CHAPTER 2
THE GREEK JEWELED STYLE*

Fotini Hadjittofi

Michael Roberts's ground-breaking monograph argued that a set of stylistic features became prominent in Latin poetry during the fourth and fifth centuries CE: brilliant verbal and/or visual patterning, episodic fragmentation, ecphrastic description, enumeration and paradoxical juxtaposition – together these constitute the jeweled style, which scholars of late Greek poetry have subsequently detected in poets spanning the whole period from Quintus of Smyrna (third century) to Nonnus of Panopolis (fifth century) and the latter's sixth-century imitators.[1] This contribution aims primarily to undertake an 'archaeology' of this style in late Greek poetry: it will first try to detect its presence in poetry, starting from the third century; it will argue that Greek prose is both an earlier and a more frequent vehicle for the jeweled style than Greek poetry; and finally, it will provide some preliminary explanations as to why much of Greek poetry throughout late antiquity continued to be written in a markedly archaic, Homericizing style, which can be conceived as the opposite of the jeweled style.

A Greek jeweled style in the third century?

When exactly does a jeweled style emerge in Greek poetry? Can it really be detected as early as the third century? Ps.-Oppian's *Cynegetica*, dedicated in the proem to emperor Caracalla, can be securely dated to the early third century. A few lines after the proem's dedication, we find a very metapoetic, and very Callimachean, dialogue between the poet/narrator and the goddess who will inspire, and be the natural patron of, his poem: Artemis. The goddess accosts the poet and prescribes his subject matter using a style that is, at times, strikingly rhetorical. These are her parting words (1.35–40):

μέλπε μόθους θηρῶν τε καὶ ἀνδρῶν ἀγρευτήρων·
μέλπε γένη σκυλάκων τε καὶ ἵππων αἰόλα φῦλα,
βουλὰς ὠκυνόους, στιβίης ἐϋκερδέος ἔργα·
ἔχθεά μοι θήρεια λέγειν, φιλότητας ἀείδειν
καὶ θαλάμ**ους ἐν** ὄρεσ**σιν** ἀδακρύτ**οιο** Κυθείρ**ης**
καὶ τοκετ**οὺς ἐν**ὶ θηρ**σὶν** ἀμαιεύτ**οιο** λοχείη**ς**.

Sing the battles of wild beasts and hunting men;
sing of the breeds of hounds and the varied tribes of horses;
the quick-witted counsels, the deeds of skilful tracking;
tell me the hates of wild beasts; sing their friendships

and the bridal chambers of tearless Aphrodite upon the mountains,
and the births without midwife among the beasts.

(Translation adapted from Mair 1928: 7)

Throughout his poem, Ps.-Oppian is very fond of anaphora: here we see it in two distichs (lines 35f. and 39f.). The latter distich repeats the exact same syntactical pattern in its two verses: the initial καί is followed by a plural accusative in -ους; then we have ἐν with a dative plural in -σιν; then a combination of adjective and noun in genitive singular, with the adjective ending in -οιο and the noun in -ης. With the last two words of the goddess, ἀμαιεύτοιο λοχείης (the unmidwifed birth), Ps.-Oppian coins a new adjective and creates a seeming contradiction that would later appeal to Nonnus of Panopolis, who uses the adjective to describe, among other paradoxical generations, the birth of Dionysus, unmidwifed and half-formed, from Semele's burning body (*Dion.* 1.5).[2]

Before we rush to assume that the pseudo-Oppianic Artemis proclaims a new, jeweled style as well as a new poem, we should remember that, for Greek poets, style is wedded to genre, and each genre is defined by its first inventor, the πρῶτος εὑρετής. For Ps.-Oppian's didactic poem, this would be Hesiod. Indeed, in her very first words to the poet/narrator, Artemis tells him, 'Get up! Let us tread upon the rough path, / which no mortal has ever trodden with his song!' (1.20–1: ἔγρεο, καὶ τρηχεῖαν ἐπιστείβωμεν ἀταρπόν, / τὴν μερόπων οὔπω τις ἑῇς ἐπάτησεν ἀοιδαῖς). Apart from containing obvious Callimachean echoes (see Costanza 1991), these lines also enclose an allusion to Hesiod in the 'rough path' that the poet is asked to tread which echoes the 'rough path' of virtue that Perses, Hesiod's brother, is encouraged to follow in the *Works and Days* (290f.: οἶμος … τρηχύς). As Michael Paschalis (2000: 219) notes, the hunting ground, which is naturally 'rough', becomes metapoetic ground, as Ps.-Oppian traces the genealogy of his song through Callimachus back to Hesiod. By doing so, Ps.-Oppian acknowledges that Callimachus' untrodden paths were already and always Hesiodean. The *Cynegetica*'s Hesiodean affiliation has consequences for its style. Hesiod did not compose the same kind of magniloquent epic as Homer. His style was recognized in antiquity as 'smooth' and sweet; Dionysius of Halicarnassus even calls it 'girly' (παρθενωπά).[3] Hesiod's interest in euphonics and rhythm is well illustrated, for example, in the rich anaphora, assonance and paronomasia that characterize the following four verses from the proem of the *Works and Days*:

ῥέα μὲν γὰρ **βριά**ει, **ῥέα** δὲ **βριά**οντα χαλέπτ**ει**,
ῥεῖα δ' ἀρίζηλον μινύθει καὶ ἄδηλον ἀέξ**ει**,
ῥεῖα δέ τ' ἰθύνει σκολιὸν καὶ ἀγήνορα κάρφ**ει**
Ζεὺς ὑψιβρεμέτης, ὃς ὑπέρτατα δώματα ναί**ει**.

(*Op.* 5–8)

For easily he strengthens, and easily he crushes the strong,
easily he diminishes the conspicuous and increases the inconspicuous,

easily he straightens the crooked and withers the proud –
high-thundering Zeus, who dwells in the loftiest abode.

(Translation adapted from Most 2018: 87)

These are the same sound effects that Ps.-Oppian strives to achieve. Hesiod's poetry has never been called jeweled, and there is no reason why such a label should be made to apply to Ps.-Oppian, who, apart from the repetitions and alliterations, does not exhibit other markers of the jeweled style such as the emphasis on visuality or paradox.[4] The Greek poets of the third century display an ideology of continuity which needs to be taken into account here. Ps.-Oppian tells us that he is, ironically, treading an entirely new path while following into the footsteps of Callimachus, who is in turn revealed to be following into the footsteps of Hesiod. Some metrical and stylistic aspects do evolve over time (for example, Ps.-Oppian's sentence structure is more nominal than Hesiod's), but there is no clear rupture. Because the tradition in which Greek poets insert themselves already includes a poetic revolution (that of the Hellenistic period), even as they proclaim new departures, they can neither re-revolutionize the tradition without taking into account the Hellenistic transformations nor seamlessly continue the archaic tradition as if that revolution had not happened.[5]

Another third-century poet provides the most striking example of perpetuating not only the style but also the very persona of his archaic model. Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica* is an epic poem which bridges the gap between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* by narrating the events that took place in Troy after the death of Hector and up until the sacking of the city and the Achaeans' departure. Lacking a proem, this epic presents itself as 'still' the *Iliad*, picking up the story from Hector's funeral, exactly where the *Iliad* ended (see Maciver 2012: 29).[6] In spite of attempts to see in Quintus (especially in some of his speeches) the influence of the rhetorical education that is the hallmark of the Second Sophistic,[7] the *Posthomerica* is neither rhetorical in style nor in any other way a precursor of later aesthetics. The narrator of the *Posthomerica* not only speaks like Homer, reproducing Homeric language and style, but also inserts a pseudo-autobiographical interlude whose details could easily be ascribed to 'the real' Homer; that is, he presents himself as receiving poetic inspiration while shepherding his flock on a hill in Smyrna, one of Homer's traditional birthplaces. As scholars have often noted, these lines recall both Hesiod's own autobiographical investiture in the *Theogony* (22–8) and Callimachus' recollection of the Hesiodean scene in the *Aetia* (fr. 2.1f.).[8] Even in this supremely Homeric epic, Quintus cannot just write 'as if' he is Homer: he has to contend with Callimachean criticism of the 'continuous song' – the thematically and stylistically traditional epic that he is writing. That Quintus' Homer (or Homeric persona) is also a 'Hesiod' (at least within the in-proem) could tell us something more about the *Posthomerica*'s style: not that it strives after euphonics and rhythm like Ps.-Oppian (who sits at the opposite end of the stylistic spectrum), but that it is heavily invested in *gnomae* and a general concern for propriety and moderation (stylistic and otherwise).[9] In this case, the presence of Hesiod keys us

into an intellectualized didactic mode (with a focus on ethics), which is pervasive in the epic.

Probably the last poem that can be dated to the third century (or the very early fourth century), Triphiodorus' epyllion on the capture of Troy, represents a final 'opportunity' for tracing a jeweled style in Greek poetry before its emergence in Latin poetry.[10] Like Quintus, Triphiodorus derives most of his vocabulary from Homer and deals with an eminently (post-)Homeric topic. His poem, however, is written on a smaller scale, is more Alexandrian in metre (see Whitby 1994: 119), and is more fond of lexical experiments including non-Homeric uses of Homeric words and apparent neologisms.[11] The following four lines come from Triphiodorus' only ecphrasis, the construction of the Trojan Horse by Epeius:

ὀφθαλμοὺς δ' ἐνέθηκε λιθώπεας ἐν δυσὶ κύκλοις
γλαυκῆς βηρύλλοιο καὶ **αἱμαλέης ἀμε**θύσσου·
τῶν δ' ἐπιμισγομένων διδύμης ἀμαρύγματι χροιῆς
γλαυκῶν φοινίσσοντο λίθων ἑλίκεσσιν ὀπωπαί.

(69–72)

The eyes he set, gem-eyes, in two circles
of blue-green beryl and blood-red amethyst;
as the colors mingled in a sparkle of double hue,
the eyes were red enveloped in the blue-green gems.

In just these four verses two words are never attested before Triphiodorus (λιθώπεας in l. 69 and αἱμαλέης in l. 70). The first one is a striking combination of λίθος (gem) and ὤψ (eye) that is doubly appropriate in its context, as the Horse's eyes are made of gems and the gems themselves sparkle like eyes. Triphiodorus' concern here is with showcasing language at the expense of visual clarity: we have to reach the last verse, in this convoluted sentence, to be able to understand what configuration of stones is implied: a circle of red amethysts surrounded by green beryl. Can we, then, speak of a jeweled style in Triphiodorus? We can probably speak of a specific jeweled *passage*, but Triphiodorus' epyllion, as a whole, displays neither the fragmentation nor (outside the ecphrasis) any emphatic attention to visuality and detail. In many respects, Triphiodorus' poetics and stylistic register create, as Calum Maciver (2020: 183) has recently put it, a paradoxical 'collusion' between the hyper-Homeric and the Alexandrian. Nor is Triphiodorus' style as strikingly rhetorical as Ps.-Oppian's. See, for example, how the *Cynegetica* describes the same combination of colours, green and red, in the eyes of the leopard:

γλαυκιόωσι κόραι βλεφάροις ὕπο μαρμαίρουσ**αι**,
γλαυκιόωσιν ὁμοῦ τε καὶ ἔνδοθι φοινίσσοντ**αι**,
αἰθομέναις ἴκελαι, πυριλαμπέες.

(3.70–2)

The pupils glow in blue-green beneath the eyelids,
blue-green at once and red within,
flaming, bright like fire.

(Translation adapted from Mair 1928: 119)

Like Triphiodorus, Ps.-Oppian uses precious vocabulary (πυριλαμπέες is a rare word, first attested in Aratus, *Phaen.* 1040), but his verbal patterning is more rhythmical as the first two verses here begin with the same word and end in the same syllable. Ps.-Oppian and Triphiodorus adopt different elements of what we might call the jeweled style, but neither poet espouses that style entirely.

And yet a jeweled style was arguably available in Greek literature – indeed in literature earlier than both Ps.-Oppian and Triphiodorus. To find it, however, we should look not to poetry but to prose. The second-century novel by Achilles Tatius displays most if not all of the characteristics of the jeweled style: fragmentation of the narrative by frequent digressions, paradoxical juxtapositions, short, often antithetical clauses and dazzling visuality expressed in brilliant verbal patterning.[12] As a brief example that resonates with the description of the horse's eyes in Triphiodorus, we can take the bridal necklace which appears in the second Book of the novel and which consists of a set of stones, three of which are placed on top of each other to form a pendant shaped like an eye:

ἤριζον δὲ πρὸς ἀλλήλους οἱ **λίθοι**. ὑάκινθος μὲν ῥόδον ἦν ἐν **λίθῳ**, ἀμέθυσος δὲ ἐπορφύρετο τοῦ χρυσοῦ πλησίον. ἐν μέσῳ δὲ τρεῖς ἦσαν **λίθοι**, τὴν χροιὰν ἐπάλληλοι· συγκείμενοι δὲ ἦσαν οἱ τρεῖς· **μέ**λαινα μὲν ἡ κρηπὶς τοῦ λίθου, τὸ δὲ **μέ**σον σῶμα λευκὸν τῷ **μέ**λανι συννυφαίνετο, ἐξῆς δὲ τῷ λευκῷ τὸ λοιπὸν ἐπυρρία κορυφούμενον· ὁ λίθος δὲ τῷ **χρυσῷ** στεφανούμενος ὀφθαλμὸν ἐμιμεῖτο **χρυσοῦν**.

(2.11.2–4)

The gems were at rivalry with one another. The jacinth was a rose in stone. The amethyst shone purple next to gold. In between were three gems of graded colour; the three of them were set together. The base of the gem was black; the one in the middle component was white woven with black; and next to the white the final crowning [stone] glowed like fire. The gem was wreathed with gold and looked like a golden eye.

Achilles Tatius creates a dazzling verbal picture, crafted out of very short clauses, to describe the glittering 'necklace of varied stones' (περιδέραιον μὲν λίθων ποικίλων, 2.11.2). Achilles' style of *poikilia* (not by any means unique to his ecphrases) is patently more jeweled than Triphiodorus': as well as being rich in alliteration, it is also interested in lexical innovation (the verb ἐπυρρία, although not looking remarkable, is first attested here), and it is equally, if not more, fond of paradox. In the first line here, for example, the sentence ὑάκινθος μὲν ῥόδον ἦν ἐν λίθῳ reads at first sight, 'the hyacinth was a rose in stone'.[13] Achilles' 'rose' refers not to the shape but the colour of this flower, so the author could have simply used a different term for 'red', had he not meant to catch his readers off

guard and make them wonder at the paradox of 'the hyacinth was a rose'. Achilles' notion that the gems rivalled each other (ἤριζον) while being set together (συγκείμενοι) is also typical of the *concordia discors* that Roberts (1989: 144–7) has set at the heart of late Latin poetics.

If a jeweled style can be detected in Greek literature before the fourth century, its more natural expression is not in poetry but prose. As the following section goes on to trace this style in fourth- and fifth-century Greek poetry, the same tendency will be confirmed: prose will be shown to be just as or even more jeweled than poetry and importantly, it will have clearer and earlier precedents for its jeweled-ness.

The Greek jeweled style in the fourth and fifth centuries

The most important Greek poet of the fourth century is without any doubt Gregory of Nazianzus. No justice can be done here to his enormous and multi-generic output spanning both poetry and prose. In his poetry, Gregory is able to adopt different styles (and metres) according to the genre in which he writes: he can be an epigrammatist, a poet of invective compositions in iambics and a didactic poet composing in hexameters.[14] Like the third-century poets examined above, Gregory contends with both the archaic and the Hellenistic tradition, but, as he composes in a variety of modes and genres, he is able to pick up and adapt different poetic personas according to what he aims to achieve in each poem. In an elegiac poem that attacks his enemies, for example, he 'becomes' Callimachus:

βαρὺς γὰρ αὐτοῖς, καὶ θράσους ἤμην γέμων.
  τέμνων ὁδοὺς ἀτρίπτους,
ἐθῶν πατρῴων καὶ νόμων διαφθορεὺς,
  εἴπερ νόμος τὰ φαῦλα,
πλούτου, τύφου τε, θρύψεως, φιλαρχίας,
  τῶν νῦν ἐπικρατούντων.

(*PG* 37.1410.4–9 = *carm*. 2.1.68.15–20)

I was too heavy for them and full of audacity.
  Carving untrodden paths,
corrupting our ancestral customs and laws,
  (if what is bad can be law)
wealth, vanity, debauchery, lust for power,
  everything that is now in charge.

Gregory's 'untrodden paths' (ὁδοὺς ἀτρίπτους) are obviously those of Callimachus,[15] whose rebellious persona Gregory adopts here in order to figure himself as a revolutionary ecclesiastic trampling on ancestral customs. There are *some* markers of the jeweled style in this passage: the syntax relies on nouns and participles (five verses have no main verb)

and there is a striking enumeration in line 19. However, we notice the jeweled style most prominently within Gregory's poetry in a group of didactic poems entitled by their editors (Moreschini and Sykes 1997) as *poemata arcana*. These deal with theological topics and are written in hexameter. The following verses are from a poem entitled 'On the Testaments and the Coming of Christ':

ἀλλὰ κενώσας
ὃν κλέος ἀθανάτοιο Θεοῦ **Πατρὸς** Υἱὸς **ἀμήτωρ** (40)
αὐτὸς καὶ δίχα **πατρὸς** ἐμοὶ **ξένος** υἱὸς ἐφάνθη·
οὐ **ξένος**, **ἐξ** ἐμέθεν γὰρ ὅδ' **ἄμβροτος** ἦλθε **βροτωθεὶς**
παρθενικῆς διὰ μητρὸς, **ὅλον** μ' **ὅλος** ὄφρα σαώσῃ.
καὶ γὰρ **ὅλος** πέπτωκεν Ἀδὰμ διὰ γεῦσιν ἀλιτρήν.

(*PG* 37.459.13–460.3 = *arc.* 8.39–44)

but having emptied himself
of his glory, the son without a mother of the ever-living God the Father,
he revealed himself to me, a strange kind of son without a father;
no, not strange, for on my account he who is immortal became a mortal
through his virgin mother, so that He, whole, may save me wholly.
For Adam had also fallen whole due to his sinful tasting [of the fruit].

Gregory revels in the many paradoxes of Christ's incarnation, especially his having no mother in heaven and no father on earth. The richly adorned style, full of alliterations and *polyptota* (40f.: Πατρὸς Υἱὸς ἀμήτωρ . . . δίχα πατρός; 41f.: ξένος . . . οὐ ξένος, ἐξ ἐμέθεν; 42: ἄμβροτος . . . βροτωθείς; 43f.: ὅλον . . . ὅλος . . . ὅλος), emphasizes the juxtaposition of contradictory elements in Christ's nature. How can we explain Gregory's recourse to a markedly more jeweled style in these poems? Only part of the answer can come diachronically from *within* the poetic tradition: that is, because these poems are didactic, they can more easily be affiliated with the Hesiodean, 'sweet' style of epic poetry and thus embody the continuity of developments already under way in Ps.-Oppian. Another part of the answer, perhaps contextually and synchronically more relevant, is that these poems communicate directly with Gregory's own prose, specifically with a group of theological orations in which we can also find this same jeweled style.[16] A passage from Gregory's *Third Theological Oration* compares particularly well with the lines cited above:

ἐγεννήθη μέν, ἀλλὰ καὶ **ἐγεγέννητο**· ἐκ γυναικὸς μέν, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρθένου. τοῦτο ἀνθρώπινον, ἐκεῖνο θεῖον. **ἀπάτωρ** ἐντεῦθεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ **ἀμήτωρ** ἐκεῖθεν. ὅλον τοῦτο θεότητος. **ἐκυοφορήθη** μέν, ἀλλ' ἐγνώσ**θη** προφήτῃ καὶ αὐτῷ **κυοφορουμένῳ**, καὶ προσκιρτῶντι τοῦ λόγου, δι' ὃν ἐγένετο. **ἐσπαργανώθη** μέν, ἀλλ' **ἀποσπαργανοῦται** τὰ τῆς ταφῆς ἀνιστάμενος. (*Or.* 29.19)

He was born – but he had already been born; from a woman – but a virgin. This [is] human, that divine. Without a father here, but with no mother there. All of this

> [is] of the Godhead. He was carried in the womb – but he was recognized by the prophet [John the Baptist], himself still in the womb, leaping before the Word, for whose sake he came into being. He was wrapped in swaddling clothes [Lk. 2.41] – but he took off the swaddling clothes of the grave when he rose again.

Similar to the language and style that Achilles Tatius uses in his novel, this is a very poetic prose, built on the basis of short, antithetical clauses which frequently omit any verb and are rich in repetition and alliteration.[17] Gregory not only varies the lexicon he inherits from the Bible,[18] but also uses the same striking vocabulary that features in his poetry to articulate the same paradoxes about Christ's nature (e.g. ἀπάτωρ . . . ἀμήτωρ). Gregory of Nazianzus is by no means unique among Christian prose writers in employing such a jeweled style. Morwenna Ludlow (2020) has recently shown that such a style is also ubiquitous in many orations by Gregory of Nyssa and Basil of Caesarea, and in what follows (in the section on jeweled Christian prose below) it will even be found in Christian commentaries. Where Gregory *is* innovative is the degree to which he adapts this same style for his *poetry*. As suggested above, Greek poetry up until the early fourth century may display some elements of the jeweled style, but no single poem can be termed jeweled as straightforwardly as some of Gregory's poems. Trying to establish whether Gregory composed his didactic poetry having his own prose in mind or even in a book next to him is likely a futile task,[19] but it is important for what follows to bear in mind that when a full-fledged jeweled style emerges in Greek poetry, it does so in *some* of the poems of a prolific author who also addressed the same topics in jeweled prose.

It is only in the fifth century, with the gargantuan *Dionysiaca* by Nonnus of Panopolis, that the jeweled style in Greek poetry finally comes into its own, and it is this specifically Nonnian jeweled style that we find later in the sixth century, in the brilliant ecphrases of Christodorus,[20] John of Gaza[21] and Paul the Silentiary,[22] which, for lack of space, cannot be discussed here. Ecphrases and an ecphrastic mode of composition are prevalent in the *Dionysiaca* itself, whose extremely variegated style, episodic composition and attention to detail make it the most impressive (as well as the most extensive) embodiment of the jeweled style in Greek poetry. Rather than look at one of Nonnus' ecphrases of works of art (the shield of Dionysus or the necklace of Harmonia), where questions of allegory and symbolism tend to interfere with stylistic considerations,[23] a selection of verses from two descriptions of cities will be taken as an example here: the two coastal cities, Tyre in Book 40 and Beirut in Book 41, are presented in extravagant language that dwells on their paradoxical confounding of land and water.[24] Tyre is introduced as a wonder (θάμβος, 40.316) and compared to a swimming girl who is, strikingly, immobile while embraced by Poseidon:

> νηχομένῃ δ' ἀτίνακτος ὁμοίιος ἔπλετο κούρ**ῃ**,
> καὶ κεφαλὴν καὶ στέρνα καὶ αὐχένα δῶκε θαλάσσ**ῃ**, (320)
> χεῖρας ἐφαπλώσασα μέση διδυμάονι πόντ**ῳ**,
> γείτονι λευκαίνουσα θαλασσαίῳ δέμας ἀφρ**ῷ**,
> **καὶ πό**δας ἀμφοτέρους ἐπερείσατο μητέρι γαίῃ.

καὶ πόλιν᾽Εννοσίγαιος ἔχων ἀστεμφέι δεσμῷ
νυμφίος ὑδατόεις **περι**νήχεται, οἷα συνάπτων (325)
πήχεϊ **π**αφλάζοντι **περί**πλοκον αὐχένα νύμφης.
καὶ Τύρον εἰσέτι Βάκχος ἐθάμβεε, τῇ ἔνι μούν**η**
βουκόλος ἀγχικέλευθος ὁμίλεε γείτονι ναύτ**η**
. . . καὶ ἔβρεμεν εἰν ἑνὶ χώρῳ
φλοῖσβος ἁλός, μύκημα βοῶν, ψιθύρισμα πετήλων,
πεῖσμα, φυτόν, πλόος, ἄλσος, ὕδωρ, νέες, ὁλκάς, ἐχέτλη, (335)
μῆλα, δόναξ, δρεπάνη, σκαφίδες, λίνα, λαίφεα, θώρηξ.
καὶ τάδε παπταίνων πολυθαμβέα ῥήξατο φωνήν·
‘νῆσον ἐν ἠπείρῳ πόθεν ἔδρακον;’

(*Dion*. 40.319–38)

Immobile, she is like a swimming girl,
and gives to the sea head and breast and neck, (320)
in the middle stretching her arms over the two waters,
and whitening her body with foam from the sea beside her,
while she rests both feet on mother earth.
And Earthshaker holding the city in a firm bond
floats all about, a watery bridegroom, as if clasping (325)
the neck of his bride in a splashing arm, embracing her.
Still more Bacchus admired the city of Tyre; where alone
the herdsman’s way was near the fisherman,
. . . and in one place was
the loud noise of the sea, the lowing of cattle, the whispering of leaves,
rigging, trees, navigation, forest, water, ships, lugger, plowtail, (335)
sheep, reeds, sickle, boats, lines, sails, corselet.
As he surveyed all this, he thus expressed his wonder:
‘How’s this – how do I see an island on the mainland?’

(Translation adapted from Rouse 1940: 177–9)

The description is strikingly visual and erotic; it insists on an abundance of details that can overwhelm the reader (or listener) and culminates in three verses consisting solely of *asyndeta* (vv. 334–6), which create a cumulative effect.[25] The description of Beirut in the following Book opens with another set of *asyndeta*,[26] followed by a series of juxtaposed agricultural activities (which are not printed below), which then lead into the metaphor of the swimming girl embraced by Poseidon:

ἔστι πόλις Βερόη, βιότου τρόπις, ὅρμος᾽Ερώτων,
ποντοπαγής, **εὔ**νησος, **ἐύ**χλοος, οὗ ῥάχις ἰσθμοῦ (15)
στεινὴ μῆκος ἔχοντος, ὅπῃ διδύμης μέσος ἅλμης
κύμασιν ἀμφοτέροισιν ἱμάσσεται ὄρθιος αὐχήν·
. . .

πήχεϊ μυδαλέῳ περιβάλλεται ὑγρὸς ἀκοίτ**ης**, (30)
πέμπων ὑδατόεντα φιλήματα χείλεσι νύμφ**ης**·
καὶ βυθίης ἀπὸ χειρὸς ὁμευνέτις ἠθάδι κόλπῳ
ἕδνα Ποσειδάωνος ἁλίτροφα πώεα λίμν**ης**
δέχνυται, ἰχθυόεντα πολύχροα δεῖπνα **τραπέζης**,
εἰναλίῃ Νηρῆος ἐπισκαίροντα **τραπέζῃ**

(*Dion*. 41.14–35)

There is a city Beroë, the keel of human life, harbour of the Loves,
firm-based upon the sea, with fine islands and finely green, with a ridge of isthmus
narrow and long, and between the two seas
the rising neck is beaten by the waves of both.
. . .
and her watery husband embraces [her neck] with wet arm, (30)
putting moist kisses on the bride's lips;
she, his bedfellow, accepts in her well-accustomed bosom from his watery hand
Poseidon's bride-gifts, the sea-bred flocks of the waters,
the fishes of many colours for her banqueting-table,
which dance on the table of Nereus in the brine.

(Translation adapted from Rouse 1940: 197–9)

The last three verses here are entirely taken up by an extravagant pleonasm about the fish that Poseidon gives to Beirut. This excessive string of nouns, adjectives and participles (which is very characteristic of Nonnus' style) seems to have no point other than to draw attention to the language itself, to the poet's mastering of his chosen style and to his own poetics. The 'many-coloured' (πολύχροα)[27] fish resonate with the varied, multihued style – so fond of juxtaposing synonyms – that characterizes the poem as a whole.[28] These three verses have no particles or conjunctions, thus forming a unit within themselves. The last verse is a four-word hexameter in which the first and last words are joined syntactically, further isolating the verse from what precedes and follows it. This type of verse, the *versus tetracolus*, can be a useful index for the jeweled style: since such verses usually include very long, often striking words and, comparatively speaking, tend to be epexegetical rather than narrative, it can be assumed that the higher their frequency, the more ostentatious the language of a text and the more fragmented its narration.[29] Vergil's *Aeneid* only has four such verses. Greek poetry apparently begins from a more jeweled 'baseline', as Homer has one *versus tetracolus* in every sixty-five. With Hesiod, the percentage increases to one in every forty-four verses; with Apollonius of Rhodes, it rises again to one in twenty-nine; with Ps.-Oppian, it reaches one in twenty-one; with Triphiodorus, one in seventeen; and, finally, in the *Dionysiaca*, one in every fifteen verses is a *tetracolus*.

There is, then, a gradual development within the poetic tradition of specific techniques which allow Nonnus to articulate his poem in this highly ecphrastic, discontinuous mode. There is also a clearly increasing tendency to view the world as paradox and to

express this view through antithesis and with striking lexical innovation. Beirut, for example, is described in a one-word paradox as ποντοπαγής (*Dion*. 41.16: fixed firmly in the sea). The adjective was apparently coined by Nonnus and is an absolute *hapax*; yet both its form and the type of thinking it expresses have precedents in Gregory of Nazianzus, a poet that Nonnus read and imitated (see D'Ippolito 1994 and Simelidis 2016: 298–307). Gregory, in the same poem mentioned above, describes Christ as an αὐτοπαγὴς βροτός (*arc*. 8.69: a self-formed mortal) – that is, one who mysteriously constituted himself in the womb of his mother. The *Dionysiaca* is a poem that 'feeds' on almost all previous poetic genres, incorporating hymns, epigrams, bucolic, didactic and of course mythological epic from Homer to Triphiodorus.[30] Its style also participates in, and brings to its apex, an organic development (within the poetic tradition) towards an ever-more jeweled style – a development that received extra impetus from contact with prose, especially in the poetry of Gregory of Nazianzus, Nonnus' important stylistic predecessor.

Even in such an omnivorous mega-poem as the *Dionysiaca*, however, the direct influence of jeweled prose cannot be disregarded. Just as the Christian paradoxes of Gregory's theology are equally conveyed within his poetry and his prose (and with recourse to the same jeweled style), the urban and natural paradoxes of late antique city encomia were communicated in both modes of expression: the genre of *patria* encompassed both poetry and prose (see Dagron 1984: 9–12 and Focanti 2016: 485f.). Scholars have often argued that Nonnus' descriptions of Tyre and Beirut were directly inspired from Achilles Tatius, who had proclaimed Tyre a 'city in the sea and an island on land' (2.14.4: πόλις ἐν θαλάσσῃ καὶ νῆσος ἐν γῇ),[31] and who inserted this paradoxical series of antitheses in his encomium of the Nile:

> Νεῖλος ὁ πολὺς πάντα αὐτοῖς γίνεται, καὶ ποταμὸς καὶ γῆ καὶ θάλασσα καὶ λίμνη. καὶ ἔστι τὸ θέαμα καινόν, ναῦς ὁμοῦ καὶ δίκελλα, κώπη καὶ ἄροτρον, πηδάλιον καὶ δρέπανον, ναυτῶν ὁμοῦ καὶ γεωργῶν καταγωγή, ἰχθύων ὁμοῦ καὶ βοῶν. ὃ πέπλευκας, φυτεύεις, καὶ ὃ φυτεύεις, τοῦτο πέλαγος γεωργούμενον.
>
> (4.12.1–5)
>
> The great Nile is everything to them – river and land and sea and lake. And it is a new sight: close together the boat and the hoe, the oar and the plough, the rudder and the sickle – the common lodging of sailors and farmers, of fishes and oxen. You sow where you have sailed, and where you sow it is a cultivated sea.

Nonnus may indeed have read Achilles Tatius or even drawn inspiration from these particular passages,[32] but the intermingling of earth and water, the figuring of coastlines as *paradoxa* and the praise of coastal cities as swimming nymphs would have likely been common if not ubiquitous in city encomia.[33] In the fourth century, the *rhetor* Himerius, an author also responsible for a protreptic discourse on the value of *poikilia* (*Or.* 68), addresses a prose encomium to Constantinople:

> σὲ μὲν καὶ Ποσειδῶν ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ θαλάσσιος γλαυκοῖς **περι**βάλλει τοῖς κύμασιν, οἷά τινα νύμφην Ναΐδα, καὶ **π**ανταχόθεν **περιπ**τύσσει καὶ γέγηθε· σὲ δὲ καὶ Νηρηΐδων **ἁλιπορφύρων** χοροὶ ἄκροις ἐπισ**κιρ**τῶντες τοῖς **κύ**μασι **κύ**κλῳ **περὶ** πᾶσαν χορεύουσι.
>
> (*Or.* 62.2)
>
> Poseidon, king of the sea, surrounds you with his bluish waves, as if you were a Naiad nymph; he embraces you on every side and rejoices in you. Choruses of sea-purple Nereids, leaping on the surface of the waves, dance around the whole of you in a circle.
>
> (Translation: Penella 2007: 46f.)

Having proclaimed himself a new Pindar for a new Athens (Constantinople) at the beginning of the speech, Himerius consistently appropriates poetic vocabulary (here, ἁλιπορφύρων) and evokes dazzlingly jeweled images. In this oration, he will go on to compare the city's walls to a golden diadem that the emperors have placed on her head. In a different speech, again for Constantinople, the city itself is compared to a golden necklace, in which the gems that are its various architectural wonders – the senate, baths and theatres – vie for the spectators' attention (*Or.* 41.7).[34] Himerius' Constantinople, like the two Nonnian cities, is also a city paradoxically founded on water. Himerius describes how the city expanded towards the coast and 'has turned what by its nature is rolling and constantly on the move [the sea] into something immobile' (*Or.* 41.6: σαλεύουσαν φύσιν καὶ ἄστατον **πεπηγέναι πεποίηκεν**).

Achilles Tatius, Himerius and Nonnus use a similarly jeweled style to praise similarly paradoxical landscapes. That the two prose authors are earlier (and Achilles Tatius significantly so) is a likely indication that it was in prose, not in poetry, that this style and the type of thinking it usually expresses were developed and sustained. To a significant extent the Greek jeweled style goes back to Gorgias, whose extremely figured speech was used as a vehicle precisely for paradoxical arguments such as, in his *Encomium of Helen*, 'Even if she followed Paris willingly, Helen should be considered entirely innocent.'[35] The Gorgianic style, later termed 'Asianic' by the Romans, would never go entirely out of fashion from the moment it was introduced to Athens in the fifth century.[36] Literary fragments, as well as *encomia* surviving in inscriptions, from the Hellenistic period onwards attest to its continued appeal.[37] It later became the style of choice for many orators of the Second Sophistic and other prose authors of the same period, such as Achilles Tatius.[38] The development of a corresponding style in poetry must have been propelled by the growing parallel employment of both prose and poetry for the same functions.[39] Gregory reflects on the same theological *paradoxa* in prose and poetry. Ecphrases and *encomia*, including *patria* and panegyrics, were equally written in prose and verse. It is significant that Nonnus' *Dionysiaca*, for all its poetic 'inter-genericity' (cf. Harrison 2007), presents itself as a panegyric for Dionysus – an epic panegyric which, Nonnus alleges, Homer himself should have composed instead of singing the praises of Achilles.[40] Nonnus pursues a poetics that is marked by discontinuity and rejection of (or

fierce antagonism with) the poetic tradition – a stance that is markedly different from that of earlier Imperial poets.[41] Nonnus' antagonism with the poetic tradition can be construed as an adaptation *for poetry* of an anti-poetic discourse found in earlier prose panegyrics, which sought to denigrate Homer as the model panegyrist in order to elevate the contemporary speaker and his *laudandus*.[42] Nonnus-the-panegyrist can attack Homer-the-panegyrist because his predecessors working in prose had used this exact same technique. The conceptualization of epic as panegyric, that is, as a declamatory genre which could be expressed in appropriately jeweled prose, allowed epic itself to assume an entirely and unashamedly jeweled guise.

Jeweled Christian prose and un-jeweled biblical poetry

The jeweled style in Greek poetry remains mostly wedded to poetic genres that have corresponding prose iterations (the panegyric of Nonnus and the ecphrases of his imitators). The stylistic registers used by Greek biblical poetry seem to confirm this view. Poets writing on biblical topics choose to eschew the jeweled style in the main body of their compositions: the poems of Eudocia and Ps.-Apollinaris are, in different ways, decidedly Homeric, and Nonnus' *Paraphrase* is significantly less jeweled than the same poet's *Dionysiaca* (see below). Yet both Eudocia's *Homerocentones* and the *Metaphrasis Psalmorum* by Ps.-Apollinaris are prefaced with jeweled hexameters, whose style markedly differs from the Homericizing compositions that follow (see Agosti 2001: 87–92 and 2019: 137). What can account for this change in stylistic register? The very genre of the preface provides at least part of the explanation. It has long been observed that verse prefaces grew out of the rhetorical *prolaliae* which preceded declamatory performances at least since the second century CE: before taking up his fictional persona, the declaimer would address the audience in his own voice and try to win their favour or address his speech's composition and structure.[43] When this practice was transferred to poetry, it would, eventually, give rise to more informal, iambic prefaces to hexameter poems.[44] Iambic is, of course, the most conversational and un-poetic of all Greek metres. In the case of these earlier Christian compositions, the prefaces are not in iambics. They are, nevertheless, more prose-like precisely in that they are jeweled: the space of the declamatory preface afforded poets 'permission' to use a style that is more rhetorical and more closely affiliated with artistic prose than the very Homeric modes they would adopt in the rest of their poems.

The reasons behind the avoidance of the jeweled style in Greek biblical poetry are complicated and cannot be addressed here in full, but must include both Christian suspicion against ostentation (material and linguistic)[45] and also the scandal provoked by the composition of poetry by two arch-heretics: Arius and the historical Apollinaris, the first of whom wrote his notorious *Thalia* in an extremely rhetorical style.[46] Yet, none of these factors stopped Gregory of Nazianzus from writing jeweled didactic emulating his own, jeweled theological orations. Genre is again significant: in paraphrasing or retelling the biblical stories in centos, poets must have consulted commentaries and

other Christian prose, but their project was plainly poetic. They aimed, that is, simply to render the Bible in verse and not primarily to expound or expand upon it in the manner of orations and commentaries. There can be no prose equivalent to these purely poetic enterprises.

My final illustration of the extent to which the Greek jeweled style is predominantly tied to prose is Nonnus' *Paraphrase of the Gospel According to John*. Penned by the same poet as the extravagant *Dionysiaca*, this is a surprisingly un-jeweled poem. That is not to say that the jeweled style is entirely absent from the poem: lacking a preface by the poet himself,[47] the epic begins with a 'hymn to the Logos' which significantly expands upon John's corresponding proclamation and which is reminiscent of Gregory's didactic verses, especially as it also terms the Logos 'a son without a mother' (1.2: υἱὸς ἀμήτωρ). Such jeweled passages, however, are few and far between in the poem.[48] The *Paraphrase* follows its *Vorlage* very closely, often limiting itself to lexical variation and the addition of adjectives to the biblical text. These adjectives can perform important theological work,[49] but they are not enough for us to qualify the poem's stylistic register as jeweled. *Versus tetracoli* appear less frequently in the *Paraphrase* than in the *Dionysiaca* (see Faulkner 2020: 29f.). The pace of the biblical narrative is respected and not interrupted by long digressions and ecphrases. There is but one full-fledged ecphrasis in the whole poem (the lanterns, in 18.18–24), and even that only takes up seven verses.[50] This lack of attention to visuality is indeed striking, especially considering the poet's own practices in the *Dionysiaca*.

The healing of the man born blind is an apt example. Recounted in John 9.6, this miracle provided fertile ground for homilists and commentators to expound on the importance of vision and on the beauty of creation as proof of the wisdom and providence of the Creator. In the fourth century, John Chrysostom dedicates two homilies to the miracle, one of which waxes lyrical on the eye as the superior human organ (*PG* 59.307.46–308.23). Also from the fourth century is a homily by a less well-known bishop, Asterius of Amaseia, who takes the opportunity to insert an extended ecphrasis of the eye in his interpretation of the miracle. This ecphrasis unfolds over three paragraphs (7.3–5), dwelling on the eye's glistening, mirror-like surface and its intermingling of colours (7.4.2: ποικίλοις τισὶ κύκλοις, a strange unity of varied circles). The ecphrasis concludes with a quasi-ethopoeia in which the author exclaims, as if in the persona of the newly seeing blind man:

> διὰ τούτου ἔχω γνῶσιν ἡλίου καὶ οὐρανοῦ κόσμον ἔμαθον καὶ κάλλος ἀστέρων ἱστόρησα καὶ γῆς ὑπόστασιν καὶ φύσιν θαλάσσης, σπερμάτων διαφορὰν καὶ φυτῶν ποικιλίαν καὶ χρωμάτων ποικίλην βαφήν, σκότους κατήφειαν καὶ φωτὸς λαμπήδονα καὶ πάντα ἁπλῶς ὅσα ὁ Θεὸς κτίσας ἐπῄνεσεν.
>
> (7.5.1)
>
> Because of it [the eye] I know the sun and I have learned the ornaments of sky and the beauty of the stars and the substance of the earth and the nature of the sea, the diverse kinds of seeds and the variety of plants, and the multiple hues of colours, the dejection of darkness and the brightness of light and simply everything that God made and praised.

Asterius writes a sermon meant for oral delivery in front of an audience of certainly mixed capacities. His lively style, with the accumulation of short clauses and relatively simple vocabulary, is clearly intended to retain his listeners' attention. Yet, we find a thematically similar passage in the commentary on John's Gospel written by Cyril of Alexandria in the fifth century. Where Asterius sings the praises of the eye in the abstract, Cyril remarkably puts himself in the place of the healed blind man and proffers a full-fledged, jeweled ethopoeia. This is only its final part:

> **ἰδοὺ** λαμπρὸν ἡλίου **περι**αστράπτει με φῶς· **ἰδοὺ** ξένων θεαμάτων τὸν ἐμὸν ὀφθαλμὸν **περι**στοιχίζεται κάλλος. ἄρτι μόλις ἔγνων τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ βλέπω μὲν θεῖον ἐν αὐτῇ **περι**αστράπτοντα ναόν, ὁρῶ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ τὸ σεπτὸν ὄντως θυσιαστήριον· κἂν ἐπέκεινα πύλης εὑρεθῶ, ὅλην ἐν κύκλῳ **περι**αθρήσω τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, καὶ τί μὲν ὄρος ἐστί, τί δὲ φυτὸν ἐπιγνώσομαι. μεταμειβομένου δὲ τοῦ καιροῦ πρὸς ἑσπέραν, οὐκ ἔτι τὸν ἐμὸν ὀφθαλμὸν τὸ τῶν ἄνω θαυμάτων **δια**λήσεται κάλλος, οὐχ ὁ **δια**φανὴς τῶν ἀστέρων χορός, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τῆς **σελ**ήνης τὸ πάγχρυσον **σέλ**ας.
>
> (6.1 on Jn 9.15 = Pusey 1972: 2.165,25–166,8)

> Lo! the bright light of the sun is shining around me: lo! the beauty of strange sights surrounds my eye. A short time ago I scarcely knew what Jerusalem was like; now I see glittering in her the temple of God, and I behold in its midst the truly venerable altar. And if I stand outside the gate, I can look around on the country of Judea, and shall recognize one thing as a hill and another as a tree. And when the time changes to evening, my eye will no longer fail to notice the beauty of the wondrous objects on high, the brilliant company of the stars and the golden light of the moon.
>
> (Translation adapted from Randell 1885: 2.26f.)

Nonnus had read Cyril's commentary before composing his *Paraphrase* (see Livrea 1989: 25 and Spanoudakis 2014: 18f.). Yet, his rendering of this miracle inserts no ecphrasis or praise of the eye, no ethopoeia of the healed blind man and no amplification of the Gospel to highlight the power of vision to convey knowledge about the creation and the Creator. This is neither to say that Nonnus' rendition is theologically disinterested, as Michele Cutino (2009: 237f.) claimed, nor that it lacks hermeneutic potential and remains at the level of a school exercise, as Martin Hose (2004: 29) thought in relation to Greek biblical poetry in general. The *Paraphrase*, relying on the exegesis of Cyril and others,[51] turns this miracle into a second Genesis by recalling God's creation of man: Jesus is said to mould new eyes for the blind man with the 'familiar mud, out of man-begetting dust' (9.33f.: ὀφθαλμοὺς τελέων νεοτευχέας ἠθάδι πηλῷ / ἐκ χοὸς ἀνδρογόνοιο,).[52] The difference is that here the hermeneutic weight is carried by the adjectives (νεοτευχέας, ἠθάδι and ἀνδρογόνοιο are all significant) and not by a profusion of jeweled language and imagery as in Cyril. The above sample from the supposedly 'dry' genre of the commentary is clearly more jeweled than a poem written by the major representative of the jeweled style in Greek poetry. Nonnus was patently *not* aiming to

write a jeweled biblical poem – it is likely that such an enterprise would have been a generic impossibility in Greek poetry.

Conclusion

This contribution has argued that a jeweled style emerged in Greek poetry at about the same time as in Latin poetry (during the fourth century), but it did so on a more limited scale, in only *some* of the poems of Gregory of Nazianzus and with the impetus of the same author's jeweled prose. It was Nonnus' *Dionysiaca* that brought a poetic jeweled style into vogue in the fifth century and influenced a series of imitators in the sixth century. This new style, however, did not sweep over the entire landscape of Greek poetry: it was neither embraced by all poets nor even adopted to the same extent for all poems *by the same poet*, as Nonnus' different registers for the *Dionysiaca* and the *Paraphrase* suggest. Throughout late antiquity, poets could and did often choose to compose Homericizing poetry – a kind of poetry that has no clear equivalent in the Latin tradition, as it involves adopting a peculiar language and not just a style.[53] The *Orphic Argonautica* is one such example of Homericizing poetry from the secular tradition. An archaic, Homericizing mode was from the beginning (in the Bodmer poems, from the early/mid-fourth century), and remained throughout late antiquity, the main style of choice for poets working on biblical topics.[54] Greek poetry responded to the jeweled style in a genre-specific way, allowing this style to flourish in those genres that had equivalent prose iterations, from which the poems could derive, direct or indirect, motivation for and 'legitimization' of their jeweled-ness. An epic poem conceived as a panegyric, an ecphrasis in verse praising a public monument and a poetic preface corresponding to an orator's *prolalia* all have obvious rhetorical functions which could be equally served by artistic, declamatory prose.[55] Greek prose had a jeweled version long before Greek poetry acquired one, and it would continue to be the embodiment of the jeweled style *par excellence*.

Notes

* I thank the editors of this volume for their meticulous work on my chapter. I also gratefully acknowledge the financial support of FCT (Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia), Portugal, through the project PTDC/LLT LES/30930/2017 (national funds).

1. For the jeweled style in Quintus' *Posthomerica* see the reading of Book 13 by Avlamis (2019: 184–6). It is commonplace to qualify Nonnus' style as jeweled; see e.g. Agosti (2006) and De Stefani and Magnelli (2011: 557). See also below.
2. See further *Dion.* 41.133 (birth of Eros); 48.841 (birth of Dionysus); *Par.* 3.36 (being reborn in baptism). For the theme of paradoxical generation in the *Dion.* see Hadjittofi (2016: 149–51).
3. See Dion. Hal., *De comp*. 23.16–17 (εὔφωνά τε εἶναι βούλεται πάντα τὰ ὀνόματα καὶ λεῖα καὶ μαλακὰ καὶ παρθενωπά) and the analysis in R. Hunter (2009: 255 and 2014: ch. 6).
4. For Ps.-Oppian as influenced by rhetoric see Whitby (1994: 111) and Silva Sánchez (1999).

5. Cf. specifically on Callimachus' influence De Stefani and Magnelli (2011).
6. For Quintus' impersonation of Homer see now Greensmith (2020).
7. For this argument see especially Bär (2010), with the *antilogia* of Maciver (2012b).
8. See Greensmith (2020: 158–88) with further bibliography. For Homer as a shepherd before his poetic investiture in the Troad, in the vicinity of Achilles' tomb, see Hermias' commentary on Plato's *Phaedrus* (243a = 1.80.14–26) – a neglected account, which I will analyse elsewhere.
9. For Quintus' gnomic style see Maciver (2012: 87–123).
10. Triphiodorus is dated thus on the basis of a papyrus fragment (*P.Oxy.* 2946) which cannot be later than the very early fourth century; see Miguélez Cavero (2013: 4–6). The relative chronology of Quintus and Triphiodorus is contested although most scholars now agree that Quintus is the earlier poet; see, recently, Carvounis (2019: xx–xxvi) and Greensmith (2020: 24–34).
11. See Miguélez Cavero (2013: 44–6) with further bibliography.
12. Whitmarsh (2020: 40) has called Achilles' style in parts 'prose-poetic'.
13. ὑάκινθος means both 'jacinth' and 'hyacinth', but the second meaning would have been the most natural and frequent one; cf. Whitmarsh (2020: 208).
14. See Cameron (2004: 333) and, especially on Gregory's awareness of the classical genres and their norms, Kuhn-Treichel (2020).
15. See *Aet.* fr. 1.27f. (κελεύθους / ἀτρίπτους) and Poulos (2019: 54f.). On Gregory's Callimacheanism cf. Simelidis (2009: 30–46).
16. Hose (2004: 24f.) argues that much of Gregory's poetry is a 'transposition' of his own prose into verse: the *Carmina moralia*, for example, 'transpose' his paraenetic literature, and the poems about himself (*Carmina de se ipso*) 'transpose' his prose *Apologia*. A more extensive analysis than can be carried out here would be needed to confirm whether Gregory's poetry consistently turns more jeweled in those cases where it 'transposes' jeweled prose (if the poetry indeed relies on the prose, which is not universally accepted; see n. 19 below).
17. On the musicality of Gregory's prose, its 'enumerative method' and its influence on the style of Marino see Ward (1994).
18. E.g. the 'leaping' of John the Baptist is described in Luke 1.41 with the verb σκιρτάω, which Gregory turns into προσκιρτάω. Attestations of the latter verb in other authors are all later. Gregory uses it also in his *Funeral Oration for Basil* (*Or.* 43.75) and in two further speeches (*Or.* 38 and 39; *PG* 36.329.46 and 36.352.34).
19. For an attempt to read the poetry as depending on the orations see Keydell (1951), who goes so far as to treat the *arcana* as one continuous poem. Cf. also Hose's (2004: 24f.) views, as reported above n. 16, and *contra* Moreschini and Sykes (1997: 58f.), who also note that as a didactic poet, Gregory is at once traditional and innovative. For Gregory's apophatic poetics in the *arcana* cf. Meinel (2009).
20. On Christodorus' Nonnian style see Bär (2012: 469–71); on his relationship with Homer, whom he calls his own father in *Anth. Pal.* 2.320–3, see among others Kaldellis (2007) and Höschele (2021).
21. On the date of John's poem see Lauritzen (2015: xii-xviii), on its style Gigli Piccardi (2011).
22. On Paul's Nonnian metre and style see Fayant (2003).
23. On the shield of Dionysus see, e.g. Spanoudakis (2014b) and Gagné (2019: 196–203). On the necklace of Harmonia see Miguélez Cavero (2017).
24. For the same paradox in late Latin poetry and in connection to the jeweled style see Hardie (2019: 173–85). Contrast Ps.-Oppian's description of a diverted river in *Cyn.* 2.116–58,

where such a paradoxical landscape could have been described but is not as Ps.-Oppian is more interested in providing mythological digressions; for stylistic analysis of part of this passage see Whitby (1994: 112–14).

25. On the 'cumulative aesthetic' in late antique art see Elsner (2004: 304–9), for that in literature see Roberts (1989: 66–121) and Miller (1998: 124–30).
26. A more impressive series of *asyndeta* in praise of Beirut, spanning eight verses, can be found in *Dion*. 41.143–50.
27. The same adjective is used for the rainbow in *Dion.* 2.203; for the 'varied necklace' crafted by Hephaestus in 5.580 (ποικίλον ὅρμον); and for Dionysus' shield, again crafted by Hephaestus, in 25.387 (ἀσπίδα δαιδάλλουσα πολύχροον).
28. For Nonnus' poetics of *poikilia* see e.g. Fauth (1981) and Miguélez Cavero (2008: 139–45 and 162–8).
29. See Bassett (1919), from whom the following statistics are also derived.
30. For brief overview see Lasek (2016).
31. See the commentaries by Simon (1999: 283f.), Accorinti (2004: 112–14 and 174–5), Chuvin and Fayant (2006: 156), all with further bibliography. Already in Chariton, Tyre is 'a city founded in the sea' (7.2.8.1: ἡ μὲν γὰρ πόλις ἐν θαλάσσῃ κατῴκισται).
32. For similar hymns and encomia of the Nile, which are not, however, as stylistically close to Nonnus as Achilles Tatius see e.g. an epigram by Philip of Thessalonica (*Anth. Pal.* 9.299) and a fragmentary hexameter hymn to the Nile (fourth century), edited by Cribiore (1995), who also notes that some vocabulary used in the hymn will later become standard in Nonnus. The fragmentary hexameter cosmogony found on *P.Strasb.* 481 is very probably part of a *patrion* of Hermoupolis Magna and likewise presents similarities with Nonnus' vocabulary and with his account of the foundation of Beirut; see the recent edition of the text, with rich commentary, by Perale (2020: 33–83).
33. Also in the encomia for those who sponsored such building projects: an anonymous epigram praises a certain Venetius who surpassed Theseus and Pelops by turning Smyrna's deep sea into dry land (*Anth. Pal.* 9.670.1: βυθὸν ἠπείρωσε).
34. For further commentary on this speech see Hadjittofi (2014). The motif of the dispersed gaze as a reaction to an architectural or urban wonder appears in two second-century authors: Aelius Aristides, whose praise of Smyrna includes a comparison of the city to a multicoloured necklace that draws the eye of the viewer into different directions (*Or.* 17.10–11) and Achilles Tatius 5.1.1–5, where Clitophon pronounces his eyes 'vanquished' at the sight of Alexandria. After Himerius, it also appears in Procop. *Aed.* 1.1.47–9; Paul. Silent. 296–9; Choric. *Laud. Marc*. 2.26.
35. Gorgias' lost speech *On Nature or On Non-Existence* also put forward a very paradoxical thesis: it first denied the existence of reality itself; it then denied the possibility of knowing something about reality (if it existed) and communicating that knowledge (if it could ever be acquired). It is no wonder that such an apophatic argument and the style in which it must have been couched appealed to later theologians.
36. On the adoption of this essentially racist view of 'Asian' decadence in Eduard Norden's influential study on *Kunstprosa* see Ludlow (2020: 13–18).
37. See e.g. Papanikolaou (2009) on a first- or second-century BCE inscriptional encomium of Isis and (2012) on an inscription from Lycia, dating to the second century CE and featuring many *hapax legomena* and other rare terms, including the word θεοτόκος for a miracle in which the earth 'gave birth' to two stone images resembling Apollo and Artemis.

38. For an example from the oratory of the early second century CE see the two declamations of Polemo, both written in the Gorgianic style and indulging in paradoxes; one speech, for instance, proclaims its subject 'a dead man superior to death' (2.2.31: νεκρὸν θανάτου κρείττονα) and an 'ensouled corpse' (2.12.5: σῶμα ἔμψυχον).
39. Roberts (1989: 49f.) briefly points out that in late antiquity the distinction between poetry and prose progressively broke down.
40. See the 'proem in the middle' of Book 25, with Henry (2020: 448–51). For the *Dionysiaca* as panegyric see Miguélez Cavero (2010) and for the late antique focalization of earlier epic poetry through panegyric Pollmann (1999: 63).
41. On Nonnus' combative relationship with Homer see especially Shorrock (2001).
42. I analyse this technique in Hadjittofi (2021), also pointing out its genealogy in a historiographical trope first developed in Thucydides' 'Archaeology'.
43. See Zuenelli (2019: 46) with further bibliography.
44. In Greek poetry such iambic prefaces are only attested in the sixth-century poems of John of Gaza and Paul the Silentiary.
45. Roberts (1989: 142) argues that some Latin Christian poetry avoided the excesses of the jeweled style to refute 'any accusation of self-serving stylistic virtuosity'.
46. Faulkner (2020: 1–31) attributes the extant *Metaphrasis Psalmorum* to the historical Apollinaris, but the question is far from settled. It is impossible to know from the brief mentions of Socrates of Constantinople (*Hist. Eccl.* 3.15f.) and Sozomen (*Hist. Eccl.* 5.18.3f.) which style the hexameter paraphrases would have adopted, but Sozomen does also mention lyric poems in the manner of Pindar, which are likely to have been jeweled compositions.
47. I explore the implications of this absence in Hadjittofi (2020).
48. For some such passages see *Par.* 3.16–47 (the paradox of the second birth in baptism), 5.79–82 (on the resurrection) and 19.139–45 (the Beloved Disciple is appointed as the son of the Virgin).
49. For an example of how the employment of single adjectives affects Nonnus' Christology see Hadjittofi (2018).
50. On this ecphrasis, its links with the visual world of late antiquity and its symbolic interpretation see Agosti (2014: 159f.) and on its exceptional status in the poem Verhelst (2019: 12–14).
51. For full details and references see Hadjittofi (2020: 83 n. 70).
52. Cf. the emphatic hemistich ἀνέρος ἔπλασεν ὄμμα repeated in two consecutive verses at 9.30f.
53. Few scholars speak of 'Vergilizing' poetry, and one who does use this word refers almost exclusively to Proba's cento (see Curran 2012). The imitation of Vergil by later poets never extends to, for example, continuing his epic or impersonating him, as Quintus impersonates Homer.
54. For the style of the Christian poems found on the Bodmer codex (*Codex Visionum*) see Agosti (2002).
55. Peirano Garrison (2019) rightly speaks of a dynamic and competitive interaction between Latin poetry and prose – a model that could well apply to the Greek tradition, too.