

A. TUILLIER – G. BADY, *Saint Grégoire de Nazianze, Oeuvres poétiques Tome I 1^{re} partie. Poèmes personnels II, 1, 1-11*. Texte établi par André Tuilier et Guillaume Bady. Traduit et annoté par Jean Bernardi, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2004, CCXVIII + 214 pp., ISBN 2-251-00516-1.

The present volume is the first of at least five volumes which will contain the poetic works of Gregory of Nazianzus and comprises the poems traditionally numbered 2.1.1-11. The editors have thus reversed the order of the Maurists, beginning with the personal narrative poems before the theological ones. The contributions of the three editors are as follows: Bernardi – three introductory sections on Gregory, covering an account of Gregory’s life (pp. IX-XLI), a summary of his literary output (pp. XLII-L), and a summary of the poems edited in this volume (pp. LI-LVII), and the footnotes (pp. 2-136) and complementary notes (pp. 137-209) on literary and historical themes; Tuilier – an extended and detailed study of the manuscript tradition (pp. LVIII-CLXXXIX), and the footnotes and complementary notes that discuss the text; and Bady – a manuscript inventory (pp. CXC-CCXV). Tuilier and Bady are responsible for the text and the facing translation (pp. 2-136).

The chief strengths of this edition are the creation of an improved text (there are thus many differences between this edition and Jungck’s edition of 2.1.11), and the thorough investigation into the history of the manuscript tradition. The editors have recognised the importance of the Syriac versions (pp. CLXIV-CLXVIII, cf. p. 60, n. 18 and p. 76, n. 80) and the Byzantine commentators (pp. CLXVIII-CLXXXIV, cf. p. 160, n. 112 and p. 161, n. 115). Several lines omitted from earlier editions have been restored (1.92a, 11.183b, 611b, 651b and 1726b), but 11.1574 is put in parentheses, being “une simple répétition maladroite du v. 1519”. The order of vv. 188-90 in the manuscripts has been restored, against Jungck, who had moved 190 to before

188. A new conjecture δρᾶμά τ' ἔμπαλιν is proposed at 11.1730 (but without a supporting note).

The most serious weakness to both the introductory sections and the literary and historical notes is the failure to refer to many important scholarly works on Gregory and the period, e. g. Raymond Van Dam, “Emperor, Bishops, and Friends in Late Antique Cappadocia”, *JThS* 37, 1986, 53-76 (Van Dam’s important series of monographs on the Cappadocians appeared too late for consideration); Richard Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, Edinburgh 1988; R. Lim, *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1995; Kristoffel Demoen, *Pagan and Biblical Exempla in Gregory Nazianzen: A Study in Rhetoric and Hermeneutics*, Turnhout 1996; Neil McLynn, “A Self-Made Holy Man: The Case of Gregory Nazianzen”, *JECS* 6, 1998, 463-83; and Francesco Trisoglio, “La humanitas di gregorio di Nazianzo attraverso ai suoi tre più ampi carmi autobiografici”, *La Scuola Cattolica* 105, 1977, 567-94, and “Gregorio di Nazianzeno, “De vita sua” (2.1.2): struttura e arte del carme”, *Orpheus* 19-20, 1998-1999, 402-23. Similarly, although the editors refer to Benin’s unpublished 1988 Lille thesis on 2.1.1 and Jungck’s 1974 edition of 2.1.11, there is no mention of the English translations of 1 and 11 by Meehan (Washington, D.C. 1987) and of 11 by White (Cambridge 1996), and no reference to J. T. Cummings’ edition of 11 (an unpublished Princeton University dissertation, cf. the same author’s contribution to *Studia Patristica* 7, Berlin 1966, 52-9).

The discussion of Gregory’s literary output and the overview of the individual poems are limited by the failure to consider Gregory’s poetry against the context of poetry in late antiquity. For instance, an interesting area of investigation is the vocabulary shared by Gregory and Nonnus, but Nonnus’ work is only briefly considered (p. LXVII). It is suggested that 2.1.1 was published in 371, but was subject to later revisions (p. LI). This thesis, however, is not properly explored and the reasons for the revision are not explained. Throughout this edition Gregory’s debt to his classical sources also needs to be considered much more thoroughly: although some Homeric borrowings are noted, many phrases have been overlooked.

The rest of this review will comment on specific points of detail in the text, translation and commentary of 2.1.1 and 11.

2.1.1

31. The phrase ὁ τοῦ κόσμου ἄρχων in *John* 12.31 (p. 4, n. 13) is in turn rooted in Jewish tradition (see the commentary of Barnabas Lindars, London 1972, *ad loc.*). The phrase κόσμου μεδέων is also found in *carm.* 2.2.1.33 and in A.G. 1.25.1: Χριστέ, Θεοῦ σοφίη, κόσμου μεδέων καὶ ἀνάσσων.

59. δολόμητις may have biblical precedents (p. 6, n. 22), but it is also appropriate in a passage steeped in Homer, cf. *Iliad* 1.300, 3.198, 250 and 308, 4.525 and 11.422 (nearly always of Aigistheus).

60. The link suggested in p. 6, n. 23 between ἐπήλυθε φωτὶ εοικῶς and *John* 3.19 (τὸ φῶς ἐλήλυθεν) is tenuous.

123. The reference in p. 11, n.38 should be to *Romans* 11.17 not 11.7.

126. The phrase μελιθεῖ καρπῶ is Homeric, cf. *Iliad* 18.568 and *Odyssey* 9.94. Note also 124, where πυθμέν' ἐλαίης is also Homeric, cf. *Odyssey* 13.122, 372, and 23.204.

142. For the phrase ἐπὶ χθόνα μητέρ' ἔμοιο cf. *Epigrammata* 8.106.1: Ἡνίκα Μαρτινιανὸς ἔδυσ χθόνα, μητέρα πάντων. Euripides, *Hippolytus* 601, γαῖα μήτηρ, is cited (p. 12, n. 46), but more relevant are Hesiod, *Theogony* 284: προλιπὼν χθόνα μητέρα μῆλων, and Euripides, *Helen* 40: πλήθους τε κουφίσει μητέρα χθόνα.

183. It is suggested (p. 14, n.56) that the image here comes from the Psalms, but there is also an Homeric echo: κύνας οἱ μ' ὑλάουσι recalls *Odyssey* 16.9: ἐπεὶ κύνες οὐχ ὑλάουσιν.

191. Note that μονόφορβος is Gregory's invention.

202. *Colossians* 2.20 and 3.5 are cited in p.16, n.62, but more relevant is *Galatians* 6.14: ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται ἀγῶ κόσμῳ.

235-9. The same mythical exemplar is used in *carm.* 2.1.51.10-1.

250. The footnote refers to *Philippians* 3.19 (p. 19, n. 74), but ἐφημέρια φρονέοντες, echoes *Odyssey* 21.85.

304. p. 141, n. 79 should refer to 1.2.14 not 2.1.14.

327. Tuilier argues for πνεύματι over ῥεύματι (p. 142, n.

85): it should be noted that the same phrase appears in *carm.* 2.1.13.20-1.

350. κόνις and σάκκος are also linked in *carm.* 2.1.45.145-6.

367-77. Gregory's version of the Good Samaritan has a number of Homeric allusions: πληγῆσιν ἀεικελίησι in v. 370 draws on *Odyssey* 4.245, and νηλεί θυμῶ in v. 373 on *Odyssey* 9.272, 287, and 368.

400. In place of λόγῳ, the reading of A, followed by Jungck, the editor has adopted λόγων, the reading of the other manuscripts. For ἰλήκοις with a genitive, compare Heliodorus, *Aethiopica* 10.16.10: ὑμεῖς δὲ ἰλήκοιτε ὧ θεοὶ τῶν εἰρημένων.

458. Gregory's ῥήμασί θ' αἰμυλίοισι (which the editors have rightly changed from a smooth to a rough breathing) alludes to *Odyssey* 1.56: αἰμυλίοισι λόγοισι, cf. also *carm.* 2.2.6.28.

460. I *Corinthians* 7.35 is cited in p. 31, n. 112, but the phrase Θεοῦ ἐκγεγαῶτα is epic in origin, cf. *Hymn to Ceres* 237: θεοῦ ἐκγεγαῶτα.

466. For Μάγνησσα λίθος discussed in p. 32, n. 117, cf. also *carm.* 1.2.2.583 and 2.2.7.198. *Iliad* 4.485 is cited, but *Odyssey* 1.184, where the phrase is in the accusative case, is more relevant.

467. To the citations of ἄντιτα ἔργα in p. 143, n. 118 can be added *Odyssey* 17.51.

526-7. The footnote refers to Plato, *Phaedrus* (p. 36, n. 129), but Gregory's language is again Homeric: νύκτα καὶ ἦμαρ (v. 526) is based on the Homeric νύκτάς τε καὶ ἦμαρ (*Iliad* 5.490, 22.432, 24.73, *Odyssey* 2.345, 10.28, 10.80, 15.476, and 24.63), while for πίπτουσαν ἔραζε (v. 527), cf. *Iliad* 12.156, 17.633, 18.552, and *Odyssey* 22.280.

529-42. While the language of the extended simile draws on Theocritus (p. 137, n. 130), it also has some debt to Homer: μεγάλῳ πατάγῳ (v. 536) is from *Iliad* 21.9 and 387, and χαμάδις βάλεν (v. 540) from *Iliad* 7.190, 15.714, *Odyssey* 4.114, and 19.63.

556. In addition to *Iliad* 6.346 (p. 38, n. 135), note also *Iliad* 12.253, *Odyssey* 10.54, 12.288 and 409.

597. For the association of τέφρα and αἶμα (p. 41, n. 155), note that they are also linked in *carm.* 2.2.1.40.

632. Hesiod, *Scutum* 87 is cited in p. 43, n. 168 for ἐπιπλομένοις ἐνιαυτοῖς, but of more relevance may be *Theogony*

493: ἐπιπλομένου δ' ἐνιαυτοῦ (note that the plural is read by a scholiast).

2.1.11.

12. ὄνομα is preferred to ὄμμα, but for κλεινὸν ὄμμα, compare Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 1184.

39. In p. 147, n. 12 κυχλῖς is printed, but κικλῖς is the manuscript reading followed in the text. The former is only attested in Hesychius.

115. The translation takes οὐδὲ ἓν with ἐπαίρουθ' 'n'aient aucun motif de s'enorgueillir', but White's translation takes them with μαθόντες 'those . . . who had learned nothing at all'.

131. The editors have identified a problem with Κύπρου τὰ πλευρά (thus the translation 'Chypre et ses côtes . . .') but offer no solution here.

154. Tuilier (p. 148, n. 31) suggests that νέων is an adjective governing χερῶν not the genitive plural of ναῦς, but this requires ἄραγμα to bear the sense 'effort' rather than 'clash', and it is hard to see how this can be justified.

275. Note that ἐγγυμνάσματα *metri causa* for προγυμνάσματα is a *hapax legomenon*.

670. The editors adopt τὸ (L A) over τὸν (C S O W, preferred by Jungck), but do not justify its adoption over the masculine article.

675-7. The allusions to *Daniel* and *Jonah* are noted (p. 86, n. 123), but this overlooks the reference in 676 to the three young men in the fiery pit, which is based on 3 *Mach.* 6.6: σὺ τοὺς κατὰ τὴν Βαβυλωνίαν τρεῖς ἐταίρους πυρὶ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐθαιρέτως δεδωκότας εἰς τὸ μὴ λατρεῦσαι τοῖς κενοῖς διάπυρον δροσίσας κάμινον ἐρρύσω μέχρι τριχῶς ἀπημάντους φλόγα πᾶσιν ἐπιπέμφας τοῖς ὑπεναντίοις.

710. An explanation for the radical divergence in the manuscripts is really desirable at this point (μιμούμενοι (L) compared to καὶ πολυπόδων in other manuscripts). Note that πολύποδες and χαμαιλέοντες are combined in Theodoret *Ep.* 125.

839. To the discussion of the sources of G.'s list of Egyptian gods in 838-40 (p. 167, n.144), note that Ἄνουβις and Ἐρμάνουβις are also combined by Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride* 375e.

1021. ὑπάρχου is translated as préfet, with p. 175, n. 196, which refers to the *praefectus Augustalis*, but Gregory could be referring to the *praeses* of the province of Augustamnica. For the provincial structure of Egypt at this time, cf. Roger Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity*, Princeton 1993, 63-4.

1061. It is suggested that the line is an echo of *Colossians* 4.18 (p. 176, n. 204), but Gregory may also have in mind Euripides, fr. 133 K.: ἀλλ' ἡδύ τοι σωθέντα μεμνήσθαι πόνων.

1240. The commentary (p. 108, n. 229) does not make it clear that the whole line is a traditional proverb. In addition to Libanius, there are several other citations: Plutarch, *De tuenda sanitate praecepta* 122c, Strabo 12.4.4, Cyril, *Contra Julianum* 2.46, as well as several references in later lexicographers and commentators. The quotation is included in the fragments of Aeschylus by Mette (*tetral.* 37 A fr.406) on the basis of the scholiast on Gregory who puts the quotation in the mouth of Telephus. An identical quotation of the proverb is also found in *carm.* 1.2.10.293.

1352. Tuilier defends τοῖς, the reading of most manuscripts, against τοὺς adopted by previous editors (p. 183, n. 246), but the usage is unparalleled and it is hard to see why Gregory should have adopted it.

1389. Note that this verse directly echoes Euripides, *Hecuba* 553 (p. 114, n.254), the plural being changed to singular.

1390. Euripides, *Hecuba* 553 is not relevant here (p.1 14, n. 255).

1473. The apparatus does not include a variant in P which is discussed in n. 270.

1616-7. The reference to Euripides, fr. 1079.1-2 K. is relevant, but the text cited is attributed by Stobaeus to Critias. The quote from Euripides is:

οὐκ ἔστι λύπης ἄλλο φάρμακον βροτοῖς
ὡς ἀνδρὸς ἐσθλοῦ καὶ φίλου παραίνεσις·

There are a small number of typographical errors in the text of 11: 322. πρῶτον. 1622. δ' for γ'. 1643. θελέση for θελήση.

IAN G. TOMPKINS
Ellesmere College, Shropshire
igtompkins@hotmail.com