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KINGDOM: PREACHING AND PERSUASION

Philagathos of Cerami is one of the most important representatives of
the intense cultural revival in the Norman Kingdom of Sicily, most notably
during the reigns of Roger II (1130 – 1154) and William I (1154 – 1166).\(^1\)
He was probably born in the last quarter of the eleventh century in Sicily,
at Cerami, and became renowned for his distinguished learning, as the
epithet ὁ φιλόσοφος certifies. Philagathos is mostly known as the author
of a substantial collection of homilies for the Sunday readings and the
feasts of the liturgical year, known as the “italo-griechische Homiliar” (A.
Ehrhard).\(^2\) He also produced an allegorical interpretation of Heliodorus’
*Aethiopica*\(^3\) which might have satisfied the Byzantine Italian elite in
Sicily as it would have done in Constantinople. Also he may have been
the author of a grammatical handbook.\(^4\) His literary activity reveals the
profound impact that eleventh- and twelfth- century Constantinopolitan
literary developments had upon a peripheral region of the Byzantine
commonwealth.

This study proposes to examine Philagathos’s preaching activity within
the context of the state-building process in Norman Italy, by looking at the
state-sponsored monastic revival and at the process of institutionalization
of religious life in twelfth-century Latin Christianity. Then I observe the
relation between preaching, persuasion and poetical language by looking
at one of Philagathos’s sermons, “On the Widow’s Son” (Περὶ τοῦ ὑιοῦ
τῆς χήρας) which will be shown to carry the impress of Heliodorus’s
*Aethiopica*.\(^5\)

An important part of religious institutionalization in the Norman
kingdom was Roger II’s systematic project to organize and revive Greek
monasticism;\(^6\) in May 1131, Roger II decreed that San Salvatore of Messina should become the mother house of a congregation of subordinate monasteries. The royal monastery – μονή βασιλική – acquired jurisdiction over forty-one monasteries in Sicily and Calabria and was independent of any ecclesiastical authority. It was subordinated only to the Norman king for right of appeal and for the ratification of the election of the archimandrite.\(^7\) Historians have much discussed whether the idea of the federation of Greek monasteries is an inspiration from mainland Benedictine abbeys, or from the Byzantine monastic confederation of Mount Athos, and have generally agreed that the Byzantine model prevailed.\(^8\) Yet the Byzantine model is drafted into the state building process of a Western kingdom. Roger II organized the monastic foundations of his family into one religious structure, with the centre at Messina at the very heart of the kingdom. This was a clear attempt to territorialize power within Norman society by securing strategic places from the rapacity of the Norman barons, subsequently binding Greek monasticism under the authority of the Norman dynasty.\(^9\) Just as San Salvatore was endowed with properties on both shores of the strait, so too Roger II placed the priory of Augustinian canons of Bagnara Calabra under the authority of a monastic institution – i.e. the diocese of Cefalù, founded in 1131.\(^10\) The straits of Messina were thus bound in allegiance to the Norman dynasty by being ascribed to a Greek and to a Latin monastic institution, both royal foundations. This highlights the importance of geography for the state-building process, and shows that the institutional changes during the period of state formation are territorial in nature.\(^11\) In this view, monasticism is confined to an active role of securing political neutrality and of conveying ideological power to the State by shaping the norms whereby individuals should act towards each other within society. Significantly, the foundations of Messina and Cefalù belong to the swift reorganization of the Church following the establishment of the kingdom in 1130.\(^12\)

Often, the changes within Greek monasticism in twelfth-century Southern Italy are portrayed as part of the monastic reform movement in Byzantium. The so-called “Stoudite-Evergetis reform” begun in major centers of the Byzantine East in the eleventh century and gradually spread throughout the entire Byzantine Kulturkreis. This Eastern development would mirror similar evolutions with Western Christianity in a joint quest for self-government and institutional independence.\(^13\) If Kazhdan saw the Stoudite reform as “the creation of an independent monastic organization able to resist imperial coercion”, thus becoming something like a check
to imperial power, in Southern Italy monasticism can be depicted as an institution woven into the political structure of the kingdom.\textsuperscript{14} Timothy Miller on the other hand enshrines Southern Italy within the monastic reform movement in Byzantium, and observed that in the \textit{Typikon} of Luke of San Salvatore the emphasis placed on confession, good order, and humility would confirm the reform thesis. He argues that “the author of this document shows an unusually forthright awareness of his role as a reformer, even using the term ‘reformation’ (\textit{diorthosis}).”\textsuperscript{15} However, in recent scholarship the idea of a Byzantine reform movement seen in terms of the medieval West has largely been abandoned and “replaced by a scattered distribution map of small foundations, following the pattern of life laid down by their founders, and connected only by the wandering xenos, who joins a community and then moves on.”\textsuperscript{16} This approach contrasts the degree of institutionalization of the religious life in Western Christendom with what was defined as the Eastern unwillingness to control and to strictly harness the sacred under ecclesiastical or state hierarchy.\textsuperscript{17}

For the Norman rulers, protecting the Church was a prerequisite to legitimize power, while control of preaching and of the religious life was essential for preventing dissent and opposition.\textsuperscript{18} Reforming impulses similar to those in other parts of Christendom pervaded South Italian Latin monasticism in the twelfth century but they were for the most part soon domesticated within a more conventional institutional framework.\textsuperscript{19} Philagathos’ preaching is embedded in this disciplinary context of restoration and reorganization of religious life and of the church structure. The Norman kings supported his missionary activity, as the homilies delivered in front of King Roger and William I clearly attest.\textsuperscript{20}

It can be inferred that the extraordinary diffusion of Philagathos’s \textit{Homilies} was partly due to their genuine delocalization, being intended to instruct the community of a kingdom and not that of a specific monastery. They were not intended for a particular monastic audience, although a certain segregation between monks and regular believers is occasionally implied.\textsuperscript{21} Their primary end was instruction of the laity and edification of fellow-monks. Almost like an itinerant preacher, he roamed widely through Calabria and Sicily and delivered some of his compositions before Kings Roger II and William I (1154 – 1166) as remarked above. Philagathos preached in the church of the Monastery of San Salvatore in Messina, at Rossano, at Reggio, at Palermo, at Taormina, at Cerami, his birthplace, and at other, unknown, locations.\textsuperscript{22} This pursuit prompted Lavagnini to describe the religious situation in Sicily as not much dissimilar to that
encountered in Crete. Returned to Christian rule in 961, the island was evangelized by itinerant preachers – i.e. Ioannes Xenos (St. John the Hermit) and Nikon the Metaneite. Philagathos would represent the same tradition of apostolate for southern Italy, in the footsteps of Luke, the Calabrian Greek bishop of Isola di Capo Rizzuto, who in the aftermath of the Norman conquest was ordaining priests, scouring the island of Sicily, preaching the Gospel and challenging the Latins on dogmatic issues. A generation later, however, the agenda of Philagathos’s ministry shifted from the re-Christianization of the kingdom towards the inner conversion of the faithful.

If Philagathos is to be regarded as an ascetic reformer, then he provides a striking contrast to the revolutionary spiritual movements from the contemporary West. This comparison is certainly of no surprise when we consider that Philagathos was a traditional Byzantine preacher, although peculiar in many ways as several scholars have noted. Patrick Henriet has argued that in the twelfth century Latin Christian preaching acquires a new dimension, shifting from a liturgical ritualized setting to becoming an ethical discourse. This is a time dominated by itinerant preachers – Wanderprediger – the new ‘apostles’ urging reform, in an effort to monasticize the world. Great emphasis is given to austerity of life, bodily mortification, seclusion, silence, poverty and manual labour, with a desire not only to imitate but even to replicate the life of Christ. The right and authority to preach was often self-proclaimed and commensurate with the mortifications endured. Leyser showed that the paradoxical trait of intervening in the world distinguished this eremitical movement from previous expressions of eremitism in the Christian ascetic tradition.

From this comparative perspective, Philagathos’s itinerant preaching cannot be portrayed as that of a Wanderprediger urging penitence. Instead his preaching was grounded in his religious training, conspicuously displayed in his sophisticated rhetorical compositions. There is no hint in his sermons at the type of revolutionary calls common in the Latin West of the period; no idealization of poverty or unrestrained condemnation of wealth; Philagathos’s persistent entreaties for poor relief describe him as an ethical thinker. Unlike Byzantine aristocratic social thinking, which foremost advised the lower classes to endure suffering patiently, thus remaining distant from the needs of the lower classes and from injustice, in Philagathos’s Homilies the emphasis is decidedly placed on acting to relieve the poor. This is the ideal commended by the great authorities of the Orthodox tradition, such as Basil, Gregory Nazianzen
or John Chrysostom, who considered serving the poor and the needy as among their primary duties. The ideal of Christian life for Philagathos incorporated both theoria and praxis, recommending to his listeners an ascetic life nourished by contemplation yet active in the world.

Noteworthy in Philagathos’s Homilies is the absence, or rather the discrete presence, of the Muslim or Latin Other, as negative identity markers, although the polemic character of the Homilies with regard to the great heresiarchs of Christianity or pagan authors has been emphasized, to the extent that they reveal previously unknown passages from Emperor Julian’s Contra Galileos (Κατὰ τῶν Γαλιλαίων). The lack of outward denunciations of Latin practices or dogmas stands in blatant contrast with other contemporary expressions of Greek spirituality in the kingdom of Sicily, such as for instance Neilos Doxapatres who wrote at Roger II’s special request a History of the Five Patriarchates, an open denunciation of the authority of Rome and of the Western Empire. The enduring popularity of Philagathos’ Homilies could be deduced from the fact that they encompassed all Christian society, kings, monks, ordinary lay people, men and women, thereby alienating no one, and above all, that they were considered particularly eloquent.

Their eloquence springs from skillful employment of rhetorical strategies, supported by his outstanding knowledge of Christian and, all the more remarkably, of classical and post-classical authors. If in the past Philagathos’ acquaintance with Heliodorus’s work was “certainly far from established,” now the erotic novel turns out to be instrumental for Philagathos’s exegesis. While it is true that Philagathos never refers to Heliodorus expressis verbis – as he does for instance with Plato, Homer and others – the Homilies attest, as Gaia Zaccagni has proved beyond doubt, that he was indeed familiar with the Aethiopica.

Among the homilies suspected of carrying the imprint of the Aethiopica is the sermon “On the Widow’s Son” (Περὶ τοῦ ὑμῶν τῆς χήρας), delivered at the monastery of San Salvatore of Messina after the death of the first cantor (Ἐλέξθη ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ μονῇ τοῦ Σωτῆρος Ἀκρωτηρίου ἀποθανόντος τοῦ πρωτοψάλτου). “On the Widow’s Son” is the only funerary oration (ἐπιτάφιος λόγος) that we have from Philagathos. One of his dearest fellow monks from the monastery of San Salvatore had died. Stefano Caruso explained that in all likelihood the first cantor recalled in this sermon is the monk Ciprian (Κυπριανὸς), mentioned in a document from 1141 as the first cantor, implying therefore, that this homily was delivered shortly after that year. Moreover, probably Ciprian was one of the twelve monks...
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from Rossano invited by Roger II a little before 1130 to inhabit the new μάνδρα, and must have been an old acquaintance with Philagathos, himself a monk from the monastery of Theotokos Odegetria of Rossano.46 Refering to this homily, Nunzio Bianchi47 remarked that “Colonna aveva notato, senza tuttavia poter addurre più precisi riscontri, che ‘la scena tratteggiata nell’Omilia VI, col. 225 ricorda molto da vicino, per le espressioni e il colorito stilistico il quadro di eccidio sanguinoso, con cui si apre il romanzo delle Etiopiche’.”48 If indeed the passage singled out by Colonna as the inspiration for the scene from col. 225 cannot easily be pinned down in Philagathos’s text, the same does not hold true for col. 228, which unambiguously corresponds to a passage from Aethiopica:

“On the Widow’s Son” is surely one of Philagathos’ greatest sermons. The audience was deeply touched by his oration and their eyes were full of tears.52 Although he is overwhelmed by woe, Philagathos did not hold back from employing a highly rhetorical style, and even in the elaborate prologue refers to the classics.53 His use of classical sources is not simply ornamental, but consistent with the argument followed, accomplishing a surprisingly consistent superposition of narrative and existential contexts.54 In Heliodorus’s novel Calasiris bemoans the supposed death of Chariklea and Theagenes, while in the sermon “On the Widow’s Son” Philagathos lamented the death of a friend.
The metaphor employed in the *Aethiopica*, for describing Calasiris’s woe is picturesque. He roams the battlefield, mourning and sorrowing, like a bird whose nest has been laid waste by a serpent that devours her young before her eyes. The bird is afraid to come near, yet cannot bear to desert them. She flies mournfully round the scene of her wretchedness, pouring in vain her motherly complaints into ears deaf to her wails. In his homily, Philagathos reforges this pictorial passage for his purpose of describing the misery and distress of the widow who lost her only son, employing the same image. The wretched mother, unleashing the beholders’ tears, remains powerless the face of death, not unlike a bird seeing a snake creeping after her young; she only hovers above, shrieking his approach, yet unable to protect the nest from the snake. The image conveyed by the two authors is striking, and the fact that neither metaphor appears, as far as can be ascertained, in any other patristic or Medieval Greek texts, deserves special mention here. Marie-José Mondzain, applying the patristic concept of economy to preaching cogently, describes the way in which persuasion is associated to conversion through poetic language and the appeal to emotions.\(^55\) This connection between rhetoric, oral discourse and persuasion is masterfully revealed in this sermon. The end that Philagathos achieves could be connected with the definition of *ekphrasis* as formulated in the rhetorical theory of Aphthonius or Hermogenes as a ‘descriptive speech bringing the thing shown vividly before the eyes.’\(^56\) Philagathos’ rhetoric aims to reach and influence his audience, and this sermon exemplifies how rhetoric conventions are connected to persuasion and emotions. His attitude towards the wisdom from outside (ἡ ἔξωθεν σοφία) is that advised by Basil of Caesarea,\(^57\) namely to make use of anything good that can be found in Greek culture for Christians’ edification.\(^58\)

Finally, if we are to follow Margaret Mullett’s\(^59\) argument that Byzantine literature in the twelfth century is under the sway of fiction, as revealed by the rediscovery of the novel in Comnenian Byzantium, then we could conclude that this text, and Philagathos’ *Homilies* in general, mirror the qualities of a literature in state of novelization, and demonstrate once again that the narrative experiments of the twelfth century were not confined to the learned elite of Constantinople.
NOTES


3 From the conspicuous bibliography surrounding the Interpretation of the Chaste Charikleia through the Voice of Philipp the Philosopher (Τῆς Χαρικλείας ἐρμήνευμα τῆς σωφρόνος ἐκ φωνῆς Φιλίππου τοῦ φιλόσοφου) I mention the final contribution by Nunzio Bianchi, II codice del romanzo. Tradizione manoscritta e ricezione dei romanzi greci, Bari 2006, pp. 7 – 75, who convincingly established the text and exhaustively reexamined the issues concerning the authorship through a thorough analysis of the Interpretation from the perspective of Philagathos’s Homilies, and confirmed beyond doubt that the Interpretation was indeed the work of Philagathos of Cerami.


The importance of the archimandrital structure of Italo-Greek monasticism has not been overlooked by modern scholars; among them, L. T. White, in *Latin Monasticism in Norman Sicily*, Cambridge 1938, pp. 45-46 argues that the foundation of the archimandritate of San Salvatore was a “desperate effort to check the dissolution of Count Roger I’s work of restoration” while Guglielmo Cavallo, *La cultura italo – greca* cit., p. 578, sees the restoration of Greek monasticism as part of the process of cultural legitimization required by the process of Norman state formation; cf. T. Minisci, *Riflessi studitani nel monachesimo italo-greco* cit., pp. 218-220, who considers that the foundation of the monasteries of Rossano, Messina, and Carbone echoed Stoudite reform because of their involvement in urban centers and society. Following the same line of argument, Agostino Pertusi in *Rapporti tra il monachesimo italo-greco ed il monachesimo bizantino nell’alto medioevo*, in *La chiesa greca in Italia dall’VIII al XVI secolo*. Atti del Convegno storico interecclesiale (Bari, 30 aprile-4 maggio 1969), Padova 1973, vol. II, pp. 473-520, explains the Italo-Greek cenobitic revival as the combination of political or juridical action by the Norman nobility and the renewed monastic consciousness of the Stoudite and Athonite cenobitic reforms already, at work in Sicily even before the arrival of the Normans; cfr. Idem, *Aspetti organizzativi e culturali* cit., pp. 408 – 410; Cfr. André Guillou, *Il monachesimo greco in Italia meridionale e in Sicilia nel medioevo* cit., pp. 367-8.

9 See Falkenhausen, *L’Archimandritato del S. Salvatore* cit., pp. 48 – 49, remarked that «per il felice avviamento dell’archimandritato furono particolarmente importanti gli ottimi rapporti tra il re normanno e l’archimandrita Luca, che sembra abbia avuto libero accesso al palazzo reale» and suggested that «sembra che Ruggero II volesse evitare che i due porti comunicanti dello Stretto fossero controllati dai baroni normanni, spesso inclini alla sedizione».


12 For the reorganization of the Sicilian Church during Anacletus II’s pontificate see G. Loud, *The Latin Church in Norman Sicily* cit., pp. 223 – 225; for Cefalù as the intended ideological centre of the kingdom see ibid., pp. 324 – 325.


16 Margaret Mullett, *Founders, refounders, second founders, patrons*, in *Founders and refounders of Byzantine monasteries*, ed. M. Mullet, Belfast 2007, pp. 3 – 4 is convinced that “we would now all agree that Byzantium has no Cluny or Cîteaux however much we might like to cast Stoudios or Evergetis in these roles”; this is the dominant view that informs the Belfast Evergetis Project; see for this: *The Theotokos Evergetis and Eleventh-century Monasticism* cit; *Work and Worship at the Theotokos Evergetis*, ed. eadem, Belfast 1997; *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis*, trans. Robert H. Jordan, Belfast 2000; cfr. *Founders and refounders of Byzantine monasteries* cit.

17 H.B. Workman, *The evolution of the monastic ideal, with a new forward by David Knowles*, Boston 1962, pictures Eastern monks as disorderly while Western monasticism is described as a pan-European order defined by rules and institutions; despite the institutionalization of monasticism during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, in Byzantium all types of monastic life remained available to the laity; the movement for the freedom of monasteries from lay control did not reach the scale of the Western reform movement, and lay monasteries continued to be a phenomenon throughout the remaining Byzantine centuries; cf. Peter Brown, *Society and the holy in Late Antiquity*, London 1982; see also Andrew Louth, *Greek East and Latin West* cit., p. 117, who observed that it is certainly important to realize that any tendencies towards “caesaropapism” in the East were often resisted by the power of the holy, represented in the monastic order; cf. P. McNulty and B. Hamilton, *Orientale lumen et magistra latinitatis*, in *Le millénaire du mont Athos*, 963 – 1963, Chevetogne 1964, vol. I, pp. 181 – 216.

18 For the relation between heresy and preaching see Roberto Rusconi, *Predicazione e vita religiosa nella società italiana (da Carlo Magno alla Controriforma)*, Torino 1981, pp. 79, 91 and 107; he indicates how laymen tempted to preach are finally tempered by the middle of the twelfth century;

For instance see *Hom. 27*, delivered in the chapel of the royal palace in Palermo; also *Hom. 50*, delivered in the cathedral of Palermo; for the date of this homily see Ernst Kitzinger, *The Date of Philagathos’ Homily for the Feast of Sts. Peter and Paul*, in *Byzantino-Sicula II. Miscellaneo di scritti in memoria di Giuseppe Rossi Taibbi*, Palermo 1975, pp. 301 - 306.

*Hom. 7. 16* (Rossi – Taibbi, p.51); *Hom. 14.4* (Rossi – Taibbi, p. 93).


Lavagnini, *Aspetti e problemi* cit., p. 629.


Cupane, *Filagato da Cerami* cit., p. 5 describes Philagathos as «una figura di monaco di tipo assolutamente nuovo, con orizzonti letterari non riscontrabili in nessuno dei suoi pur illustri predecessori e paragonabili soltanto a quelli dei maggiori eruditi costantinopolitani dell’epoca»; see also Cristian-Nicolae Gaspar, *Praising the Stylist in Southern Italy* cit., pp. 93 – 109, for
the peculiarity of Philagathos’s allegorical method; Gaşpar showed that Philagathos’s homily “For the Beginning of the Indiction and for Saint Symeon the Stylite” is so heavily constructed on the allegorical interpretation of the number seven that, in order to strengthen the presence of that number in the symbolism of the date he was discussing (the 1st of September), the author felt compelled to move the celebration of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus, who were never celebrated on that date by the Church.

29 Ibid., p. 150.
31 It is accepted that Byzantine writers did not pay formal attention to the question of reform and social thinking; Hans-Georg Beck, Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich, Munich 1959, p. 39, provocatively argues that “Christian instruction, sermon, and catechism were embedded in dogma without making dogma fertile. Moreover, [it] was stifled with classical rhetoric and ancient reminiscences. A homily containing a strong ethical impulse, as one would expect from John Chrysostom, is distant from this epoch; it is with the exception of a few barely investigated exceptions simply foreign to it.” Philagathos’ Homilies belong though to an earlier period than that analyzed by Beck, and clearly do not represent this trend.
33 See Hom. 21.1 (Rossi-Taibbi, p. 138): Μὴ κόμως καὶ μέθας καὶ χοροὶ ἀσέμνοις τὴν ἐορτὴν ἐνυφίεσαμεν, ἀλλὰ γαλύμοις καὶ ὕμνοις καὶ ἐλεημοσύνη πενήτων τὸν Θεὸν ἐξελεσσόμεθα.; Hom. 32. 16 (Rossi-Taibbi, p. 226), Καὶ ὡς μὲν Μάρθα τῷ σώματι τούτῳ ὑπηρετήσωμεν, περὶ τὴν τῶν πενήτων θεραπείαν ἐνασχολούμενοι, ὡς δὲ Μαρία παρὰ τούς ἀχράντους αὐτοῦ πόδας παρακαθίσσαμεν.; Hom. 21. 7 (Rossi-Taibbi, p. 140), Ἀδελφοὶ δὲ τοῦ Κυρίου γενώμεθα, ἐὰν τοὺς ἄδελφους αὐτοῦ ἐλεοῦσάν τοὺς πένητας: «Ἐφ’ ὅσον γὰρ, φησὶ, ἐποίησατε ἐν τοῖς τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν ἐλαχίστων ἐμοὶ ἐποίησατε».
34 For the philanthropic tradition in Byzantium see Timothy Miller, The Birth of the Hospital in the Byzantine Empire, Baltimore 1985.
35 See Hom. 32 (Rossi-Taibbi, pp. 221-226); however, Philagathos’s interplay between theoria and praxis is refined; for instance, in Hom. 24 (Rossi-Taibbi, pp. 156-161) he advocates more a life of pure contemplation.
36 To my knowledge three instances in the entire homiletic corpus refer to Muslims; Hom. 4. 23 (ed. Rossi-Taibbi, p.31), κράτινον τῇ ἱεργῇ σου τοὺς πιστοὺς ἤμων βασιλεῖς· ἐνίσχυσον αὐτοὺς κατὰ τῶν ἄθεων Ἱσμαηλιτῶν τῶν τήν
σὴν ἀθετούντων προσκύνησιν; Hom. 14. 11 (ed. Rossi-Taibbi, p. 96) ὁποίους ὀρῶμεν τοὺς ὀμόρους ἡμῖν ἀπογόνους τοῦ Ισμαήλ, οἱ δὲ θεμινός ἄλλας ἀντ’ ἄλλων γυναικὰς ἁμείβοντες, καθάπερ εἰς ὄχειαν γεγονότες δίκην τετράποδον, καὶ γαστρὶ καὶ τοῖς μετὰ γαστέρα πάθεσιν ὑποκύπτοντες, καὶ χῦνθι ταῖς ἱδοναῖς καλινδούμενοι, πρὸς τὸ ἐναγγελικὸν κήρυγμα μύουσι τὰ τοῦ νοὸς ἁσθητήρια.; Hom. 53. 90, (ed. Caruso, p. 127) καὶ κράτος αὐτοῦ ἔφες τέλος ἀνεπιβούλευτον καὶ συντρίψας τοὺς τῆς Ἀγαφ ὑπὸς ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ δίκην κόνεως, […]; two of these invocations are rather generic and probably were prompted by political unrest; for the political context underlying Hom. 4.23 (ed. Rossi-Taibbi, p.31) and for its dating see Caruso, Note di cronologia filagateau cit., pp. 201 – 204; Caruso’s assessment is certainly overstated when he claims that in Philagathos’s Homilies one can notice “una profonda ostilità, per non dire repugnanza, di sapore addirittura razzista” towards Muslims (Caruso, Note di cronologia cit., 211); for a persuasive analysis of Christian-Muslim relations in Norman Sicily, see Alex Metcalfe, Muslims and Christians in Norman Sicily. Arabic Speakers and the End of Islam, London 2003.

There are no direct polemical references to Latin Christianity; however, an allusive argument can be glimpsed that dismantles the tenets of Latin ecclesiology, but these are not openly named in the Hom. 27. 16-19 (ed. Rossi-Taibbi, pp. 179 – 80), Eις τὸ «Τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ἀνθρωποὶ εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ άνθρωποῦ;» Ἐλεύσθη τῷ ναῷ τοῦ παλατίου Πανορμοῦ τῇ ἐφορτὶ τῶν ἄγιων Αποστόλων –; Philagathos maintains that the keys of the heavenly kingdom are not given solely to Peter but to every apostle, thus denying papal primacy. This is all the more noteworthy if we bear in mind that this homily was delivered in front of king Roger. In Hom. 28. 15-16 (ed. Rossi-Taibbi, pp. 187-188) Philagathos presents the Orthodox doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone, without mentioning the Latin filioque doctrine as a negative marker.


Rizzuto lingers on polemical aspects such as leavened and unleavened bread and on other unnamed dogmatic issues. The debates were fierce and the story says that after a disputation with Luke, some Latins decided to burn him at the stake, and accordingly built a hut which they forced the Saint to enter. They set the hut on fire, but nevertheless the saint remained unharmed (Vita di S. Luca da Isola, ed. Giuseppe Schirò, Palermo, 1954, pp. 106 – 108, 120 – 22); a twelfth-century life of Bartholomew of Simeri is silent of any polemical underpinnings; it has been suggested, not entirely convincing, that Philagathos was the author of this life: Gaia Zaccagni, Il bios di san Bartolomeo da Simeri (BHG 235), «Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici» n.s. 33, 1996, pp. 193 – 228; eadem, Considerazioni sulla paternità del Bios di san Bartolomeo da Simeri, in Liturgia e Agiografia tra Roma e Costantinopoli. Atti del I e II Seminario di Studio. Roma-Grottaferrata 2000-2001, ed. K. Stantchev and S. Parenti, Grottaferrata 2007, pp. 33- 44; for Latin-Greek relations in South Italy see G. Loud, The Latin church in Norman Italy cit., pp. 500-502, who upholds the general picture of a relative tolerance between Greek and Latins, yet erroneously maintains that the dispute between Bartholomew of Simeri and two monks from the monastery of Militino, recorded in the life of the saint, is a veiled polemic between two envious Benedictine monks and the Greek abbot, Bartholomew, favored by the king. For a proper assessment of the episode see Dominico Minuto, S. Angelo di Militino e non S. Angelo di Mileto nel Bios di san Bartolomeo, «Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici», 1998, pp. 45-46; for the political meaning of Neilos’s treaty see Salvatore Tramontana, in La monarchia normanna e sveva, in Storia d’Italia, ed. G. Galasso, Turin 1986, p. 609.

See Hom. 17.2 (Rossi – Taibbi, p. 111), which refers to the poor present at the religious feast: ἐτερος τὸν προς τοὺς πένητας ἔλεον (πάρεστι γάρ, ὡς ὀράτε, πενομένων ἐνταῦθα πληθύς), καὶ ἄλλος ἄλλο τι προσενέγκωμεν, καὶ κενός ὁφθήτω μηδείς; in Hom. 21. 4 (Rossi – Taibbi, p. 153) counsels the nobles to be less contemptuous towards the low born: Συστέλει δὲ σοι καὶ διὰ τούτων τὸ φύσημα, ἵν, εἰπερ εὐπάτριδες τυγχάνεις καὶ εὐγενής τὸν πηλόν τού σώματος, μὴ μεγάλην ὑφρύν κατα τῶν δυσεγενῶν ἀνάσας, ὀρών τὸν Δεσπότην ἐκ γενεαλογούμενων; in Hom. 37 Philagathos gave advice to the parents present there to raise their daughters in obedience to fatherly will, imitating the submission of Jephthah’s daughter (Gaia Zaccagni, La páρεγρος ἀφήγησις in Filagato da Cerami: una particolare tecnica narrativa, «Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici» n.s. 35, 1998, p. 53).

The stylistic features of Philagathos’s prose and his sources are addressed by several scholars: see the contribution of Carolina Cupane, Filagato da Cerami; Nunzio Bianchi, Tempesta nello stretto ovvero Filagato da Cerami lettore di Alcifrone, «Bollettino dei Classici» s.III, 26, 2005, pp. 91 – 97; idem, Il codice del romanzo cit., pp.22 - 48; Zaccagni, La páρεγρος ἀφήγησις cit., pp. 47 – 65; M.L. Fobelli, L’ekphrasis di Filagato di Filagato da Cerami


43 Zaccagni, La πάρεργος ἀφήγησις cit., 60 – 65.

44 Hom. 6 (ed. Rossi-Taibbi, p.37 – 44).


For Philagathos’s acknowledgment of the worth of Greek wisdom, while upholding the superiority of Christian culture, see: Hom. 24, PG vol. 132, col. 497A and Hom. 5.3 (ed. Rossi-Taibbi, 32-33). See also Hom. 40.3 (ed. Zaccagni, 144): καίτοι καὶ ἡ ἐξωθεν φιλοσοφία πάντων φησίν ἄδικώτατον τὸ μὴ ὄντα δοκεῖν (“even the pagan philosophy says that the most unjust thing of all is [for something] to appear as not it is”); elsewhere, Hom. 14.8 (ed. Rossi-Taibbi, 95), a distinction is drawn between “true wisdom” (i.e. Christian knowledge, in Philagathos’ understanding), ἡ ἀληθής σοφία, and “Greek wisdom” ἡ Ἐλληνική σοφία and in Hom. 12.5 (ed. Rossi-Taibbi, 79), “pagan” philosophy is called ἡ ἐξωθεν φιλοσοφία (“the philosophy from outside” as differentiated from “our philosophy,” i.e., Christian philosophy); see also: Agostino Pertusi, Aspetti organizzativi e culturali cit., p. 409, who argued that the Italo-Greek monks followed Basil’s advise not to disregard worldly literature. This claim is supported by the fact that the typicon of the monastery of San Salvatore in Messina mentioned the existence of such literature within the monastery. For this, see T. Minisci, I Typikà liturgici dell’Italia bizantina, «Bollettino della Badia greca di Grottaferrata» 7 (1953), 103; The typikon of San Salvatore was also analyzed by M. Scaduto, Il monachesimo basiliano cit., 196-213;

Margaret Mullett, Novelisation in Byzantium: Narrative after the Revival of Fiction in Byzantine Narrative: Papers in Honour of Roger Scott (Byzantina Australiensia, 16) ed. John Burke et al., Melbourne 2006, pp. 1-28, drawing on Bakhtin’s concept of “novelisation” the author discusses the great influence that the novel exerted upon Byzantine literature in the twelfth century and in what way it carried the stamp of novelistic narrative; Philagathos’s Homilies can be termed novelistic as they share prominent features of the novel: persuasiveness, vividness, keen descriptions of heroes and heroines, etymology, puns, a keen ear for pronunciation, integration of biographical narrative, and even contain passages from the novel adjusted to contextual needs.