

THE EIGHTH HOMERIC HYMN AND PROCLUS

It is universally recognized that the Hymn to Ares stands apart from all the other poems in the Homeric collection, and that it was composed centuries later than any of those that can be assigned to a particular period with any degree of confidence. Many older scholars classed it or even printed it with the Orphic Hymns, which are transmitted together with the Homeric Hymns as well as with the hymns of Callimachus and Proclus. But the similarity with the Orphic Hymns is only superficial. It merely consists in the stylistic feature of accumulated epithets, a common characteristic of late hymns. There are three reasons for not lumping the Hymn to Ares with the very homogeneous Orphic series. First, the Orphic Hymns are courteous invocations of different gods to come to a ceremony described as *τελετή* or *τελεταί*, while the Hymn to Ares is an intensely personal prayer for the poet's own soul. Secondly, the Orphic collection already contains a hymn to Ares (65), and duplications are avoided. (There are a number of hymns, to Dionysus, but then he bears a different title in each case, *Liknites*, *Trieterikos*, etc.) Thirdly, in the Homeric hymn Ares is addressed as a planetary god. In the Orphic hymn to Ares, this aspect is totally absent, and the same is true of the hymns to Hermes, Aphrodite, Zeus, and Kronos.

All the same, an accident of transmission does seem the only likely explanation of the presence of the hymn in the Homeric collection. Our collection must descend from the one that was in circulation in late Hellenistic times as 'the hymns of Homer'. (See Allen-Halliday, pp. lxvii f.) It is improbable on grounds of style and content that the Hymn to Ares existed so early, let alone got itself adopted as a work of Homer. Nor is it probable that it could have somehow slipped in from the big world at a later period. The hymns of Homer should by that time have been no more subject to additions than those of Callimachus.

In that case, the Hymn to Ares ought to come from one of the other hymn collections transmitted with the Homeric Hymns. It is not Callimachean, it does not belong with the Orphic Hymns. That leaves Proclus.

A number of parallels with the hymns of Proclus have been noticed, and it has sometimes been assumed that the hymn was influenced by Proclus or influenced him. I do not know of anyone who has proposed that it is by him. But I shall show that the parallels of thought and language are more extensive than has been realized, and that the hymn is so like Proclus in technique that its ascription to him is not only a possibility but something more.

First some general comparisons. Proclus' hymns, like the Hymn to Ares, are personal, not cultic. He prays for the deliverance of his own soul from the evils that threaten it (1. 40-1, 3. 15, 4. 11, 5. 14, 6. 6, 7. 33). Except in the sixth hymn, there is a regular pattern by which the first part of the hymn is devoted to predication of powers and functions (listed epithets in 1. 33-4, 6. 1-3, 7. 3-4, 40), or references to myth, and the second part to prayers. The transition occurs near the middle in hymn 3, before the middle in 4 and 5, a little after it in 1, 2, and 7. The Hymn to Ares shows the same structure, with the transition in

the middle. Metrically, no distinction can be established between it and the other seven. All are Nonnus-like without being as strict as Nonnus.

The most striking parallels are:

Ares 1-3 Ἄρες ὑπερμένετα, βρισάρματε, χρυσεοπήληξ,
ὄβριμόθυμε, φέρασπι, πολισσόε, χαλκοκορυστά,
καρτερόχειρ, ἀμόγητε, δορυσθενές

Procl. 7. 3-4 ἄρσενόθυμε, φέρασπι, μεγασθενές, ὄβριμοπάτρη,
Παλλὰς Τριτογένεια, δορυσσόε, χρυσεοπήληξ

Common to both are the elements χρυσεοπήληξ, ὄβριμο-, -όθυμε φέρασπι, -σόε, δορυ-, and -σθενές.

Ares 6-8 πυραυγέα κύκλον ἐλίσσων
αἰθέρος ἐπταπόροις ἐνὶ τεύρεσιν, ἔνθα σε πῶλοι
ζαφλεγέες τριτάτης ὑπὲρ ἄντυγος αἰὲν ἔχουσι

Procl. 2. 15-17 ἔνθα σέ φασι
ψυχὴν ἀενάοιο πέλειν κόσμοιο θεείν,
εἶτε καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ κύκλων ὑπὲρ ἄντυγας αἰθέρι ναίεις.

ἐπταπόρος was known to Proclus from the Chaldaean Oracles (p. 63 Kroll).

Now for the more detailed comparison. I shall take the Hymn to Ares line by line, noting Proclan parallels (a few from his prose writings) underneath. An asterisk marks words and phrases occurring in the same metrical position as in the Hymn to Ares. Many of the parallels listed are of no individual significance; but in the mass they will show how extensively the diction of the Hymn agrees with that of Proclus. *Ares* 1-3: see above. The seven surviving hymns of Proclus all begin with κλυθι/κλυτε/χαῖρε or ὑμνέομεν. But only in two cases could the god's name have been put in the initial position. Here Ἄρες suggests itself as an opening, and κλυθι follows in line 9.

4 Νίκης εὐπολέμοιο πάτερ, συναρωγὲ Θέμιστος,

Filial relationships are referred to in Procl. 2. 2-3, 3. 2, 6. 1, 7. 1-2.

5 ἀντιβίοισι τύραννε, δικαιοτάτων ἀγέ φωτῶν,

7. 50 κάρτος ἐπ' ἀντιβίοισι. In *Tim.* i. 34. 22 D. τῇ Ἀρείκῃ τάξει τῇ πρυτανευούσῃ πάσας τοῦ κόσμου τὰς ἐναντιώσεις καὶ τὴν ἐτερότητα τοῦ παντός. — 2. 20 *δικαιοτάτοιςι βελέμοις (again superlative as a metrically useful equivalent for the positive). ἀγός was known to Proclus from the Chaldaean Oracles (*in Remph.* ii. 296. 10 K.), and interpreted by him as connected with Ares.

6-8: see above. Additional parallels: πυραυγέα κύκλον ~ 1. 6 ἐριφεγγέα κύκλον; in *Tim.* ii. 48. 23 ὁ μὲν Ἄρης πῦρ οὐράνιον. ἐλίσσων . . . ἐπταπόροις ~ 1. 48 μοιριδίοισιν ἐλιξοπόροιςιν ἀτράκτοις (= the planetary circles); αἰθέρος . . . ὑπὲρ ἄντυγος ~ 1. 5 ὑπὲρ αἰθέρος ἔδρην (cf. E. Pfeiffer, *Studien zum antiken Sternglauben*, 110); αἰὲν ἔχουσι ~ 3. 17 *αἰὲν ἔχουσιν, 4. 9 αἰὲν ἔχοι.

9 κλυθι βροτῶν ἐπίκουρε, δοτὴρ εὐθαρσέος ἡβης,

1. 2 *κλυθι φάους ταμία, 4. 5 *κλυτε σαωτήρες μεγάλοι; κλυθι or κλυτε also 1. 1, 5; 2. 19; 4. 1, 14; 7. 1, 31, 51.

10 πρὸ καταστίλβων σέλας ὑψόθεν ἐς βιόγητα
ἡμετέρην

1. 38 *πρηγῶν (in a prayer). 1. 8-10 ζωσάμενοι δὲ πλάνητες αἰθαλέας σέο πύρρους . . . ζωογόνους πέμπουσιν ἐπιχθονίους ραθάμιγγας. Prayers for spiritual

light: 1. 40, 4. 6, 7. 33, 1. 4 ὑπόθεν ἁρμονίης ρύμα πλούσιον ἐξοχετεύων. 6. 4 τεύχετε δ' αἰγλήσσαν ἐμοῦ βιότοιο πορείην. 7. 37 εἰ δέ τις ἀμπλακίη με κακῇ βιότοιο δαμάξει. 47 δὸς βιότῳ πλώοντι. 5. 12 ἡμετέρην = 'my'. (Cf. Keydell, *Nonni Panop. Dionysiaca*, i. 55*.)

11

καὶ κάρτος ἀρήιον, ὥς κε δυναίμην

7. 50 (δὸς) κάρτος ἐπ' ἀντιβίοισι. 4. 7 (νεύσατ') ὄφρα κεν εὖ γνοίην. Similar use of optative in 1. 32.

12

σεύασθαι κακότητα πικρὴν ἀπ' ἐμεῖο καρήνου,

6. 5-6 κακὰς δ' ἀπελαύνετε νούσους ἐκ ρεθέων. 7. 44 ἀπέλαυε *πικρῶν ἀγέλασματα νούσων, 46 παῦσον ὄλην *κακότητα. 3. 10 καὶ ἐμεῖο πολυπτοίητον ἐρωὴν (σέο, σέο for σός 1. 8, 27; 2. 20; 7. 22, 25, 33, 45). 7. 16 *κάρηνα.

13

καὶ ψυχῆς ἀπατηλὸν ὑπογνάμψαι φρενὸς ὁρμήν,

Prayers for purity 1. 35, 40 f., 2. 19 f., 3. 10 ff., 5. 14, 6. 6, 7. 33 ff.; talk of the soul also 1. 29, 2. 5, 4. 11, etc. 3. 10 ἐμεῖο πολυπτοίητον ἐρωὴν παύσατε. ἀπατηλὸν ~ 3. 12 μηδέ μ' ἀποπλάγξειεν ἀδεισιθέων γένος ἀνδρῶν. 7. 25 *φρένας.

14

θυμοῦ τ' αὐ μένος δὲ κατισχέμεν ὅς μ' ἐρέθησι

In *Tim.* i. 148. 3 ὁ δὲ θυμὸς Ἀρεϊκός, 163. 6 ἐκάστη τοῦ τόπου μερὶς ὑποδέχεται ψυχὰς τὰς αὐτῇ προσφόρους, ἡ μὲν Ἀρεϊκὴ τὰς θυμοειδεστέρας κτλ. Cf. 79. 9, iii. 69. 21, 355. 14. 1. 25 ὕλης *δ' αὐ. 7. 34 μένος δ' ἔμπνευσον ἔρωτι . . . 38 πολλαῖσιν ἐρίχθουμαι ἄλλοθεν ἄλλαις πρήξεσιν οὐχ ὅσαις, τὰς ἥλιτον ἄφρονι θυμῷ.

15

φυλόπιδος κρυερῆς ἐπιβαίνεμεν· ἀλλὰ σὺ θάρσος

δὸς μάκαρ,

2. 21 οὐχ ὁσίων παύουσα πόθων κρυόεσσαν ἐρωὴν. 4. 10 κρυερῆς γενέθλης, 12 Πουή τις *κρυόεσσα. 1. 43 εὐκλείης τ' ἐπίβησον ἐμέ. 33 ἀλλὰ θεῶν ὤριστε. 2. 14 ἀλλὰ θεά. 3. 10 ἀλλὰ θεαί. 4. 13 ἀλλὰ θεοί. 5. 12 ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμετέρην ὑποδέχυντο πότνα θυγλήν. 1. 46 δὸς ἀναξ. 7. 32 f. *δὸς δέ μοι ὄλβιον ὄρμον . . . *δὸς ψυχῇ φάος ἀγνόν.

16

εἰρήνης τε μένειν ἐν ἀπήμοσι θεσμοῖς

1. 23 ἁρμονίης παναπήμονος. 7. 43 καὶ *ἀπήμον' ὕγείν. 1. 43 προγόνων τ' ἐνὶ *θεσμοῖς Μουσάων . . . δώροισι μελοῖμην. 12 Ὁράων κατὰ θεσμόν.

17

δυσμενέων προφυγόντα μόθον κῆράς τε βιαίους.

5. 15 (also last line of hymn) γηγενέος *προφυγοῦσαν ὀλοῖον οἶστρον ἐρωῆς.

So much for style and diction. On the question of the hymn's historical appropriateness to Proclus, I applied to Mr. Alan Cameron. I quote from his reply: 'If Hom. *h.* viii had been transmitted as Procl. *h.* viii, I would certainly have accepted it as authentic without question. What is so striking in Hom. *h.* viii is the feeling of personal weakness and sinfulness that so characterise Proclus' hymns.' He goes on to refer to ἀντιβίοισι at Procl. 7. 50 paralleling *Ares* 17, pointing out that Proclus had his enemies, particularly the Christians; Marinus (*Vita Procli* 15, cf. 19) tells of clashes with the authorities, which on one occasion made it necessary for Proclus to depart to Lycia for a year. 'Most interesting of all, however', Mr. Cameron continues, 'is the dual aspect of the prayer (in the Homeric hymn): dispel weakness on the one hand, but keep me from strife on the other. Not only does this suit Proclus' position very well, it is a position of many late Neoplatonists, whether revealed in their writings or in their acts. There is an interesting parallel in Simplicius' commentary on Epictetus' *Enchiridion*, pp. 65-66 ed. Dübner, which I think alludes

to Justinian's closing of the Academy in 529. S's theme is that philosophers should on the one hand not knuckle under and lose their self-respect, while on the other not provoke the authorities by untimely *παρηγορία*, i.e., like Hom. *h.* viii 16-17, steer a middle course, *δυσμενέων προφύγοντα μόθον*.⁷

If the hymn had been transmitted under the name of Proclus, I think that not only Mr. Cameron but everyone else would have accepted it as Proclus' without ever calling its authenticity in question. Let us return to this matter of the transmission. It will be allowed in principle that an accident of the sort I postulate is a possibility. But a more definite hypothesis ought to be offered.

The manuscripts of the Homeric Hymns may be grouped as follows:

1. M, written not long before or after 1300, is the only manuscript to antedate the fifteenth century, with one disputed exception (Pfeiffer, *Callimachus*, ii, p. lvii). It contains the end of hymn 1 followed by hymns 2-18. 4 (with 10 and 11 transposed); none of the others contains any part of hymns 1-2. It does not contain Proclus.
2. The main tradition is represented by twenty-four manuscripts containing hymns 3-33 (or a portion of this series); they fall into three classes, *f*, *p*, and *x*. Seventeen of the twenty-four contain Proclus, and in twelve of these (ten *p*, two *x*), Proclus immediately precedes the Homeric Hymns. This was presumably the situation in *Ψ*, the twelfth/thirteenth-century common archetype for the Callimachean, Orphic, and Proclan Hymns. (*f*, *p*, and *x* correspond to *h*, *φ*, and *θ* in Orpheus, *O*, *α*, and *δ* in Proclus, *α*, *β*, and *ε* in Callimachus.
3. A recension called *z* is represented by three manuscripts which contain hymns 8-18 followed by part of 3. They thus have the Hymn to Ares in first place. One of them contains Proclus (without heading, as in *x*), following the Homeric and Orphic Hymns.

The order of hymns in the ancient collection seems to have been based on a simple principle: long hymns first, the short ones at the end. As things are, the position of the relatively long Hymn to Pan (19) is anomalous. If 19-33 once followed after 7, the anomaly would vanish; the 48-line Hymn to Pan would follow the 59-line Hymn to Dionysus.

The following hypotheses may be suggested. The original order was 1-7, 19-33, 9-18. A medieval copy fell gradually to bits. First the leading quires, containing 1-2, came away, and were lost to the main tradition descending through *Ψ*. The other sections that became separated contained 3-7, 19-33, and 9-18. On the assumption of twenty to twenty-two verses to the page and a two-line space for each heading, this could represent forty-eight, six, and two leaves respectively, i.e. six whole quires and a seventh from which the two last leaves became detached.

These two leaves were the first to go. They were not lost, but tucked away elsewhere, probably in another book. Later on, the rest of the quire came away. A collector of hymns, such as produced *Ψ*, then copied, in the order in which he came upon them, Hom. 3-7, Procl. 1-8, Hom. 9-18, 19-33. In a second copy, Proclus was removed and put at the front, but Procl. 8 was inadvertently left behind to become Hom. 8. This was the order in *Ψ*, reflected in the main families *f*, *p*, and *x*.

It must have been the conventional order at the time when M was copied, a century or so later than *Ψ*. This was a period when old manuscripts were

being rediscovered; and the scribe of M, or a predecessor, found a damaged book that contained hymn 1 (or part of it; cf. Allen-Halliday, p. xx), 2, and a good number of the rest with a text that differed somewhat from Ψ (which indicates that it was not identical with the disintegrating copy I have described above). He copied it, but also used a Ψ manuscript, and followed the latter's order of hymns, thus including the Hymn to Ares. He stopped copying before the end of 18.

The status of z may best be judged from that representative of it which also contains Proclus and the Orphic Hymns, namely Harleianus 1752. In those collections too it represents an eccentric recension, having Orph. 15-17, 36, 34, 66, 46, 32, 37, 7-9, 86 (with omissions), followed by Procl. 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, 7. Keydell (*GGA* 1942, 77 ff.) showed that this recension was due to Georgios Gemistos, known as Plethon (c. 1355-1451). In one of the Orphic Hymns it preserves four true readings independently of Ψ (*CQ* n.s. xviii (1968), 291 n. 2). Quandt (p. 20*) points out that in the Homeric Hymns it is most closely related to f , and that f , alone of the hyparchetypes, has a descendant that was copied in the east. f and z , therefore, are the two sources most likely to preserve traces of something separate from the main Ψ tradition. Assume that Plethon, possessing a copy descended from the disintegrating manuscript at the stage when it contained hymns 3-7, 19-33, acquired an ordinary Ψ manuscript, and decided to copy what was in the second and not the first, namely 8-18; then he began on 3. Then you have a precise explanation of the order of hymns in z , and one that ties in neatly with the development assumed to account for the order in Ψ .

University College, Oxford

M. L. WEST