεράρχαι ὡς ἑρμηνευταὶ τῆς Ἁγίας Γραφῆς. Athens 1963. (I know this study only through the critical summary in TRISOGLIO, 1973 pp.272-275.)

ŠPIDLÍK, T., Grégoire de Nazianze. Introduction à l'étude de sa doctrine spirituelle. Roma 1971.

Špidlík, T., Y a-t-il un pluralisme théologique en Grégoire de Nazianze? La théologie est-elle une poésie ou une science? *Studia Patristica* 16.2 (1985) 428-432. <Špidlík, *théologie*>

Stählin, G., Μῦθος. *ThWNT* 4 (1966) 769-803.

ΣΤΕΦΑΝΙΔΗΣ, B.K., Ἱστορικαὶ διορθώσεις εἰς τὴν Ἐκκλησιαστικὴν Ἱστορίαν τοῦ Σωκράτους. *Ἐπετηρὶς τῆς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* 26 (1956) 57-129.

Sternbach, L., Curae Menandreae. *Rozprawy Akademii umiejetności, Wydział filologiczny* 17 (1892) 168-245. <Sternbach, *Curae*>

Sternbach, L., Dilucidationes Nazianzenicae. *Eos* 16 (1910) 11-25. <Sternbach, *Dilucidationes*>

Sternbach, L., Les influences alexandrines et de l'époque suivante chez Grégoire de Nazianze. *Bulletin international de l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences et des Lettres. Classe de philologie*, 1922. (Krakau 1926) 60-64. <Sternbach, *Influences*>

Sternbach, L., Cercidea. *Eos* 30 (1927) 347-366. <Sternbach, *Cercidea*>

Sundermann, K., Gregor von Nazianz: Der Rangstreit zwischen Ehe und Jungfraulichkeit (Carmen 1,2,1, 215-732). Einleitung und Kommentar. *Forschungen zu Gregor* 9. Paderborn 1991.

Sykes, D.A., The *Poemata Arcana* of St. Gregory Nazianzen. *JThS* 21 (1970) 32-42. <Sykes, *Arcana*>

Sykes, D.A., The *Poemata Arcana* of St. Gregory Nazianzen: Some Literary Questions. *ByzZ* 72 (1979) 6-15. <Sykes, *Literary Questions*>

Sykes, D.A., The Bible and Greek Classics in Gregory Nazianzen's Verse. *Studia Patristica* 17,3 (1982) 1127-1130. <Sykes, *Bible*>

Sykes, D.A., Gregory Nazianzen as Didactic Poet. *Studia Patristica* 16,2 (1985) 433-437. <Sykes, *Gregory*>

Sykes, D.A., Reflections on Gregory Nazianzen's *Poemata quae spectant ad alios*. *Studia Patristica* 18,3 (1989) 551-556. <Sykes, *Reflections*>

Szymusiak, J.-M., Note sur l'amour des lettres au service de la foi chrétienne chez Grégoire de Nazianze. *Oikoumene. Studi paleocris-*

tiani in onore del Concilio Ecumenico Vaticano II. (Catania 1964) 507-513. <Szymusiak, *Note*>

Szymusiak, J.-M., Grzegorz Teolog. Posnań 1965. (Polish. with French summary) <Szymusiak, *Teolog*>

Szymusiak, J.-M., Pour une chronologie des discours de s. Grégoire de Nazianze. *VChr* 20 (1966) 183-189. <Szymusiak, *Chronologie*>

Szymusiak, J.-M., Grégoire de Nazianze et le péché. *Studia Patristica* 9,3 (1966) 288-305. <Szymusiak, *péché*>

Trisoglio, F., S. Gregorio di Nazianzo scrittore e teologo in quaranta anni di ricerche (1925-1965). *Riv. di Storia e Lett. Relig.* 8 (1972) 341-374. <Trisoglio, 1972>

Trisoglio, F., San Gregorio di Nazianzo in un quarantennio di studi (1925-1965). *Rivista lasalliana* 40. Torino 1973. <Trisoglio, 1973>

Trisoglio, F., La « humanitas » di Gregorio di Nazianzo attraverso ai suoi tre più ampi carmi autobiografici. *La scuola cattolica* 105 (1977) 567-594. <Trisoglio, *« humanitas »*>

Trisoglio, F., Mentalità ed atteggiamenti degli scoliasti di fronte agli scritti di S. Gregorio di Nazianzo. *Symp.Naz.* pp.187-251. <Trisoglio, *scoliasti*>

Tuilier, A., Grégoire de Nazianze. La Passion du Christ. Tragédie. *Sources Chrétiennes* 149. Paris 1969.

Van de Paverd, F., A Text of Gregory of Nazianzus Misinterpreted by F.E. Brightman. *OCP* 42 (1976) 197-206.

Van der Meer, H., Euhemerus van Messene. Diss. Amsterdam 1949.

Van Noppen, J.-P., Questions sur la métaphore. Introduction au Colloque « La pratique de la métaphore ». *RBPh* 68 (1990) 527-530.

Vernière, Y., L'empereur Julien et l'exégèse des mythes. *J. HANI (ed.), Problèmes du mythe et de son interprétation. Actes du Colloque de Chantilly, 24-25 Avril 1976* (Paris 1978) 105-118.

von Blumenthal, A., Τύπος und παράδειγμα. *Hermes* 63 (1928) 391-424.

WEDER, H., Die Gleichnisse Jesu als Metaphern: traditions- und redaktionsgeschichtliche Analysen und Interpretationen. Göttingen 1978.

WEIJENBORG, R., Some Evidence of Unauthenticity for the 'Discourse XI in Honour of Gregory of Nyssa' Attributed to Gregory of Nazianzen (*sic*). *Studia Patristica* 17.3 (1982) 1145-1148.

WERHAHN, H.M., Dubia und Spuria unter den Gedichten Gregors von Nazianz. *Studia Patristica* 7,1 (1966) 337-347. <Werhahn, *Dubia*>

WERHAHN, H.M., Übersichtstabellen zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung der Gedichte Gregors von Nazianz. Aachen 1967 (originally in typescript, incorporated in HÖLLGER pp.15-34). <Werhahn, *Übersichtstabellen*>

WESCHE, K.P., The Union of God and Man in Jesus Christ in the Thought of Gregory of Nazianzus. *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 28 (1984) 83-98.

WIERENGA, L., Retorische tekstbeschrijving. *Ch.* GRIVEL *(ed.), Methoden in de literatuurwetenschap* (Utrecht 1978) 149-165.

WIFSTRAND, A., L'église ancienne et la culture grecque. Paris 1962.

WILL, W. - KLEIN, R., Hellenen. *RLAC* 14 (1988) 375-445.

WINSLOW, D.F., Christology and Exegesis in the Cappadocians. *ChHist* 40 (1971) 389-396. <Winslow, *Exegesis*>

WINSLOW, D.F., Orthodox Baptism - A Problem for Gregory of Nazianzus. *Studia Patristica* 14,3 (1976) 371-374. <Winslow, *Baptism*>

WITTIG, M., Gregor von Nazianz. Briefe. Eingeleitet, übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen versehen. *Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur* 13. Stuttgart 1981.

WYSS, B., Zu Gregor von Nazianz. *Phyllobolia für P. Von der Mühll* (Basel 1946) 153-183. <Wyss, *Phyllobolia*>

WYSS, B., Gregor von Nazianz. Ein griechisch-christlicher Dichter des 4. Jahrhunderts. *Museum Helveticum* 6 (1949) 177-210. <Wyss, *Dichter*>

WYSS, B., Gregor von Nazianz. *RLAC* Bd.12 (1983) 793-863. <Wyss, *RLAC*>

WYSS, B., Gregor von Nazianz oder Gregor von Nyssa? (Greg.Naz. epist.249 Gallay / Greg.Nyss. epist.1 Pasquali). *E. LUCCHESI - H.D. SAFFREY (edd.), Mémorial A.-J. Festugière. Antiquité païenne et chrétienne* (Genf 1984) 153-162.

YOUNG, F.M., Typology. *S.E. PORTER, P. JOYCE, D.E. ORTON (eds.), Crossing the Boundaries. Essays in Biblical Interpretation in honour of M.D. Goulder.* (Leiden 1994) 29-48.

YOUNG, F.M., Hermeneia: towards an Understanding of Biblical Exegesis in the Early Church, forthcoming (mid-'95).

ZEEGERS - VANDER VORST, N., Les citations des poètes grecs chez les apologistes chrétiens du II^e siècle. *Recueil de Travaux d'Histoire et de Philologie* 4,47. Louvain 1972.

ZEHLES, F.E., Kommentar zu den « Mahnungen an die Jungfrauen » (carmen 1,2,2) Gregors von Nazianz. v.1-354. Diss. Münster 1987.

ZORZETTI, N., Dimostrare e convincere: l'*exemplum* nel ragionamento induttivo e nella communicazione. *Rhétorique et histoire. L'*exemplum *et le modèle de comportement dans le discours antique et médiéval. Mélanges de l'Ecole Française de Rome* 92 (1980) 33-65.

INDEX OF PASSAGES FROM GREGORY NAZIANZEN

This index contains all the passages mentioned in this book: the bold italic page numbers refer to passages at least partially quoted in Greek.

POEMS

I,1,1, vv.2-3 ***390***
I,1,1, vv.6-7 ***150***
I,1,1, vv.6-8 ***169***
I,1,2, v.69 391
I,1,3, vv.24-31 254
I,1,3, vv.33-41 ***85***
I,1,4, v.3 ***213***
I,1,5, v.53 ***158***
I,1,5, vv.53-54 and 63-64 ***105***
I,1,6, vv.53-69 ***90***
I,1,6, vv.59-66 ***390***
I,1,6, v.69 ***253***
I,1,6, vv.88-96 101
I,1,8, v.32 ***213***
I,1,8, v.38 ***302***
I,1,8, v.53 ***213***
I,1,8, vv.97-122 ***273-5***
I,1,9, vv.1-7 ***254***
I,1,9, vv.15-18 ***224***
I,1,9, vv.87-93 ***288***
I,1,9b, vv.16-17 187
I,1,9b, vv.16-33 317
I,1,9b, vv.31-32 ***261***
I,1,12 233
I,1,12, vv.1-5 ***286***
I,1,12, vv.6-8 ***234***
I,1,12, vv.28-29 234
I,1,12, vv.31-33 235
I,1,12, vv.38-39 ***234***
I,1,13 254
I,1,15, vv.8-9 235
I,1,16 186
I,1,18, v.72 235
I,1,19 254
I,1,20, v.7 235
I,1,21, vv.1-2 235
I,1,21, vv.9-10 235
I,1,21, v.17 235
I,1,22, vv.1-2 235
I,1,23, v.3 391
I,1,24-27, opening verses 283
I,1,24, v.1 ***215***
I,1,24, v.10 237
I,1,25, v.3 235
I,1,26, v.14 237
I,1,27, vv.1-7 188
I,1,27, vv.20-22 393
I,1,27, vv.32-35 ***280***
I,1,27, vv.36-41 235
I,1,27, vv.43-66 188
I,1,27, vv.75-77 ***282***
I,1,27, vv.86-87 283
I,1,27, v.93 169
I,1,38 ***195***, ***309***
I,2,1, vv.131-133 ***187***
I,2,1, vv.132-133 317
I,2,1, vv.288-295 110
I,2,1, vv.296-341 ***91***, 161
I,2,1, vv.302-303 292
I,2,1, vv.305-322 177
I,2,1, v.311 106
I,2,1, v.333 ***213***
I,2,1, vv.377-379 390
I,2,1, v.389 ***213***
I,2,1, vv.409-423 ***88***
I,2,1, vv.418-421 147
I,2,1, v.440 ***26***
I,2,1, vv.446-469 24
I,2,1, vv.446-472 ***110***
I,2,1, vv.448-450 187
I,2,1, vv.454-455 ***146***
I,2,1, v.472 ***213***
I,2,1, vv.485-486 147, ***165***
I,2,1, vv.496-497 ***95***
I,2,1, vv.582-585 ***304***
I,2,1, vv.588-591 ***391***
I,2,1, vv.610-612 ***391***
I,2,1, v.627 ***391***
I,2,1, vv.680-683 ***83***, 187
I,2,1, v.700 ***213***

I,2,2, v.3 *391*
I,2,2, vv.36 and 39 212
I,2,2, vv.51-57 168, *316*
I,2,2, v.127 *392*
I,2,2, vv.129-133 *392*
I,2,2, v.131 *162*
I,2,2, vv.138-140 *150*, 392
I,2,2, v.152 *158*
I,2,2, vv.152-210 86, 182
I,2,2, v.154 213
I,2,2, vv.170-171 *147*
I,2,2, v.171 *183*
I,2,2, vv.172-176 150
I,2,2, vv.177-179 *182*
I,2,2, vv.181-183 234
I,2,2, vv.187-189 *183*
I,2,2, vv.194-201 234, 235
I,2,2, v.210 *183*
I,2,2, vv.246-247 101
I,2,2, v.271 *392*
I,2,2, v.288 146
I,2,2, v.314 391
I,2,2, v.320 391
I,2,2, v.344 230
I,2,2, vv.371-401 188
I,2,2, vv.432-437 *97*, 187
I,2,2, vv.435-437 148
I,2,2, vv.491-495 *292*
I,2,2, vv.491-501 217
I,2,2, vv.495-502 227
I,2,2, v.500 127, 189, *392*
I,2,2, vv.534-559 *101*
I,2,2, vv.596-599 101
I,2,2, vv.653-678 188
I,2,3, vv.27-29 *258*
I,2,3, vv.44-48 *161*
I,2,3, vv.47-48 83, 187
I,2,3, vv.79-80 and 88-89 *98*
I,2,3, v.84 99
I,2,6, vv.20-23 83, 187
I,2,6, vv.51-52 *104*
I,2,6, vv.57-58 *392*
I,2,9, vv.22-24 *303*
I,2,9, vv.51-52 *213*
I,2,10, vv.1-13 *65*
I,2,10, v.31 *162*
I,2,10, vv.31-33 *147*
I,2,10, vv.31-35 190
I,2,10, v.33 147
I,2,10, vv.34-35 *160*
I,2,10, v.41 *160*
I,2,10, vv.50-51 *291*
I,2,10, v.51 216
I,2,10, v.195 *227*
I,2,10, vv.196-197 *223*
I,2,10, vv.198-202 and 209-218 *78*
I,2,10, v.206 *392*
I,2,10, v.214 *154*
I,2,10, vv.214-220 *178*
I,2,10, vv.214-579 178
I,2,10, v.215 155
I,2,10, vv.215-7 101
I,2,10, v.216 209
I,2,10, vv.218-227 148
I,2,10, vv.236-237 *192*
I,2,10, vv.236-243 392
I,2,10, v.259 *179*
I,2,10, v.265 *179*
I,2,10, vv.270 and 272-279 *90*
I,2,10, v.288 *165*
I,2,10, v.293 145, *179*, 392
I,2,10, vv.294-305 147
I,2,10, vv.308-312 *393*
I,2,10, v.319 179
I,2,10, v.335 180
I,2,10, vv.341-364 190
I,2,10, v.350 *180*
I,2,10, vv.350-351 *121*
I,2,10, v.365 *154*
I,2,10, vv.365-369 *180*
I,2,10, v.368 *65*
I,2,10, v.376 47
I,2,10, vv.382-384 *180*
I,2,10, v.392 *166*, 299
I,2,10, v.398 227
I,2,10, vv.401-411 227
I,2,10, v.407 *180*, *215*, 299
I,2,10, v.412 *213*
I,2,10, vv.412-413 *123*, *181*
I,2,10, vv.488-489 *181*
I,2,10, vv.523-524 *158*
I,2,10, vv.538-539 *181*
I,2,10, v.579 *181*
I,2,10, vv.579-580 *77*
I,2,10, vv.580-584 *123*
I,2,10, v.584 *65*
I,2,10, vv.604-611 *393*
I,2,10, v.617 *158*
I,2,10, v.684 *190*
I,2,10, vv.684-693 190
I,2,10, vv.694-698 *190*
I,2,10, vv.767 and 772-773 *77*
I,2,10, vv.772-777 *123*
I,2,10, v.793 *158*
I,2,10, vv.808-817 *393*
I,2,10, vv.818-822 192
I,2,10, vv.823-828 *102*
I,2,10, vv.829-830 *227*

I,2,10, vv.829-858 227
I,2,10, vv.833-842 127
I,2,10, vv.841-842 189
I,2,10, v.842 392
I,2,10, v.877 ***65***
I,2,14, vv.87-89 317
I,2,14, vv.87-92 187
I,2,14, vv.102-108 ***226***
I,2,15, v.39 213
I,2,15, vv.85-86 ***393***
I,2,15, vv.85-96 24
I,2,15, v.91 392
I,2,15, v.105 ***147***
I,2,15, vv.105-107 ***159***
I,2,17, v.5 ***393***
I,2,17, v.33 ***84***
I,2,17, vv.37-40 ***84***
I,2,17, vv.41-43 ***84***
I,2,24, vv.213-224 253
I,2,24, vv.225-232 109
I,2,25, v.119 ***393***
I,2,25, vv.125-126 ***164***
I,2,25, v.126 299
I,2,25, v.134 ***164***
I,2,25, vv.181-184, v.253
and vv.304-305 ***81***
I,2,25, vv.183-303 86, 177
I,2,25, v.184 120
I,2,25, vv.184-189 ***177***
I,2,25, vv.197-200 ***236***
I,2,25, v.207 ***65***
I,2,25, v.210 ***158***
I,2,25, v.214 99
I,2,25, vv.222-230 ***236***
I,2,25, v.231 ***158***. ***177***
I,2,25, v.237 ***177***
I,2,25, vv.237-240 and 249-252 ***100***
I,2,25, v.239 ***178***. 393
I,2,25, v.253-259 ***102***
I,2,25, v.253 ***154***
I,2,25, vv.279-289 ***191***
I,2,25, vv.285-289 393
I,2,25, vv.290-293 ***121***
I,2,25, vv.290-303 ***143***
I,2,25, vv.306-313 253
I,2,25, v.334 235
I,2,25, vv.371-391 ***259***
I,2,25, vv.371-407 109
I,2,25, vv.432-435 ***100***
I,2,25, v.527 212
I,2,26, vv.1-6 108. ***144***
I,2,26, vv.19-20 ***224***
I,2,28, vv.70-84 145
I,2,28, vv.139-168 86. ***175***
I,2,28, vv.151-158 393
I,2,28, vv.215-229 ***106***
I,2,28, v.220 60
I,2,28, v.227 120
I,2,28, v.232 215
I,2,28, vv.232-234 ***154***
I,2,28, v.233 ***111***
I,2,28, v.234 215
I,2,28, vv.338-339 ***393***
I,2,28, v.355 ***393***
I,2,29, v.42 ***302***
I,2,29, v.105 146
I,2,29, v.115 156
I,2,29, vv.123-128 ***122***
I,2,29, v.127 ***215***. ***300***
I,2,29, v.129 ***156***
I,2,29, vv.139-140 ***166***
I,2,29, vv.153-162 ***86***. 161
I,2,29, vv.157-160 ***393***
I,2,29, vv.165-168 ***160***
I,2,29, vv.185-186 ***145***. 393
I,2,29, v.187 215
I,2,29, vv.187-188 ***154***
I,2,29, vv.187-206 108
I,2,29, vv.291-296 ***109***
I,2,31, acrostic 65
I,2,33, vv.65-66 105. ***393***
I,2,34, vv.54-62 77
I,2,34, v.127 ***82***
I,2,34, vv.185-188 ***253***
I,2,34, vv.189, 192-198 ***268***
I,2,34, vv.189-221 268
I,2,34, vv.242-244 ***265***
I,2,34, vv.245-247 23
I,2,38, vv.3-6 ***310***
I,2,38, vv.4-5 ***165***. ***291***
II,1,1, vv.1 and 6-7 ***312***
II,1,1, v.91 ***393***
II,1,1, v.127 ***394***
II,1,1, v.128 ***164***
II,1,1, vv.229-240 ***394***
II,1,1, vv.367-377 143
II,1,1, v.368 156
II,1,1, vv.376-379 ***281***
II,1,1, vv.380-392 ***281***
II,1,1, vv.393-410 143
II,1,1, v.426 ***155***
II,1,1, v.431 ***164***
II,1,1, v.433 ***157***
II,1,1, vv.479-483 ***168***. ***291***
II,1,1, v.584 ***310***
II,1,10, v.5 ***121***
II,1,11, v.15 ***121***
II,1,11, vv.51-53 ***164***

II.1.11. vv.52-53 ***309***
II.1.11. vv.112-3 22
II.1.11. vv.186-201 ***194***. ***308***
II.1.11. vv.292-294 187
II.1.11. vv.292-295 ***81***
II.1.11. vv.350-351 ***394***
II.1.11. vv.675-677 183
II.1.11. vv.679-683 ***84***
II.1.11. v.707 394
II.1.11. v.736-745 ***159***
II.1.11. v.753 ***394***
II.1.11. v.808 ***165***. ***291***
II.1.11. v.823 ***165***
II.1.11. vv.848-850 146
II.1.11. v.863 ***112***
II.1.11. v.1035 ***158***
II.1.11. vv.1081-1083 ***168***. ***309***
II.1.11. vv.1102-1104 ***146***
II.1.11. v.1240 145
II.1.11. vv.1258-1272 144
II.1.11. vv.1404-1406 292. ***394***
II.1.11. v.1441 ***77***
II.1.11. vv.1838-1842 105, ***167***, ***287***
II.1.12. vv.136-175 ***112***
II.1.12. v.137 ***66***
II.1.12. vv.230-237 ***258***
II.1.12. vv.303-305 189
II.1.12. v.419 ***165***
II.1.12. v.430 ***164***
II.1.12. vv.434-435 ***160***. 190
II.1.12. vv.457-461 86. ***163***
II.1.12. v.514 235
II.1.12. v.590 ***394***
II.1.12. vv.595-597 ***103***
II.1.12. v.658 ***145***
II.1.12. v.662 145
II.1.12. vv.663-665 ***185***
II.1.12. vv.682-695 ***184***
II.1.12. vv.701-708 143
II.1.12. vv.724-726 86
II.1.12. vv.728-729 ***305***
II.1.12. v.746 ***394***
II.1.13. vv.92-95 ***167***
II.1.13. vv.117-123 287
II.1.13. vv.124-137 187
II.1.13. vv.134-138 ***103***
II.1.13. v.136 ***158***
II.1.13. vv.149-150 ***162***
II.1.13. vv.176-177 187
II.1.14. v.61 124. 234
II.1.15. vv.22-25 ***166***. ***291***
II.1.16. vv.61-62 ***164***
II.1.16. vv.63-76 25
II.1.16. vv.67-76 ***159***. 177
II.1.17. vv.51-56 ***112***
II.1.17. v.60 ***394***
II.1.17. vv.65-66 ***394***
II.1.19. v.31 ***164***
II.1.19. vv.31-36 ***112***
II.1.19. vv.83-84 ***163***
II.1.19. vv.86-93 ***104***
II.1.19. v.92 169
II.1.22a ***196***, ***309***
II.1.22. vv.10-11 ***394***
II.1.30. vv.40-42 ***309***
II.1.31. v.1 ***395***
II.1.32. v.10 ***226***
II.1.32. vv.20-21 ***395***
II.1.34. v.24 ***213***
II.1.34. vv.69-91 61
II.1.34. vv.99-102 187
II.1.34. vv.151-152 (34b. vv.1-2) ***66***
II.1.34. vv.157-160 ***21***
II.1.34. v.189 ***158***
II.1.39. vv.12-21 ***259***
II.1.39. vv.47-53 21
II.1.39. vv.63-67 ***61***
II.1.39. vv.82-83 235
II.1.39. v.102 145
II.1.41. vv.15-18 ***395***
II.1.41. v.21 ***157***
II.1.41. vv.46-47 190, ***302***
II.1.44. v.40 ***215***
II.1.45. vv.3-7 ***159***. ***395***
II.1.45. vv.175-176 209
II.1.45. vv.177-180 ***253***
II.1.45. vv.219-220 280
II.1.45. vv.223-224 ***160***
II.1.46. vv.25-26 310
II.1.46. v.26 395
II.1.46. v.40 234
II.1.46. vv.41-46 187
II.1.50. v.31 213
II.1.50. v.69 ***164***
II.1.50. v.73 295
II.1.50. vv.73-74 ***310***
II.1.50. vv.75-76 237
II.1.51. vv.33-36 ***312***
II.1.58. vv.4-7 ***185***
II.1.63 ***313***
II.1.68. vv.63-66 ***81***
II.1.83. vv.9-10 ***163***, ***305***
II.1.88. vv.7-8 ***147***
II.1.88. vv.7-17 190
II.1.88. v.50 ***395***
II.1.88. vv.164-175 ***313***
II.1.88. vv.170-173 ***274***
II.1.93 ***395***

II.1.93, v.4 ***213***
II.2.1, vv.145-146 ***160***
II.2.1, vv.239-240 ***395***
II.2.1, v.302 ***160***
II.2.1, vv.337-340 188
II.2.1, vv.337-350 86
II.2.1, vv.345-352 96
II.2.2, vv.1-5 ***86***
II.2.2, v.3 395
II.2.3, v.42 ***158***
II.2.3, vv.42-46 ***98***
II.2.3, vv.50-51 and 54-64 ***87***
II.2.3, v.51 ***213***
II.2.3, vv.54-57 148
II.2.3, v.62 97, ***157***
II.2.3, vv.105-110 ***148***
II.2.3, vv.105-125 187
II.2.3, vv.105-126 86
II.2.3, vv.105-136 177
II.2.3, vv.116-120 ***169***
II.2.3, v.133 ***177***
II.2.3, vv.134-136 ***395***
II.2.3, vv.137-176 ***112***
II.2.3, vv.140-141 ***160***
II.2.3, vv.147-148 ***149***
II.2.3, v.161 213
II.2.3, v.168 ***165***
II.2.3, vv.206-210 160
II.2.3, vv.213-215 ***162***
II.2.3, vv.318-332 ***99***
II.2.3, v.338 213
II.2.4, v.58 22
II.2.4, vv.127-128 ***395***
II.2.4, v.129 ***395***
II.2.4, v.201 ***395***
II.2.5, v.1 22
II.2.5, vv.85-86 ***296***
II.2.5, vv.193-196 190, ***301***
II.2.5, vv.196-202 ***231***
II.2.5, v.200 ***213***
II.2.5, vv.203-213 ***149***
II.2.5, vv.230-233 ***304***
II.2.5, vv.234-237 ***303***
II.2.5, vv.242-243 ***304***
II.2.5, vv.244-249 ***304***
II.2.5, v.262 ***395***
II.2.6, v.98 60
II.2.6, v.99 ***165***
II.2.7, vv.51-68 223
II.2.7, vv.69-71 223
II.2.7, vv.69-171 216
II.2.7, vv.71-74 ***225***
II.2.7, vv.75-84 ***225***
II.2.7, v.88 226
II.2.7, v.91 ***223***
II.2.7, vv.91-102 ***227***
II.2.7, v.93 ***395***
II.2.7, vv.94-96 127
II.2.7, v.96 ***189***, 392, ***396***
II.2.7, vv.103-105 229
II.2.7, v.130 ***219***
II.2.7, vv.130-159 ***221***, 229
II.2.7, vv.130-169 218
II.2.7, vv.132-133 ***219***
II.2.7, vv.138-146 ***265***
II.2.7, v.143 213
II.2.7, vv.148-150 168, ***291***
II.2.7, v.152 ***396***
II.2.7, v.159 216
II.2.7, vv.162-164 220
II.2.7, vv.165-169 ***219***
II.2.7, v.166 ***216***
II.2.7, v.219 ***213***
II.2.7, vv.239-251 209
II.2.7, vv.239-290 216
II.2.7, v.244 ***218***
II.2.7, v.249 ***222***
II.2.7, vv.252-280 189
II.2.7, vv.253-255 ***225***
II.2.7, v.259 392
II.2.7, v.270 ***223***
II.2.7, v.278 ***396***
II.2.7, vv.281-290 190
II.2.7, vv.286-290 ***224***
II.2.7, v.287 392
II.2.7, v.301 213
II.2.7, v.316 ***213***

epg.1, vv.3-4 189
epg.4 190
epg.4, vv.1-3 ***190***
epg.6, vv.3-4 ***137***
epg.20, vv.1-3 83
epg.22 187
epg.43 ***165***
epg.43, v.1 394
epg.43, vv.1-2 ***291***
epg.65, v.1 ***151***, 230
epg.74, v.1 292
epg.84, v.1 ***396***
epg.88 ***173***
epg.88, v.1 ***396***
epg.88, v.3 ***160***

ept.18, v.2 396
ept.18, vv.1-4 ***160***
ept.27, v.4 ***396***
ept.30, v.1 136

ept.40, v.1 ***290***
ept.40, v.3 396
ept.40, vv.1-2 ***160***
ept.40, vv.1-3 86, ***189***
ept.57, vv.1-2 ***160***, ***290***
ept.58, v.3 ***206***
ept.60, vv.3-4 280
ept.68, v.4 ***158***
ept.69 190
ept.69, v.1 ***158***
ept.69, v.5 ***160***
ept.69, v.6 ***396***
ept.70 190
ept.70, v.1 ***160***
ept.70, v.2 396
ept.70, vv.1-2 ***158***
ept.78, v.9 ***193***
ept.90, vv.1-3 ***185***, ***309***

ORATIONS

or.2.24-25 268
or.2.30 82
or.2.37 215
or.2.48 ***261***
or.2.49 ***262***
or.2.88 ***277***
or.2.104 120, ***219***
or.2.104-106 ***80***
or.2.105 ***284***, ***287***
or.2.106-110 275
or.2.109 ***276***
or.4.4 ***131***
or.4.4-6 23
or.4.18-20 ***307***
or.4.58 190
or.4.67 ***253***
or.4.70 190, 395
or.4.72 ***91***
or.4.79 ***77***
or.4.82 305
or.4.85 292, 394
or.4.94 ***123***
or.4.100-109 23
or.4.101 131
or.4.103 189, 396
or.4.104 ***23***
or.4.107-108 ***23***
or.4.108 216
or.4.115 ***218***, ***220***, ***267*** (bis), 292, 394
or.4.115-116 ***218***
or.4.115-122 216
or.4.116 146, 220
or.4.117 ***219***, ***220***, ***267***
or.4.117-118 218, 220
or.4.118 ***219***, 220
or.4.118-119 ***265***
or.4.119 214, ***220***, ***222***, ***267***
or.4.120 ***79***, ***226***, ***227***
or.5.31 392
or.5.31-32 189, 216, 225
or.5.32 131, ***214***
or.5.35 ***279***
or.5.38 ***189***, ***214***, 226, ***290***
or.6.1 292
or.6.17 ***261***
or.6.19 ***76***, ***174***
or.7.17 ***279***
or.8.11 ***60***
or.8,16 ***255***
or.8,18 ***192***
or.9.3 82
or.10.1 187
or.11.2 ***277***
or.12.2 ***277***
or.13.2 277, ***292***
or.14.2-4 188
or.14.4 ***76***, 187
or.14.15 80
or.14.21 ***255***
or.14.23 216, ***294***
or.14.27 ***252***
or.14.29 227
or.14.33 215
or.14.35 ***82***, 286
or.14.37 ***282***
or.15 234
or.15.12 ***119***, ***142***, 155, 286
or.15.9 80, ***144***
or.16.7 292
or.16.11 ***272***, 288
or.17.1 ***259***
or.18,9-10 137
or.18.14 277
or.18.17 309
or.18,28 ***193***, 396
or.19.13 188
or.21.21 131
or.21.29 ***278***
or.21,36 26
or.24,5 82
or.25,2 224
or.25,3 224

or.25,12 ***255***
or.26,7 187
or.26,9 ***289***
or.26,10 ***215***. ***306***
or.26,16 ***257***
or.27,5 227
or.27,9 292
or.27,10 392
or.28,2 237, ***263***
or.28,2-3 ***315***
or.28,3 ***279***
or.28,4 219
or.28,14 223, ***224***
or.28,14-15 217, 223
or.28,15 ***225***. 227
or.28,18 ***277***
or.28,29 292
or.29,5 260
or.29,14 ***119***
or.29,20 ***253***, ***282***
or.30,10 260
or.30,12 260
or.30,16 ***271***
or.30,18 260
or.31,7 ***215***
or.31,16 ***220*** (*bis*), ***226***
or.31,21-22 ***260***
or.31,21-23 260
or.31,24 ***260***
or.31,25-27 254
or.31,31-33 ***118***
or.32,16 236, ***277***, ***279***
or.32,18 ***154***
or.32,24 ***264***, 390
or.32,25 189
or.33,11 235
or.33,12 224
or.34,5 ***142***, ***223***
or.34,14 ***97***, 187
or.37 269
or.37,2 ***269***
or.37,7 ***76***
or.37,20 ***261***
or.38,1-2 ***255***
or.38,2 ***309***
or.38,9 225
or.38,12 ***273-5***. ***291***
or.39,1 ***256***
or.39,3 ***215***, 218, ***222***. 229
or.39,3-7 216
or.39,4-5 189
or.39,6 ***223***
or.39,7 ***225***. ***227***
or.39,11 255
or.39,14 ***108***
or.39,17 ***256***
or.40,6 ***253***
or.40,18 391
or.40,20 ***280***
or.40,21 ***280***
or.40,26 236
or.40,28 ***256***
or.40,30 76
or.40,31 ***283***
or.40,38 ***155***
or.40,46 ***257***
or.41,1 227
or.41,4 ***120***. 254, ***257***
or.41,15 ***270***
or.41,15-17 270
or.41,17 ***271***
or.42,9 234
or.43,3 190, 224
or.43,7 ***194***
or.43,8 ***228***
or.43,11 ***22***
or.43,21 190, ***215***
or.43,23 190, 209, ***223***. 234
or.43,26 292. ***300***
or.43,29 187
or.43,32 ***166***
or.43,45 189
or.43,52 ***119***
or.43,55 ***308***
or.43,66 292
or.43,67 ***264***
or.43,70 309, ***318*** (*bis*)
or.43,70-76 142, 297, 317
or.43,71 ***277***
or.43,72 ***261***. ***318***
or.43,73 ***319***
or.43,75 ***142***, ***319***
or.43,76 ***319*** (*bis*)
or.43,80 60
or.45,10-21 271
or.45,10 235, ***271***
or.45,11 ***253***. ***263***
or.45,12 ***249***. 260, 262
or.45,14 ***272***
or.45,15 ***272*** (*ter*), ***273***. 288
or.45,16 ***267***, ***272*** (*bis*), ***273***
or.45,17 ***272***
or.45,18 ***272***
or.45,20 ***272***
or.45,21 ***273***. 277
or.45,23 ***257***

LETTERS

ep.3.1 60
ep.7 137
ep.26.2 215
ep.32.4-5 ***133***
ep.32.8-11 190
ep.34.3 ***132***
ep.38.1 395
ep.66.3 82
ep.76.4 60
ep.77,4 and 12 ***79***
ep.96,1 ***214***
ep.99,1 187
ep.101.55-59 259
ep.114.1 215
ep.114,2-5 108
ep.115,3 ***285***
ep.156,1 ***131***
ep.165,4 131
ep.175,2 132, ***216***
ep.176,6 392
ep.178,3 ***143***, ***161***
ep.178,4 ***132***
ep.206,3 ***80***, ***155***
ep.230.1-2 ***118***
ep.230.2 ***161***
ep.232,2 ***279***
ep.233.1 189
ep.235.3-4 189

Composition, impression et reliure: Brepols S.A. - Turnhout (Belgique)
Printed in Belgium
D/1996/0095/9
ISBN 2-503-50481-7 relié
ISBN 2-503-50482-5 broché
ISBN 2-503-99034-7 série