

prosecutor does; so, contrasting with Martin/Woodman, the incongruity and contrast is not so much that 'the [defendant's] circumstances represented the very opposite of preparation', but that the prosecution deliberately brought about the contrast. It may be no accident that the language of this sentence is comparatively Ciceronian. There is an abundance of antithesis and balance, even the sort of parallelism in construction which Tacitus regularly avoids for the sake of *variatio*.²⁰

If the forensic setting holds the key to the text, the meaning inherent in (*prae*)*paratur* would seem preferable to that in *comparatur*. Moreover, the simple form *paratur*, while not diminishing the contrast and offering the same meaning as the compound, is the word used by Cicero.²¹

The text for the relevant section of *Annals* 4.28 should read:

ab exilio retractus inlueque ac squalore obsitus et tum catena vinctus peroranti filio pater paratur. adulescens multis munditiis, ...

University of Cape Town

D. WARDLE

²⁰ Parallelism: 'inlueque ac squalore obsitus' and 'catena vinctus'; antithesis and balance: 'reus pater accusator filius', 'retractus ... obsitus ... vinctus'. Ciceronian vocabulary: *squalor* (e.g. *Sest.* 68; *Verr.* 2.5.48; *Cluent.* 18, 192; *Mur.* 42, 86; *Planc.* 21), but far less frequent in Tacitus (*Germ.* 31.2, *Hist.* 4.72.3), in fact here only in the *Annals* and as such to be added to Appendix 48 of Syme's *Tacitus*, words not recurring after the first Hexad. *Inlueque*, by contrast, never appears in Cicero, but three times in *Annals* 1–6 (1.24.3, 6.43.2) always in the ablative singular.

²¹ *Praeparo* appears in Cicero speeches only once and not of preparing witnesses; in his philosophical works *praeparo* is more frequent, but never with a personal object.

ON THE DATE OF JOHN OF GAZA

According to a marginal lemma in the only manuscript that carries the poem (Palat. gr. 23 + Paris. gr. suppl. 384), the painting of the world described in a well-known ecphrasis by John of Gaza was situated in the winter baths of Gaza. According to the standard edition of John's poem by P. Friedlaender, these are the baths Choricus of Gaza refers to as in course of construction at Gaza in A.D. 535 or 536.¹ If so, then both the painting and John's poem would have to be later than this. And since the poem does not claim to have been written for the dedication of the baths, it might be considerably later. G. Krahmer even dated it to the seventh century, on the grounds that John misunderstood some details of the picture he was describing.²

Despite some sensible criticism by G. Downey,³ this is still the generally accepted date and location.⁴ But there are serious objections. In the first place, the passage of Choricus refers to *another* winter bath (ἑτέρον χειμῶνος ὥρα λουτρόν), implying that at least one existed already. Even if John did write at Gaza, he might have written on an earlier bath. Second, this same lemmatist repeats his lemma locating the baths in Gaza at the end of the poem – but then goes on to add 'or in Antioch' (ἢ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ). Third, in a further note on the beginning of the poem he remarks that the painting John describes was also mentioned by Procopius of Gaza (ταύτης τῆς

¹ P. Friedlaender, *Johannes von Gaza und Paulus Silentiarius: Kunstbeschreibungen Justinianischer Zeit* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1912), p. 111; Choricus, *Or.* iii.55, p. 63. 14 Foerster-Richsteig. So too A. Ludwig, *Rhein. Mus.* 44 (1889), 197, 'offenbar in Gaza'.

² *De tabula mundi ab Joanne Gazaeo descripta* (Diss., Halle, 1920), p. 64.

³ 'John of Gaza and the Mosaic of Ge and Karpoi', *Antioch-on-the-Orontes II: The Excavations 1933–1936* (Princeton, 1938), pp. 205–12.

⁴ e.g. H. Hunger, *Die Hochsprachliche Profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, ii (Munich, 1978), p. 110; C. A. Trypanis, *Greek Poetry from Homer to Seferis* (Chicago, 1981), p. 402.

γραφῆς μέμνηται καὶ Προκόπιος ὁ Γαζαῖος). In itself this detail looks circumstantial enough, but unfortunately Procopius is known on good evidence to have been dead by 530.⁵

Friedlaender dismissed the reference to Antioch as a 'wertloser Zusatz',⁶ and suggested a later Procopius of Gaza.⁷ Ludwig gave a whole series of reasons for disregarding the Antioch reference. But why should the similarly anonymous scholion locating the painting at Gaza carry any more weight? More important, it has not been appreciated that every piece of information we have bearing on the title, date and occasion of John's poem is written in the hand of this same lemmatist.

Now this man was far more than just a lemmatist. Since Preisendanz's detailed study of the various hands in *AP*, it has been universally accepted that the lemmatist is to be identified with the copyist J,⁸ who is also to be seen as the *maître d'œuvre* of the entire MS, the source for the Palatine Anthology, John of Gaza, Paul the Silentiary's epiphraze of Hagia Sophia, the *Anacreontea* and various other unique works. J copied substantial portions of text at the beginning, middle and end of the MS and went all through adding lemmata, corrections and additions of various sorts. We may even be able to pin a name on him. I have elsewhere given reasons for identifying J as the well known early tenth-century courtier and poet Constantine the Rhodian.⁹ He was something of a scholar as well as a copyist. To give only the most relevant example, he goes on to add one further marginal note by the beginning of the poem on the so-called school of fifth- and sixth-century Gaza:

This city [Gaza] was devoted to the Muses, and attained the highest distinction in literature; among its celebrities were John and Procopius and Timothy, who wrote on the animals of India, and various anacreontic poets.

Timothy of Gaza did indeed write such a work, now lost save for a few Byzantine excerpts;¹⁰ J himself cites a speech by Procopius, also now lost; and a couple of later MSS preserve six anacreontics by John of Gaza (Bergk, *PLG* iii.⁴342–8). All in all, a remarkably well-informed note, evidently based in part at least on first-hand knowledge (J's interest in anacreontics is also illustrated by the inclusion in his manuscript of the *Anacreontea*, again in his own hand, a text known only from *AP*).

If all our information comes from the same source, we can be more systematic in our evaluation of its contradictions. The most authoritative is surely the title written directly above the text of the poem, again in the hand of J: ἔκφρασις τοῦ κοσμικοῦ πίνακος τοῦ ὄντος ἐν τῷ χειμεριῷ λουτρῷ. No reference here to Gaza. And yet this is presumably what stood in J's exemplar. What other source is he likely to have had for the location of the baths?¹¹ J's first marginal note repeats the same information in slightly different words: ἔκφρασις τῆς εἰκόνης τῆς κοσμογραφίας τῆς ἐν τῷ χειμεριῷ λουτρῷ τῷ δημοσιῷ ἐν Γάζῃ. εἰκόνος comes from the poem itself (line 12),

⁵ A. Chauvot, *Procope de Gaza, Priscien de Césarée, panégyriques de l'empereur Anastase Ier* (Bonn, 1986), pp. 87–91.

⁶ Friedlaender (1912), p. 111 n. 2.

⁷ Friedlaender (1912), pp. 111–12; cf. Ludwig (1889), 200.

⁸ C. Preisendanz, *Anthologia Palatina: codex Palatinus et codex Parisinus phototypice editi*, i (Leiden, 1911), cols. lxxv–cx.

⁹ *The Greek Anthology: From Meleager to Planudes* (Oxford, 1993), pp. 298–328.

¹⁰ F. S. Bodenheimer and A. Rabinowitz, *Timotheus of Gaza on Animals: Fragments of a Byzantine Paraphrase of an Animal-Book of the Fifth Century A.D.* (Paris and Leiden, 1949).

¹¹ Against Preisendanz's assumption that all the substantial scholia in the margins of *AP* were copied from its exemplar, see my *Greek Anthology*, chs V and VI *passim*; even if there was an earlier scholion, that still leaves the question of its source.

and δημοσιῶ is no more than an obvious assumption. ἐν Γάζῃ is surely a similar assumption.

Having just written the poet's name as 'John of Gaza', and being about to add his reference to three further writers from Gaza, it is hardly surprising that J should have assumed that John's baths were in Gaza. Ludwich and Friedlaender made the same assumption for the same reason. What, then, of his final addition ἡ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ?

In the first place, it is clearly more than just an addition. It must have been intended as a *correction* of his own earlier note, or at any rate a qualification. But why should J have thought to qualify his first thoughts in this way? There are two possibilities. First, simple scholarly caution. When he came to look back over his work at the end of the poem, he may have realized that he had no explicit authority for his original assumption; that is to say, he may have noticed that there was no mention of Gaza in the *title* of the poem. The other possibility is that he recalled an additional source of information. And here it will be remembered that he does in fact cite just such an additional source at the beginning of the poem: ταύτης τῆς γραφῆς μέμνηται καὶ Προκόπιος ὁ Γαζαῖος. Perhaps the passage he remembered referred to baths in Antioch.

Why should Procopius of Gaza refer to baths in Antioch? As it happens, one of Procopius' most famous speeches, unfortunately lost, was a monody on the destruction of Antioch in the great earthquake of 526.¹² Furthermore, it is well documented that there were at least two winter baths at Antioch. Libanius refers to winter and summer baths in the plural in his panegyric of Antioch of 360,¹³ and two centuries later Evagrius describes how 'each of the baths designed for the seasons' was destroyed in the earthquake of 588.¹⁴ The implication is clearly that these baths had been among the glories of the city. It is surely more than coincidence that J's alternative suggestion should be a city celebrated precisely for its winter baths.

It remains to add that (as Downey pointed out) a passage of John's poem that had previously puzzled critics, concerning Gaia, Arura and twin children called Karpoi, is clarified by a representation of Ge, Arura and the Karpoi, appropriately labelled, on a mosaic found in a bath in Antioch.¹⁵ It is a particularly striking coincidence that both John's painting and the mosaic were in baths. The mosaic, which dates from the first half of the fourth century, must have been copied from a painting very similar to the one John describes. Of course, it is possible that a copy of this painting was to

¹² K. Seitz, *Die Schule von Gaza* (Diss., Heidelberg, 1892), pp. 10, 20; Bekker, *Anecd. Gr.* i.125.6; 153.21, 24. On the quake, G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria* (Princeton, 1961), pp. 521–5; there was another, hardly less destructive, two years later (Downey, pp. 528–9). Friedlaender (*Spätantiker Gemäldezyklus in Gaza* (Vatican, 1939), p. 95) argued that quakes in 494, 500 and 525 are also possibilities, but no quakes in those years are documented at Antioch, and the one in 526 was officially declared the worst since 458 (Downey, p. 522).

¹³ *Or.* 11.220: τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἀρμόδια χειμῶνι, τὰ δὲ συμβαίνοντα θέρει, τὰ μὲν ἕξω πνευμάτων σφοδρῶν, τὰ δ' ὥσπερ μετέωρα καὶ οὐ κοινωνοῦντα τῆς γῆς. That is to say, the winter baths have protection against bad weather.

¹⁴ *Hist. Eccl.* vi.8; cf. Downey, *History of Antioch*, p. 568.

¹⁵ Cited in n. 3 above; for a recent description and plates, Sheila Campbell, *The Mosaics of Antioch* (Toronto, 1988), pp. 7–8 with pls. 9–11. I quote only Downey's conclusion: 'the scenes in the mosaic coincide exactly with scenes which, according to probable interpretations of the *ekphrasis* were present in the painting, and ... John's apparent failure to understand the scenes in the painting could be ascribed to the presence, in the painting, of figures such as appear in the mosaic.' See too Friedlaender, *Spätantiker Gemäldezyklus in Gaza* (Vatican, 1939), pp. vi–vii; R. Keydell, *Bursians Jahresbericht* 272 (1941), 47–8; and, for further parallels with late antique mosaics of the region, G. M. A. Hanfmann, 'The Seasons in John of Gaza's Tabula Mundi', *Latomus* 3 (1939), 111–18.

be found in Gaza. Nonetheless, on the most natural interpretation the Antioch mosaic must be held to support the claims of Antioch.

Since various indications in the poem suggest that the representation John describes was painted on the ceiling of a vault or dome,¹⁶ it must have been peculiarly vulnerable to damage in an earthquake. The entire city was destroyed in the quake of 526; according to an eyewitness, hardly a building was left standing, those that survived the quake being consumed in the devastating fires that followed.¹⁷ If Evagrius recorded the destruction of the (presumably rebuilt) winter and summer baths in 588, we may surely assume that Procopius described their earlier destruction in 526.

It is fascinating to be able to follow a scholiast's train of thought so closely. In his first scholion, J simply inferred the location Gaza from John's ethnic. Gaza led him to think of the school of Gaza, and he jotted down a few names and titles. Having thought of Procopius of Gaza, he recalled a passage on winter baths in the monody on Antioch. This caused him to wonder whether John's baths were really in Antioch rather than Gaza, and it was presumably at this stage that he realized his own earlier localization in Gaza was no more than an assumption.

If John's baths were indeed in Antioch, then the earthquake of 526 would become a terminus for his poem, which might have been written as much as a generation before the age of Justinian. The other terminus remains Nonnus (mid fifth century),¹⁸ whose *Dionysiaca* is echoed in virtually every line of John's poem.

Columbia University

ALAN CAMERON

¹⁶ Downey (1938), p. 205 n. 2; R. Keydell, *Bursians Jahresbericht* 230 (1931), 137.

¹⁷ Malalas, pp. 419–29 Bonn; Downey (1961), pp. 522–3.

¹⁸ Cameron, *Yale Classical Studies* 27 (1982), 235–9; E. Livrea, *Prometheus* 13 (1987), 97–123 (rather fancifully identifying the poet with Nonnus, bishop of Edessa 449–71).