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Abstract

The present research concerns some hymns attributed to Gregory Nazianzen: carm.1.1.29-1.1.38 and 2.1.38 (M.37. cols 507-22 and 1325-29). The primary aim in the examination of these poems is to see their position in the Greek and early Christian hymnographical tradition. To fulfil this in the best possible way it seemed necessary to spend the first part of the Introduction on surveying very briefly: a) the definition of the term ὄνομα as this is used in Greek literature and the various types of Greek pagan hymns, b) the extant examples of them in a chronological order with particular emphasis on the hexameter hymns, and c) the form and content of these hymns. To these I have added a very brief history of the extant early Christian hymns, placing particular emphasis on hymns written in quantitative metres.

The second part of the Introduction is spent on general observations with regard to the language, style, content and metre of the hymns under discussion, in order to give the reader a general view of these hymns as a group and allow him to see the degree of the poet's conformity to traditional Greek practice, particularly with regard to his usage of the hexameter.

The text of the hymns in the form it appears in the Migne edition is unreliable in a number of cases, and so I decided to attempt to produce a critical edition based on the extant MSS.

The main body of the research consists of a commentary on these hymns since I considered a commentary to be the best way to analyse these poems and show their place in the literary genre to which they belong.

Since the authenticity of some of these hymns is disputed, I place particular emphasis in the commentary on parallel expressions and ideas from genuine Gregorian works in order to support their authenticity.
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I. Introduction

I.1 Brief Account on Gregorian Studies

Of the vast number of Gregorian poems (amounting to about 18,000 lines) I have chosen only eleven short poems (281 lines in all). These poems (although not all edited together in the Migne edition) may form a group since they are the only poems of the Gregorian poetic corpus to have been written in the form of a hymn as this is defined and described below (p. 16 and 21ff. respectively).

Among the innumerable prayers and supplications to Christ (included in Gregory's 'autobiographical' poetry: M.37. 968-1452) there are some which appear to contain some features commonly found in hymns: carm.2.1.3 (1020f.) and the first twelve lines of carm.2.1.22. 1-12 (1281) which seem to form themselves a poem separate from the rest of 2.1.22. On grounds of the similarity in subject of these poems with 1.1.36, they are discussed below pp.188ff. where I give the reasons which led me to exclude them from the scope of the present research (see below p.162).

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century there was a


2. Apart from the internal evidence and the fact that Cosmas of Jerusalem gives a paraphrase of only lines 1-12 (see below p.196) this may be inferred also from the fact that in many MSS the two parts appear as two distinct poems: Vaticanus Chisianus gr.16 (s.xiv), Florent.Riccard.64 (K.I.5)(s.xiv) and Vaticanus gr.482 (s.xiv), while Vat.gr.497 (s.xiii) contains only lines 1-12 (this information is collected from the brief descriptions of these MSS in the various catalogues). This has been noticed also by the annotator in the Migne edition (M.37.1281).
flourishing interest (shown by scholars of different disciplines and for various reasons—usually other than the literary) in Gregorian studies in the form of general works on Gregory's poetry as a whole, or on its major sections (didactic/dogmatic, autobiographical/historical, moral poems). This resulted mainly from the fact that a critical edition of this poetry, though constantly expected, had not appeared.

In recent years Gregorian studies have revived, and a number of works (primarily editions with a commentary) on individual poems (or groups of them) have been published.

However, no systematic research has been undertaken on these hymns as a group, apart from some articles dealing either with individual hymns (to which reference is made in the appropriate place), or with all of them, but not in depth and so they contribute little to our understanding of these hymns.

---


2. On this see below p. 63.


My primary aim in examining this particular group of hymns is to see their place in the History of Greek hymnography (pagan and early Christian).
I.2.a) Definition of the Term "Ὑμνος and Types of it

When we are confronted with the word 'hymn' today, we immediately think of a sacred lyric or song in honour of God. However, Ὕμνος, from which this word derives, did not always carry with it a similar connotation: so many are the uses of the word Ὕμνος throughout Greek literature.

Originally, Ὕμνος did not have a strictly religious sense, but meant merely a 'lay' (see Od.8.429: (δίπλα) ἐκ τῆς τερπηταί καὶ ἄουδης Ὕμνον ἀκούων which refers to the performance of Demodocus who, accompanied by the phorminx, sang at a feast of the Wooden Horse of Troy). Later, from the occurrence of such phrases as ἐς τὸ δό σ᾽ Ὕμνον (Hom. Hymn. Apoll. 19; cf. ib. 207) in poems narrating some incident in the life of a god or hero, Ὕμνος acquired by association its more specific meaning of a song in praise of a god.

The first literary hymns were written in hexameters, the metre of epic poetry, and were recited in competitions to the accompaniment of kithara by bards or rhapsodes at games (Ὑμνος), or at a god's festival. Prizes were awarded. Examples of such hymns seem to be the

2. The etymology of the word Ὕμνος is uncertain. For various suggestions see RE s.v. Hymnos cols 140-42.
5. This is implied from Hesiod. Oper. 654-57, where Hesiod relates how, with a Ὕμνος, he won a tripod at the games in honour of Amphidamas; and from Hesiod's dubious fr. 357 (ed. Merklebach-West p. 176). See also Allen-Halliday-Sikes, p. lxxxviiif.
longer hymns of the Homeric Collection, which are unanimously dated during the last stage of the epic period. Hexameter hymns could also be used by rhapsodes as preludes (προοίμια) to a recital of epic poetry. The hymns referred to a deity in whose honour the bard was about to recite the rhapsody, or for whom the festival was being held. Most of the short Homeric hymns seem to fall into this category. In them we find expressions such as ἐκ σέο δ' ἀρξάμενος κλήσις μερότων γένος ἄνδραν/ ἡμεθένων ὄν ἔργα θεοὶ ἀνηρτοῦν ἑδείξαν (Hom. hymn. 31.18-19; cf. hymn. 32.18-19). These hymns (with the exception of hymns 8, 19, 31 and 32 which are even later) are dated at the end of the genuine epic period.¹

In the course of time and as new forms of art appeared, the hexameter hymn lost its dignity and importance and was replaced by different forms of melos, so that the meaning of ὕμνος was restricted to a melic religious song in praise of any god.² Lyric hymns embrace all sorts of address to the gods. Alexandrian scholars attempted to classify lyric poetry in general and hymns in particular. However, more recently such attempt has been severely - and convincingly - criticized as based on artificial distinctions and not on real differences of technique in the compositions themselves.³ According to the Alexandrian classification lyric hymns include: ὕμνος, προοίμιος, παλίν, ὀλέθραμβος, νόμος, ἀνδρικός, ἵβακχος, and ὕπορχημα.⁴

The classification of lyric poetry by the Alexandrians was later

---

1. See Allen-Halliday-Sikes, pp.xciii-xcv, where a discussion on the two usages of Homeric hymns (i.e. as distinct hymns, or as preludes to rhapsodic recitals) and p.cix for the dating of the long and short Homeric hymns. Besides, it is worthwhile to mention here the remark made by J.Edgar, op.cit., p.17 that some of the short Homeric hymns could have been used also as closing hymns in the rhapsodic recitals.


taken over by later authors — notably by Proclus — who used ὅμνος in its generic sense to mean all types of melic (ὡς εἶδον πρὸς γένος).

A different classification of lyric hymns (according to the particular god they are addressed to) is that whereby ὅμνος is said to have been sung in honour of Zeus, whereas paeans and dithyrambs were offered to Apollo and Dionysus.

Furthermore, the passage from Didymus (referred to in n.1) goes on to regard ὅμνος as a species of lyric poetry distinguished from the rest by the fact that it was sung to the accompaniment of kithara. The same distinction (according to the accompanying musical instrument) is made also by Proclus (Chrest. ap. Photius Biblioth. 320a 18-20, ed. Henry, BL, vol.v, p.159f.) between what he calls ὅ ὁμνῶς ὅμνος' and the other forms of melic. Harvey (art.cit., p.166f.) has made an attempt to determine the form, content and performance of this type of hymn on the basis of a number of passages, mainly taken from Plato. However, such an attempt can only create more difficulties, since the information we get from the ancient sources is not only contradictory in itself, but also insufficient and ambiguous.

Another way of classifying hymns is to divide them according to their content and structure. This way was followed by Menander the Rhetor in his treatise on epideictic oratory. He uses ὅμνος (the praise of a god: see 331.20 ed. Russell - Wilson) in its generic sense and divides it into eight species: 1) καλλικός (celtic), 2) ἀξιοπεμπτικός (apopemptic), 3) φυσικός (scientific), 4) μυθικός (mythical), 5) γενεαλογικός (genealogical), 6) εκλαυμένος (fictitious), 7) εὐκτικός (precatory) and 8) ἀκευκτικός (deprecatory): 333.1-344.14

Menander admits the existence also of a mixed-hymn which may contain two or more of these types (343.27-344.4). His scheme is actually a conflation of: a) two opposing pairs (hymns calling on god and saying farewell (1,2) and hymns praying for good and seeking to avert evil (7,8)), and b) a group of four types based on the content (3-6). More precisely, the scientific hymns (3) are those of the physicists and philosophers in which the nature of the god is seen and analysed as a natural force (e.g. Apollo as the sun and Hera as the wind: 337.2-4). The mythical hymns (4) deal with the mythology of the god, while the genealogical ones (5) - which are in real terms a subdivision of the former hymns - deal with the divine birth, e.g. of Hermes mentioned in a hymn by Alcaeus (cf. Alcaeus fr.308 (b) ed. Lobel-Page PLF: 340.15. Finally, the fictitious hymns (6) refer to abstract nouns: e.g. Διός, Φάδος, Χρυσός, Πνεῦμα for which a mythology is invented by the hymn-writer.

From the above it appears that Menander's classification (partly based on the content of the hymns (3-6) and partly on their structure and purpose (1,2,7,8) is no less inadequate than the classifications mentioned above and that therefore the employment of Menander's terminology would be misleading, even if this is followed by some scholars ¹.

All the above illustrate the distortions of over-systematization by late grammarians and show that Πνεῦμα in antiquity was a somewhat protean conception and could be used in a broader or a narrower sense; and yet it always had the basic sense of a sacred composition.

I.2.b) Brief History of Greek Pagan Hymnography

We now pass on to give a brief account of most of the extant Greek pagan hymns, with emphasis on the hexameter ones.

First comes the collection of Homeric Hymns\(^1\). As has been said above the long Homeric hymns differ from the short ones, not only in the date of composition, but also in the purpose and place of performance. Both categories of hymns are more secular than ritual compositions, since they seem to have arisen from the rhapsodic tradition and not to have been composed for the service of a particular temple\(^2\). The two categories of hymns differ also in style: in the long hymns the epic narrative (dealing with the birth and other incidents in the life of the god\(^3\)) predominates so that, if one leaves out the formulaic beginning and end\(^4\), they will not differ from some epic passages dealing with a similar subject\(^5\). This obviously does not apply to the short hymns\(^6\). Both categories, together with the Homeric and Hesiodic epics, are of primary importance to the student of Greek hymnography, since they are the main source of stock vocabulary (particularly of divine epithets) used by hymn-writers of all periods.

In the archaic period lyric hymns flourished. These are of various types: some are folk compositions mainly preserved in secondary reports\(^7\), and some are personal poetry unfortunately surviving in

---

1. The attribution of this collection to Homer is discussed in Allen-Halliday-Sikes, pp.lxivff.
3. On these themes (used generally in hymns) see below p.28.
4. On this see below p. 23 and p. 31 respectively.
5. See e.g. the reference cited above on p. 13 n.3.
6. One of these (the hymn to Ares: 8) is written in a style very close to that of the Orphic hymns: see Allen-Halliday-Sikes, p. 384f.
a severely fragmentary state\textsuperscript{1}.

From the classical period onwards we have inscriptive lyric hymns from Delphi, Epidaurus and other cult-centres\textsuperscript{2}. Lyric hymns are found also in Greek drama. The dramatic dimensions of such hymns and the degree of their connection with the plot of the play have been examined in a number of dissertations\textsuperscript{3}. Here belong also the parodies of hymns found in the comedies of Aristophanes and other Greek (as well as Roman) comedians\textsuperscript{4}.

In the Hellenistic period the hexameter form reappears in the hymns of Callimachus (apart from the fifth which is written in elegiacs) and in some Idyls of Theocritus (e.g. 22: to the Dioscuri, 15.100-44: to Aphrodite and Adonis and 1.64-145: the song of Daphnis).

From the same period there are some further hexameter hymns in a narrative style and with the characteristics of syncretism and apotheosis of men: e.g. the Aretalogy to Sarapis by Maiistas (Coll. Alex. pp.68ff.) and the fragmentary hymns on Papyrus Chicagieniensis (ib. pp.82ff.)\textsuperscript{5}.

The hexameter was also the metre of the philosophical hymn. From this period comes the hymn to Zeus by Cleanthes and from the imperial the hymns of the Neoplatonic Proclus. In the same category one may also include some Orphic fragments: 62 (Apollo), 21, 21a, 168 (Zeus), 237 (Dionysus) and 32 c-e (underworld deities) (ed. Kern). The main characteristics of these hymns are first the philosophical ideas used in the exposition of the nature and functions of the god they refer to;

1. An account on these hymns may be found in Haldane p.76f.
2. See Coll.Alex. pp.132ff. Some inscriptive hymns (though from a later period are written also in hexameters: e.g. the hymn to Athene and Rhamnousian Artemis in IG 14.1389 ii.
3. See the dissertations of Haldane and Mantziou (mentioned above p.16 n.1) and R.Knoke, 'De hymnis tragicorum Graecorum' (diss., Göttingen, 1924).
5. See below p.22 ;cf. the encomia of Dioscorus (Heitsch p.127ff.).
and second the moral nature of the requests made in them.

In the imperial period belong the Orphic hymns which provide a good example of the syncretism which characterized the religion of late antiquity, since they are not only addressed to Greek gods, but also to Oriental deities (Semelē, Sabazius, Korybas). The peculiarity of their structure lies in the fact that they are composed mainly of an accumulation of epithets and other phrases in vocatives and in apposition to the name of the god (although this style is occasionally replaced with relative clauses with ὅς: e.g. hymn. 13.3ff., 18. 4ff.). Guthrie has suggested that most of these epithets were not used for any deity indifferently, but that they were in close association with the particular deity they were addressed to. Besides, we may observe that the majority of them are compound epithets (descriptive of the various characteristics, actions or even feelings of the deity and not occurring elsewhere). A probable explanation for the over-grouping of such epithets and cult-names has been brought forward by Gruppe: with these epithets the initiates (μυστα) somehow constrained the deity to appear perforce.

From the same period date the hymns on Magic papyri which have

1. See W.K.C. Guthrie, Orpheus and Greek Religion, second edition (London: Methuen, 1952), p.258. For the authorship, the purpose and the place of composition of these hymns see the bibliography cited in Quandt's edition p.44*; and RE s.v. Orphische Dichtung cols 1321ff. (Keydell). The similarities of their vocabulary with that of 3rd and 4th cen. poets led van Lier to date the hymns at the same period: see L. van Lier, 'De vocabulario Hymnorum Orphicorum atque aetate' (inaug. diss., Purmerend, 1930).
4. See below p.26 cf. also M. Hauck, De hymnorum Orphicorum aetate. (Breslau, 1911).
been collected and edited in verse form (mainly hexameters) by Preisendanz and others. The characteristics of magic hymns appear in two poems (to Asclepius and Hecate respectively) found in Hippolytus's *Refutatio omnium haeresium* and edited in Heitsch p.170f.

Two alphabetical hymns in hexameters (to Dionysus and Apollo) are found in AP 9.524, 525 respectively. They are composed throughout of epithets arranged in an alphabetical order.

Besides, there are a number of severely fragmentary oracular hymns: e.g. the hymn to Apollo and Artemis (ap. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v.8 48,4 (GCS 2 p.359.5)) and the hymn to Apollo (ap. Euseb. *Preparat. Evang.* iii 14.4f. (ed. Heitsch p.168)).

Papyrival fragments from the same period include hymns of various types such as those edited in Heitsch pp.165ff. A collection of lyric hymns in short verses is edited also in Heitsch pp.22ff. and is attributed to Mesomedes.

Finally, from the same period come some prose hymns such as those of Aelius Aristides: to Athene (orat.37), Heracles (40), Dionysus (41), Asclepius (42), Zeus (43) and Sarapis (45); and from the fourth cen.A.D. the hymn to Artemis (orat.5) by Libanius and the hymns to the King Helius (orat.11) and to the Mother of the Gods (8) by Julian the emperor.

2. The composition of alphabetical poems was very popular in Byzantine times. A fair amount of such poems has been collected and discussed in D.N.Anastasijewić, 'Die paränetischen Alphabete in der griechischen Literatur' (inaug. diss., Munchen, 1905). An example of such poems (written in iambics) is found among Gregory's works: *carm.* 1.2.30 (908-10).
3. In this category of hymns one may add some invocations from the *Oracula Chaldaica*: frs 26,61,216,218,220 (ed. des Places) and some prose prayers from *Corpus Hermeticum*: i.31-32, v.10-11, xiii. 17-20 (ed. Festugière).
I.2.c) The Form and Content of the Greek Pagan Hymn

The main parts of a Greek pagan hymn are: 1) Introduction or Prooemium, 2) Praise or Main body and 3) Prayer. I have avoided using the term invocation for the first part, since, as will be seen below, this is not appropriate for all the types of Greek hymns (particularly for most of the Homeric hymns). Besides, I used the broader terms Praise or Main body for the second part (since the main reason for its inclusion in the hymn is the praise of god) instead of the inexact term 'Pars Epica' used by Ausfeld, or the very general one 'Middle Section' followed by Haldane, or even the term 'Begründung' used by Schwenn and followed by Mantziou (as this is based on the secondary purpose of this part, namely to reinforce the prayer with a 'Ground' and secure its fulfilment: see below p. 30).

All three parts are constructed according to certain traditional principles and contain various topoi which have been discussed by a number of scholars to whom reference is made below.

1) Introduction

This part usually gives the proper name of the recipient of the hymn, or one of his by-names (which may replace the proper name if this is not mentioned) accompanied by one or more epithets, or other titles, and the patronymics of the particular god. In the case of

1. The term 'Praise (part)' has no authority outside the present research and has been employed only conventionally to replace equivalent terms followed by other scholars which I found not entirely accurate and sufficient for our purpose.
4. See Fr. Schwenn, Gebet und Opfer, (Heidelberg, 1927), e.g. p. 59.
5. See M. Mantziou, 'Hymns and hymnal prayers in fifth century Greek tragedy with special reference to Euripides' (unpublished Ph.D. diss., Univ. London, 1981), p. 5. It is used also by Beckmann (pp. 46ff.).
more elaborate hymns this part may be extended to include also
participial phrases or relative clauses, all in apposition to the
name of the deity. A reference to the leading cult-centres and
other abodes of the deity may also be made.

The addressee of a Greek pagan hymn may be any god from the
Greek pantheon: Olympian gods (Zeus, Apollo), minor gods (Pan, Asclepius),
or demigods and heroes (Hercules, Leto). To these one may add person-
ified abstract nouns (Tyche, Hygeia), natural phenomena (Boreas, Nyx)
and celestial bodies (Helius, Selene). Finally, hymns were composed
for Oriental deities, both Egyptian and Asiatic (Sarapis, Isis, Sab-
zius). However, when from the Hellenistic period onwards the apothe-
osis of men became an important characteristic of the political and
religious life of the Greeks, hymns could be composed also for empe-
rors, as well as governors, as the extant fragments of the paean to
Titus (Coll. Alex. p.173) and the hymn to Demetrius Poliorcetes (ib. p.
173f.) show. In these hymns we have an addressee-variation, according
to Cairns's definition.

The recipient of a Greek pagan hymn could be one or more gods
who have something in common: Hom. hymn.25 (Apollo, Muses, Zeus); or
all the gods in general: Procl. hymn.4.

On the significance of the knowledge of the divine name and the
various topoi employed to express it in hymns, namely the listing of
alternatives: εὐτε ... εὐτε and πότερον ... ἦ ... ἦ ... (hymn. Fortun.
8-10: Coll. Alex. p.196), or the phrase δοτις ποτ' ἔστιν (Aesch. Agam.
160) and the epithets πολυάνυμος and ἀρρητος (both common in Orph.hymn)
221ff. and Haldane p.115f.

I distinguish hymns into two main types: the direct apostrophes

1. See F. Cairns, Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry
to gods and the hymns in which the name of the god and any expression attributed to it are in the accusative. The former type of hymns is called by Wünsch 'subjective' and the latter 'objective' (see RE s.v. 'Hymnos' col.142 (Wünsch)).

We may have the following types of 'objective' hymns according to the verb which is used to introduce them:

1) Hymns introduced with a verb of singing such as άειςεων, άειςεων, άειςεδεων, μελεσων, ύμνεων, ἄρχεσαρ άειςεων, μνήμεσαρ. This type is commonly found in the Homeric hymns: hymn.12: Ἡρην άειςεων and the hexameter hymns of later poets: Procl. hymn.5 : 'Υμνέσομεν ...

Kouropoditēn and Theocr. Idyl.22: 'Υμνέσομεν ... 'Κάστορα κατ' ... Πο-

λυσικα. An example from the lyric hymns is Aristonous hymn.Vest.2 (Coll.Alex. p.164): 'Εστιαν ύμνοςομεν'.

In the Orphic hymns, however, these verbs are rare as one finds only άειςεσων in hymn.3 and μελεσων in hymn.62. Here, verbs of the third category are used instead and the same applies also to the Magic hymns.

The usage of such verbs resulted from similar introductions to the heroic narrative. The beginning of the Prooemium to Hesiod's Theogony is an example of this: Μουσάων ‘Ελλικωνλιδών ἄρχωμες’ άειςεων.

The hymnodic features of most of such prooemia have been investigated by Stenzel.

2) Hymns (mainly the Homeric ones) in which the poet asks the Muses to celebrate the god: Hom.hymn.Merc.: 'Εμφην ύμνεω Μοῦσα and Theocr. Idyl.1.64: ἄρχετε ... Μοῦσα ... ἀνοζής.

1. It seems that such verbs are rarely used in lyric hymns. I could find only three more examples: Lasus fr.1 (PLG iii p.376 Bergk) Attic Schol.3 (ib. p.644) and Alcman fr.2 (ib. p.15). Examples of the various introductory verbs may be found in Adami p.220f.

In the case of lyric inscriptionsal hymns (e.g. of paeans) the poet may exhort others to praise god: Isyllus Paean Apoll.-Asclep.1 (Coll.Alex. p.133): "Ιε Παλασ θεὸν ἄεισατε λαοῖς,/ and Macedonius Paean Apoll.1f. (ib. p.138): ἄηλην ... / εὐφημεῖτε.

3) Hymns introduced with a verb of summoning: καλέσειν, κλήσειν, καλλίσκωσιν, ἐκπροκαλεῖσθαι examples of which are: Orph. hymn.25: Προ-or-tέα καλλίσκω and 2 hymn Attis (PLG iii p.686 Bergk): "Ἀττιν κλήσω."

On the other hand, in the 'subjective' hymns the name of the god and his titles are in vocatives which implies a more personal relationship between the god and his suppliant. Again here we may have further subdivisions:

1) Hymns introduced with a verb of summoning, singing and celebrating, or praying in the first person (singular or plural) and the name of a god in the vocative accompanied by a second person pronoun (personal or possessive) which may be repeated (sometimes at the beginning of successive clauses): Orph. hymn.52.1: Καλλίσκωσιν σε, μάκαρ ... Βακχε, Cleanth. hymn.6: σ' (sc. ζεῦ) καθυσμήσω τε καὶ σὸν κρά-τος αἰὲν ἄεισώ and Sappho fr.1 (Lobel - Page): ἄδαινα" 'Ἀρδοδέτα ... λόγοσοι σε. Such hymns are generally characterized as written in 'du-Stil' (following Norden's terminology).

2) Hymns in which the name of the god (in vocative) is not followed closely by any main verb as happens e.g. in Orph. hymn.26; or it may be followed by one or more relative clauses (sometimes headed by the same pronoun producing thus Norden's 'Relativstil'): Hom. hymn 24.1f.: 'Εστιν, ἥ ... ἀμφικλείσεως,/ ; or even it may be accompanied

---

2. See Norden pp.143ff.; also Stenzel p.18ff. for examples of 'du-Stil' hymns.
3. See Norden pp.168ff.; also Adami p.242 for other examples.
by one or more participles in the participial style of predications (Norden's 'Participial stil' on pp.166ff. where examples).

3) Hymns introduced with a verb in the imperative (or its equivalents: optative, archaic imperative infinitive or negative subjunctive). This may be: a) a cletic verb: ἐλθε, μόλε, βαζε, φανε-θε, (ἀφ-)λυσο, ἔωι with or without the addition of δεύον or δεύε: Orph. hymn. 34: 'Ελθε, μάχαρ, ηαῦν, b) a verb of appealing to the deity's attention, usually to his sight or hearing: κλαθε (κθαλυτ, κλαῦτε), (εἰσ-)άνουσον, ίδε, ἐφέρα, βλέφον : Procl. hymn. 1.1: Κλαθε ... Σηρινδ and Pind. Nem. 7.1f. (Snell-Maehler, 1971), and c) a verb of salutation: χαζρε (χαζρετε): 1hymn. Attis (PLG iii p.686 Bergk) and Cleanth. hymn. 3

In the introduction (and the rest of the hymn) the divine epithets3, titles and by-names (ἐπωνυμα, ἀνοχλητικα ὤνωμα) of the god (which are usually taken from traditional vocabulary, found primarily in the Homeric epics6) have particular prominence. They are generally divided into two categories: a) those which apply generally to any god and may be thus called universal7: θες, άνα, δεσπότης, βασι-

1. For other examples see Adami p.221 and Ausfeld p.516.
2. For examples on this category see Keyssner p.129 and 132 and on category (b) see Ziegler pp.59ff., Adami p.221 and Ausfeld p.516.
3. By this term I mean any qualifying word or expression added to the name of the god without the intermediary of the copula. Thus, it is not only an adjective, but it may be also a substantive, a composite expression, a participle, or even a clause (particularly a relative one). On this see Ausfeld p.521.
4. The term is used e.g. in Plat. Rep.394 a 2.
and their feminine forms, and b) those of a 'more restricted application as κωμαστής for Dionysus (Aristoph. Nubes 606) and ἀκηθάλας for Apollo (Hom. hymn. Ven. 151).

Of these epithets the category of compound ones (διπλα όνόματα) has particular significance. They may describe: 1) the physical characteristics of god: ἐλυκοβλέφαρος of Aphrodite in Hom. hymn. 6. 19, 2) what the deity wears or carries ending in πέπλος, -στέφανος, -μύτης, -αμφως, -πεδίλας: ἐστέφανος of Dionysus in Orph. hymn. 74. 2, 3) anything connected with the deity and beginning with χρυσός: χρυσόστοιχος of Apollo in Isyllus Paean Apoll.-Asclep. 48 (Coll. Alex. p. 134), 4) the character of god ending in -θυμος, -φρόνης, -μήτης, -μήτνης: πρόφρων of Hygieia in Ariforion 2 (PLG iii p. 596 Bergk), 5) certain divine actions: σαμυβρότος of Athene in Procl. hymn. 7. 40, 6) the gifts of the god ending in -δότης, -φόρος: πλούτοδότης of Dionysus in 5 Carm. pop. (PLG iii p. 656 Bergk), 7) particular delights of the god ending in -χαρής or beginning with φυλο-: ὀλυχαρής of Ares in Orph. hymn. 65. 2, and 8) anything the god possesses or does in a great degree beginning with κολυ-, καντο- (καν-), μεγα-: κολυσφυλός of Dionysus in Hom. hymn. 26. 11.

Some epithets can be used predicatively (mainly in the Prayer) with εἶναι, γενέσθαι, ἐλθέων: 1) εὐμενής, εὐφρων and other similar epithets: ἐλθέ... εὐφρων of Selene in Orph. hymn. 9. 11 and 2) σωτήρ, σω-.

1. The divine epithets have been collected by C.F.H. Bruchmann in his Epitheta Deorum quae apud poetas graecos leguntur (Leipzig, 1893), Supplement 2 to Ausführliches Lexikon Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie, edited by W.H. Roscher. See also Ausfeld pp. 521 ff. and Adam p. 223 ff.


3. See K. Keyssner, Gottesvorstellung und Lebensauffassung im Griechischen Hymnus (Stuttgart, 1932), pp. 127 f., 133, 124 f., 130, 45 ff., and Haldane p. 177 f. for examples on these categories of epitheta.
The by-names of the deity belong also to the category of divine epithets. An elaborate example of extended usage of by-names is Orph. hymn.34 where one finds fifteen such by-names.

The parentage (γένος) of the god (when it is used) may be given with patronymics, or with other expressions of origin, or even with participles or relative clauses: Hom.hymn.26.1f.: Διόνυσον . . . Ζηνός καὶ Σεμέλης . . . νυῖν, and hymn.Curetum 1f.(Coll.Alex. p.160): Κοῦρες,/ . . . Κράνες,/. Sometimes other relatives besides the parents might be mentioned: Hom.hymn.9.1: "Άρτεμιν . . . κασυνυτὴν 'Εκάτολο.

A final feature of the Introduction is the reference to the birth-place, cult-centre, or other abode of the god. This is made through phrases with the verbs μέοςαυ, κατέχειν, νέοςαυ, έφέσαυ, ἀμφιπολεύειν Orph.hymn.48.5: (Εαβδαίςες) . . . Φυγνής μεσόςαυ, or with έκείνου: Mag.hymn. 1.1 (Abel): (‘Απολλών) . . . λέγει Παρνασσόν δρός καὶ Δελφέςα Πυθώ,/. The hymns where the poet is wondering about the 'polytopy', 'polynomy' and parentage of a god using various disjunctive expressions: εἶπε . . . εἶπε, ἦ . . . ἦ, are called by Menander the Rhetor ἄπορητωκος or διαμορητωκος (343.17-26 ed. Russell - Wilson).

The transition to the second part, namely the Praise, is achieved in various grammatical and syntactical ways: 1) with any sort of connective: γάρ, ἠσπερ, νῦν οὔτε, εἴτε κτε, 2) with the syntactical dependence on a word from the first part of a participle, a relative clause or a vocative in the second part: Hom.hymn.26.3: (Διόνυσον) ὅ

1. For other examples on both categories see Keyssner pp.87ff.,102ff., Ausfeld p.538 and Ziegler p.56f.
3. For various examples of the deity's parentage see Adami p.226ff.
4. Further examples may be found in Keyssner pp.75ff., Adami p.241 and 227ff.
The main purpose of this part is the praise of the deity which may be achieved in various ways. One is with a narration of his birth-myth (Hom. hymn. 18.3-9) usually followed by an account of his nurture and education (Hom. hymn. 26.3-6). In the long hexameter hymns other incidents or activities in the life of the god may be added: for example the slaying of Python by Apollo in Hom. hymn. Apoll. 300-74. Geographical lists and landscape descriptions are often included in them (Hom. hymn. Apoll. 30-44).

Another important topic is the description of the epiphany of the god: e.g. of the Dioscuri during a storm at sea: Hom. hymn. 33.8-17 (cf. Theocr. Idyl. 22.10-22); or the ἄνεσις of Persephone in Orph. hymn. 43. 7-9 and the return to earth of Adonis in Theocr. Idyl. 15.102-05. The commonest verb used of the deity is ἡλέκτω and sometimes ἐγκαβαλ and the corresponding for the worshipper is ἔκπειρα. Sometimes the god's epiphany may bring terror and tremor to the whole nature and sometimes joy and calmness (as may happen also at the time of his birth).

The various benefits granted by the god to mankind may be expressed with a narration of the εὑρετης-legend (Hom. hymn. Merc. 25-64, 108-14, and Hom. hymn. 20.2-7). Expressions with πρῶτος or πρῶτων are regularly used in this connection (Hom. hymn. Ven. 12).

2. A detailed account of the various themes featuring in narrative hymns may be found in Haldane pp.123ff.
3. See RE s.v. 'Epiphanie', cols 279, 312 (Pfister).
4. Examples of both cases may be found in Adami pp.231ff. and Keyssner p.33f.
5. For further examples see Keyssner p.17f.
Apart from the above narrative and descriptive themes, this part may also include an exposition of the nature (φύσις) and other characteristics (ἀρεταί) of the god, since, according to Plato, it is lawful to praise Eros (and generally any god) with reference first to his nature and then to his benefits: ("Ερωτα) ... δύκαλων ἐπαυνέσαυ, πρῶτον αὐτῶν οἶδε ἐστιν, ἔκειτα τὰς δόσεις (Sympos.195 a). This is achieved not only with the use of relevant epithets (which we have already mentioned), but also with certain topoi and expressions.

The nature of the god may be illustrated with reference to his power and generally his virtue (δύναμις, μένος, σθένος, ἴσχυς, ἀλήθεια, κράτος, ἀρετή): Orph. hymn. prooem.28: Αὐθώνος μέγ' ὑπεξροχον ἴσχυν. In turn the power and other characteristics of god may be revealed in expressions with: a) μούθος: Orph.hymn.10.28: (Φόενοι) σύ γὰρ μοῦθη τάσει τεχνεσ, and b) τὰς θάνατα: Theogn.373ff.(West): ζεύ φύλε ... σύ γὰρ πάντεσον ἀνάσεσες/ τιμὴν αὐτῶς ἐξων καὶ μεγάλην δύναμιν, .../ σὸν δὲ κράτος πάντων ἔσσε ὕπατον, βασιλεῦ/. Both expressions (as well as those with ἄει and the epithets in παν-, παντ-, πολυ-, ἄει-) serve in praising gods in a 'hyperbolic' style.

Gods may be celebrated also for being the begetters/creators of all things, as well as of mankind. Thus they are called γένεσις, γενετήρ, γενετευρα, or μήτηρ and κατήρ, or ἐνεν γεγεντωρ and προμιήτωρ: Hom.hymn.1.6 (Zeus): πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε ἀθῶν τε. Furthermore, gods may be celebrated for their gifts to men:Hom.hymn.10.1f.(Aphrodite): βροτοῦσα/ μεφιμᾶ δῶρα δόσωσαι, and for being ταμως: Procl.hymn.1.2 (Helius): φίλους ταμα.

The character of gods is revealed in the things they delight in,

1. For other examples see Keyssner pp.48ff.
3. For further cases see Keyssner pp.20ff.
4. Examples on this subject are collected in Keyssner p.71.
5. For other examples see Adam p.242 and Keyssner p.82f.
and this may be expressed in phrases with χαὐρέως, φιλεῖν, (ἐπὶ-)τέρ-πεσθεῖ: Orph. *hymn* 74.4: /κύμασι τερπομένη (sc. Leucothea).\(^1\)

The secondary purpose of this part (Praise) is to incur the pleasure of the deity so that he may fulfil the petitioner's requests which follow in the Prayer. So, all the attributes of the god are carefully recalled to secure this fulfilment and his various characteristics are chosen to show that he has the power to solve the particular problems of his petitioner.

Besides, in hymns where a personal relationship between god and devotee exists, a reference to past kindnesses rendered by the former to the latter, or to any link between god and mortals in general, is another method the petitioner may employ in order to receive a favourable response. For the same reason a promise of a dedication or sacrifice may also be included in this part, although the proper place for these features is the Prayer where the poet may even promise to praise god again, if he fulfils his requests.\(^2\)

The transition to the Prayer is achieved by the usage of νῦν, ἀλλά, ἀλλ’ ἢ, ἀλλὰ νῦν, καὶ νῦν, or without any connectives (i.e. asyndetically).\(^3\)

3) Prayer

The subject of this part depends on whether the hymn is offered by a whole congregation (or by one person on behalf of a community), as happens with Orphic hymns in particular and cult-hymns in general, or whether it concerns only an individual petitioner. In the latter case the petitioner asks for the fulfilment of various personal needs, while in the former the requests made to gods refer to the needs of

---

1. For further examples see Keyssner pp. 130ff., 67ff.
2. These and other topics have been examined with many examples in Ausfeld pp. 525ff.; see also Th. Beckmann, 'Das Gebet bei Homer' (inaug. diss. Univ. Würzburg, 1932), p. 46ff.
a whole community.

In general the Prayer may include requests for the material necessities of daily life, for the family and city, or for a pleasant life and happiness (ὑμερόθες (ῄδος) βῶς, ἀλας, εὐδαιμονία, εὐφυχα); or even requests of a moral character (mainly in the philosophical hymns)¹. Besides, requests could be made for the averting of any misfortune expressed mainly with the verbs: ἀποτρέπειν, ἀποκύπτειν, ἀπιστεῖν, ἀπελεύθερεῖν, ὑπόσθεν, παῦειν, λύειν²; or simply for deliverance expressed with σῴζειν³.

At the beginning of the Prayer there is usually a new invocation to god followed most of the time either by a verb of summoning, of appealing to the god's attention and of salutation, or by a verb of praying: λύτομαι, εὐχομαι, αἰτοῦμαι, ἱκετεύω⁴. Common in the Prayer are the imperatives of δυσάναι and ὑχεσθαι and the use of various propitiatory verbs: ἱλασέων, ἱλασκεσθαι, ἱλεθε and the epithet ἔλαιος or ἔλεως⁵.

The various verbs used in the Prayer may occur in the imperative or its equivalents: optative, negative subjunctive, or archaic imperative infinitives⁶.

Finally, the Prayer may close with a farewell expression with the verb χαίρε, featuring particularly in the Homeric hymns⁷.

---

¹ All these requests are discussed in detail and with many examples in Keysner pp.136-69. Further examples of such requests (mainly taken from the Homeric epics and Greek tragedy) are collected in Ausfeld pp.539-47.
² For examples see Keysner pp.106ff.
³ Examples may be found in Keysner pp.104ff.
⁴ For examples see Adami pp.234ff., Ziegler pp.36ff. (particularly pp.43ff. where a list of these verbs), and above p.24f.
⁵ Examples are cited in Ausfeld p.537f., Keysner pp.91ff.,124, and Stenzel p.13f.
⁶ On this see Ziegler pp.9ff., Beckmann pp.49-55 and Ausfeld p.537.
I.3.a) Brief History of Early Christian Hymnography

The so-called early Christian hymnography\(^1\) covers a variety of texts, most of which are in prose, or non-quantitative metre\(^2\). According to hymnologists these texts may be classed into three major categories: 1) quantitative hymns (personal or anonymous), 2) liturgical hymns in 'rhythmic' prose or non-quantitative metre and 3) hymns in apocryphal and heretical literature (in prose or verse-form). Since all the poems of the present research (with the exception of 1.1.32) are written in quantitative metres I shall place more emphasis on early Christian hymns of this kind (1) and less on the non-quantitative hymns (2). Besides, the hymns of category (3) should be omitted on grounds of their complete dissociation from our hymns, not only in themes, but also in style\(^3\).

In category (1) belongs the hymn to Christ attributed to Clement of Alexandria and appearing at the end of the Paedagogus\(^4\). It consists of 66 short lines (according to the edition of Heitsch pp. 157-59) which are formed mainly of epithets and other titles in apposition to the name of Christ. Most of these epithets are taken from the Bible.

Next come the long hymns of Synesius of Cyrene in short lyric lines which, although later than Gregory's, are important for our re-

---


2. On this type of metre see below p. 58, n.1.


search, not only for the metrical structure of hymns 5 and 9 (which is similar to that of 1.1.30)\textsuperscript{1}, but also because they employ various features and topoi of Greek pagan hymns and contain expressions, above all divine epithets, and themes (from the Bible and Christian literature as well as from various pagan philosophico-religious areas) featuring in our hymns\textsuperscript{2}. Reference to these is made below in the commentaries.

In the same category of quantitative hymns hymnologists include the Parthenion of Methodius, bishop of Olympus, which is found at the end of his Symposium and consists of twenty-four stanzas with an alphabetical acrostic, each followed by a refrain (ὑμακού). This poem, however, has no connection with our hymns either in metre (which seems to be predominantly iambic with resolutions and syncopations)\textsuperscript{3}, or in form and content.

In this category (1) one may include also some Christian epigrams from the first book of the Palatine Anthology which appear in hymn-form such as for example the epigrams to the Saviour: AP 1.19-28 (Claudianus), although the date limits of such epigrams in general extend well after Gregory's time.

Finally, this category contains some papyrical Christian hymns which have come down to us anonymously and mainly in a fragmentary state. Of these the earliest seems to be the hymn to the Holy Trinity on Papyrus Oxyrh. 1786 which is dated in the third century\textsuperscript{4}. Its fragmentary state prevents us from determining the content of the hymn which ends with the common doxological formula (see below p.301).

\textsuperscript{1} See below pp.55ff.
\textsuperscript{4} See Heitsch p.159 and Mitsakis p.111.
With regard to its metrical form it has been suggested by Wellesz that it is based on a combination of anapaestic metres. A hymn to Christ appears on Papyrus Berol. Mus. 8299 of the fourth cen. A.D. It consists of the last six long anapaestic lines of a poem with an alphabetical acrostic. The extant part of it is based on the theme of the Good Shepherd (cf. Ev. Jo. 10.11ff., Ev. Lc. 15.4ff.) and ends also with the common doxological formula.

The poem on Papyrus Amherst (written in a triple alphabetical acrostic) is addressed to Christians giving them instructions and rules of a moral character to follow in their lives. Having this content, the poem obviously cannot be characterized as a hymn (in the sense I have described the word above p. 16) despite opposite views of Byzantinologists.

We may now proceed to examine the texts of the second category, namely the liturgical hymns in 'rhythmic prose or non-quantitative metre. In this category hymnologists include various passages from the Old and New Testament: e.g. Psalms and other prayers (particularly those collected together by Swete in vol. 3 of his edition of The Old Testament in Greek, pp. 811-830) and the so-called Christological

---

3. See Heitsch p. 161 (who notes that eighteen lines are missing - possibly those beginning with α - ο) and the bibliography cited by him.
4. See the text as this is edited in Heitsch p. 161-64.
5. See Mitsakis pp. 114ff. and Szövérffy op. cit., pp. 8-10 (where bibliography).
6. The term is used by hymnologists (e.g. Mitsakis p. 9; cf. P. N. Trempeles, Εκλογή Ελληνικής Ορθόδοξου Υπογραφής, second edition (Athens, 1978), p. 126) to refer to prose texts which may be divided into cola (parallel or antithetical) where various rhetorical figures may appear: anaphora, isocolon etc.
7. On these prayers - known as Canticles - see J. Mearns, The Canticles of the Christian Church Eastern and Western in early and medieval Times, (Camb., 1914) and for their place in the service of the early Church H. Schneider, 'Die biblischen Oden im Christlichen Altertum', Biblica, 30 (1949), 28-65; cf. also his articles in the same periodical pp. 239-72 and pp. 433-52.
and other hymns of NT in rhythmic prose. The introduction of such texts into the liturgical life of the early Church and the origins of their antiphonal chanting have attracted the interest of many hymnologists and liturgiologists. However, neither this, nor their colometrical reconstruction is of any importance to us, but only the various themes they include (particularly attributions to the Godhead or Christ) which, as Biblical, were known to Gregory and could be used in the present hymns (as other Biblical passages are used too).

In the same category hymnologists include some early patristic texts which they divide into cola: the long prayer in the first epistle To the Corinthians by Clement of Rome (59-61 ed. Lightfoot) The Didache of the twelve Apostles (9-10 ed. Funk), the anonymous epistle To Diognetus (ed. Marrou, SC) and the homily On Pascha by Melito of Sardis (edited colometrically by S.G.Hall, 1979). However, these texts (far from being hymns at all) have no relevance to our hymns.

Two short hymns (also rearranged colometrically) appear in the Apostolic Constitutions: the Morning Hymn (Προσευχή ἐωθυνή or οὐνος ὀπερμύος) which is prefixed by the Gloria (Ev.Lc.2.14) and the Evening Hymn (Ἐνερμύος) in Const.Apost.7.47 and 48 respectively.

The main characteristics in both hymns are the accumulation of verbs

2. On this see also below the note on 1.1.32.37: ἀντιστὰς.
4. They are divided into cola e.g. by Leclercq: see DACL s.v. Hymnes' cols 2832ff.
6. See Kroll, op.cit., p.32.
of singing or glorifying and the common doxological formula at the end. More interesting with regard to the various attributes or epithets of God, and other Biblical themes they use are the prayers of the seventh book of Apostolic Constitutions and the liturgical ones in the eighth book. For the same reasons the various liturgies (of St James, Mark and Basil) and the prayers in the Euchologion of Særapion are equally important.

Finally, the fragmentary eucharistic hymns and other short non-quantitative hymns on papyri have also little relevance, either in form or content, to our hymns. 

At the end of the exposition on early Christian hymnography it would be necessary to say a word about the rendering in hexameters of the Psalms attributed to Apollinarius of Laodicea. Despite the severe criticism on the value of this paraphrase, it offers us parallel expressions (mainly divine epithets) to our hymns (as do also the verse paraphrase of the Gospel of St John by Nonnus and various passages from the Oracula Sibyllina).

1. On these hymns see e.g. Mitsakis pp.51-57 and pp.62-64 respectively; and Szövérffy p.10 and pp.8ff. respectively for bibliographies on them.
2. For the disputed authorship see e.g. J. Golega, 'Verfasser und Zeit der Psalterparaphrase des Apollinaris', BJ, 39 (1930), 1-22, and Idem, Der Homerische Psalter (Ettal, 1960).
3. See Mitsakis p.166.
4. See Kroll, op.cit., p.29.
I.3.b) The Meaning, Form and Content of Early Christian Hymns

As we have seen in the brief survey of the history of early Christian hymnography until the fourth cen. A.D. (I.3.(a)) it becomes obvious that it includes a variety of texts most of which cannot be strictly called hymns in the Greek pagan sense of the word. Therefore, it would be unnecessary to attempt here to examine the meaning and application of words like: ὑμνος, φαλαίς, (πνευματική) ὑσῆ despite the fact that these terms (first appearing in Ep. Col. 3.16 and Eph. 5.19) have been interpreted by various scholars and in a variety of ways: e.g. as denoting different types of the musical performance of Christian hymns.

However, it would be interesting to note the meaning Gregory gives to ὑμνος and other terms related to it. This is found in carm. 1.2.34.138-144 (955f.):

δέναν όου τὴν αἶτην ἐνδεδυ
τὴν δὲ προσευχὴν ἔστω τῶν ἀμελνόνων

ἀνας ὁ ἐκκαυος εἰς θέον σεβάσμον.
ὁ δ’ ὑμνος ἀνας ἐμελείς, ὡς οἴουν

For the same reasons (i.e. multiplicity of early Christian hymnography) I think that it is pointless also to describe here their form which not only differs from that of all our hymns except 1.1.32, but is also not fixed. Nor, is it necessary to raise again the dispute as to whether the various rhetorical figures (particularly the

------------------------
1. This view has been expressed by Wellesz (see Wellesz op. cit., pp. 32-42). For other views see Mitsakis pp. 39-41; and Kroll p. 5 n.2 and p. 7 n.1.
2. A survey of the various theories of Byzantine metrical featuring in an unformulated form already in the examples of early Christian hymns (written in rhythmic prose or non-quantitative metre) may be found in Trempelas, op. cit., pp. 54-93 and Mitsakis pp. 266-329.
parallel and antithetical cola) owe their introduction into these hymns to the influence of Greek rhetoric, or of the semitic style in general and 'parallelismus membrorum' in particular.

Nor, finally would it be worthwhile to discuss the content of the early Christian hymns, since this is far more general than that of the Greek pagan hymns and may include any religious subject and not simply themes related only to God. These hymns show little similarity in content with Gregory's hymns apart from the Biblical themes commonly found in any early Christian hymn.

I have decided to exclude from the brief survey of both the Greek pagan and early Christian hymns any discussion on the subject of the performance - mainly in public - of the two categories of hymns, since we do not know whether Gregory's hymns were intended for use in public worship, or, more likely, whether they were used only for his own adoration of God. The latter possibility may be implied from one of the reasons which led Gregory to compose poetry in general (which are described in a poem written by him particularly for this purpose: carm.2.1.39 (1329-36)). The reason was to console himself in his old age. This possibility is implied also from carm.2.1.34.71-91 (1312f.) where Gregory describes the content of his poetry in which the praise of God has a prominent place: μέλισσα ὥς υψωμένης εἰς ἄνθρωπον ἡμών, ἢ δὲ παρθένη/ εἰς ἄγαθον ἑωραθέντα κατάφυτον ἐν εἰς Θεόν (....) καὶ Χριστόν παπάν κλέος ἀφθατον, οἷς μὲ ἑδέξεσαι, ἀνάρρομένου μορφῆς οὗραν ἔριν (77-78, 83-84:1313).

1. For the performance of Greek pagan hymns see the discussion in Haldane pp.36-91 and for that of the early Christian hymns see J. Quasten, Musik und Gesang in der Kulten der Heidnischen Antike und Christlichen Frühzeit, reprint edition (Münster, 1973) passim.
I. 4 Language, Style and Content of the 'Gregorian' Hymns

The language of our hymns is a mixture of epic and late Greek forms - including koine - as is the language of late poets in general and of Gregory in particular. A closer examination of these hymns reveals that their metre affects their language so that the epic forms predominate in the hexameter and elegiac hymns (1.1.29, 1.1.31, 1.1.33-1.1.38, 2.1.38), while in 1.1.30 and 1.1.32 (one in anacreontics and the other in non-quantitative metre) the language is closer to, if not the same as, that of Gregory's time.

With regard to the epic forms used in our hymns we observe that the poet follows the practice of late epic writers in extending them to cover non-epic words. Thus he uses: a) the epic/Ionic ending -η in ἄνθρωπος : 1.1.35.10 and οὐρανόν : 1.1.36.21 (see the notes ad loc.), b) the unaugmented form of aorist in δείκνυσι : 1.1.36.14, στήσατ : 1.1.34.3 (see the notes ad loc.), and c) the epic ending -σατ in ζησατ : 1.1.36.16 (see the note ad loc.). Furthermore, he avoids the doubling of the introductory ρ in augmented tenses for metrical reasons: ἀρετα : 2.1.38.51 (see E. Schwyzer, Griechische Grammatik, vol. 1, p. 654, Maas, Greek Metre 130; and cf. West, Greek Metre, p. 15f.). For other examples of this feature in Gregory's De Vita Sua: carm. 2.1.11 (1029-1166) see Jungck p. 29 and Cummings p. 51. In 1.1.36.8 Gregory uses the form ἐμετο, although in other poems he prefers the alternative ἐμοτο (see Knecht, Gegen Die Putzsucht der Frauen, Exkurs 1, p. 136f.).

Other features of the language in these hymns is the use of the rare form βροτεί in 2.1.38.27 which is used in a non-classical

2. Construction of new forms by analogy with existing ones has been observed by Cummings (p. 73) in Gregory's De Vita Sua.
sense (see the note ad loc.). The poet's custom of using old words with a different meaning appears also in 1.1.32.44: ἀροεῖν, 2.1.38. 38: ἀρξερφερσαλ, and 1.1.29.14: ὑκερνεφεῖλν. Such a custom has been observed in Gregory's poetry by Pellegrino (p.87): see also below the section on the hapax legomena (§; cf. Gallay, Langue et Style, p.79f.

In the poems the language is varied by the use of the word ἀρδαιν in the hexameter hymns (e.g. 1.1.34.20) and its equivalent in sense δοῦλος in 1.1.30.46 (see the note ad loc.); and by the use of the Attic -ττ- instead of -σσ- in γλώττς: 1.1.31.11 and τρυτοῦ: 1.1.32.5 (see also Jungck p.27 for the same feature in Gregory's De Vita Sua)¹. Furthermore, one finds the epic and lyric form ἔλαιος in 1.1.29.15 and the alternative late Greek ἔλαιος in 1.1.30.36,48; while in the same hymn appear both the classical word ὁ ἔλαιος and the alternative word of koine τὸ ἔλαιος (1.1.34.27,19). Finally on the frequency of post-classical words in Gregory's writings see Cummings p. 73f.². In this category belongs also a large number of Biblical words (including those found in the Septuagint )³, required by the content of the hymns. A list of such words - though appearing in Gregory's De Vita Sua - may be found in Cummings pp.68ff⁴.

The language of our hymns is enriched with some hapax legomena⁵ which may be divided into three categories:


2. Frequency of such words has been observed in Gregory's orations, mainly his funeral orations: see Hürth, op.cit., pp.117-31 and C. Fabricius, Zu den Jugendschriften des Johannes Chrysostomos, Untersuchungen zum Klassizismus des vierten Jahrhunderts, (Lund, 1962), p.116f. For his epistles see Gallay, Langue et Style, p.76f.

3. Hürth, op.cit., pp.132ff. has shown that for the majority of the quotations of OT in his funeral orations Gregory follows the Septuagint version and in few cases possibly Origen's Hexapla.

4. See also Hürth, op.cit., pp.132-38.

5. For these I rely mainly on information derived from various Lexica.
1) New words, first occurring in these hymns: πατροφαίς: 2.1.38. 
5, οὐδόγονε: ἰβ.6, συμφαίς ἰβ.8, πεύρημα ἰβ.9, μαργάρεσον ἰβ.34, άκατα-
σκόπητον: 1.1.30.32 and πανάνυμε: 1.1.29.13.

2) Old words with a different declension: νωμητά: 2.1.38.11, 
ἐπιστεύτουν: ἰβ.48.

3) Old words in a different meaning: ὑποσχλών: 1.1.36.8, 
βροτέα: 2.1.38.27, σύνθεμα: 1.1.29.10 and ἀκλήτου: ἰβ.14.

Most of Gregory's hapax legomena have been collected by Pelle-
grino p.86f. (see also Jungck p.25, Knecht p.142 and Cummings p.65f.).

A final point to note with regard to the language of these hymns
is the absence of any distinction in sense among the suffixes -ος, 
-ων and -όνες appearing in the adjectives οὐράνως (1.1.31.4), οὐ-
ρανόν (2.1.38.23) and οὐρανοώσ (1.1.29.15) which are all used in 
the meaning of οὐράνως, namely 'heavenly'. This feature had al-
ready been in progress well before Gregory's time (see J.Wright, Com-
parative Grammar of the Greek Language (Oxford, 1912), §269 and 
Smyth 845-50 and 858).

We come now to note some peculiarities of these hymns with 
regard to their syntax. The poet appears to have mixed the syntax 
of εἰς ὃ + indicative with εἰς ζ κε(ν) (or ἄν) + subjunctive, when he 
uses εἰς ζ κε + indicative in 1.1.35.8f. (see the note ad loc.). He 
introduces a temporal clause with the rare μέσον ὅτε in 1.1.36.29 
(see the note ad loc.). He also uses: a) οἶα (+ infinitive) instead 
of οἴαν, b) the syntactical pleonasm έργεῖν τινά τιλθει ἀπό + genit. 
in 1.1.36.22, c) ἁγινεῦν τινός τινων in 1.1.36.24f. following the 
syntax of ἁγιεῖν in Homer, d) φηγγεσθήσα τινα + ἀπό στομάτων in 2.1. 
38.1f. combining two different syntactical usages of the same verb

1. New coinages appear not only in Gregory's poetry, but also in 
his orations: see Hürth, op. cit., pp.141-45.
followed by Pindar, e) ὑπερτῆλεσιν transitively in 2.1.38.16 following the syntax of ἀνατῆλεσιν as this is used in the Bible, f) the middle verb ὑπεστίατε transitively in 2.1.38.13f. and g) a participle (ἡσύς) in 1.1.32.16 in anacoluthon instead of a main verb (see oh all the above the notes ad loc.). In these poems one finds the irregular corresponsion τε ... τε in 1.1.29.8, instead of the more common τε ... τε (mainly used in poetry and appearing in 1.1.34.10 and 2.1.38.21), or τε ... καλ found in 2.1.38.45 (see the notes ad loc.).

Finally, the poet uses ἀλλά in postposition in 2.1.38.32 (see the note ad loc.) and the preposition ἐν in anastrophe in 1.1.29.11 (on this see Jungck p.29 and Werhahn on Comparatio Vitarum: carm.1.2.8.58).

The use of optative in Gregory's writings has been examined by Sister Rose de Lima Henry in her doctoral dissertation under the title 'The Late Greek Optative and its Use in the Writings of Gregory Nazianzen' and published in the Patristic Studies (vol.68) of the Catholic Univ. of America (Washington, D.C.,1943). In the hymns under discussion - provided they all belong to Gregory - one finds eighteen optatives eleven of which are wishing optatives commonly used in prayers and which may be replaced by imperatives, negative subjunctives or archaic imperative infinitives (see above p.31 and Henry op.cit., pp.9-13). These are: 1.1.29.15, 1.1.32.33, 1.1.33.5, 1.1.34.19, 1.1.36.20,33, 1.1.37.4,5,6, and 2.1.38.32,50 (four of these are not mentioned by Henry). From the remaining seven: a) two are optatives without ἄν contingent found in final clauses: 1.1.31.7: ἀφρα ... ὑπένθετε and 1.1.36.24: ἀφρα ... ἀγυνοτ, (see the note ad loc.), b) two are optatives in temporal clauses: 1.1.36.29, 30: μεσφ' ὑπε ... ἐξανδρομι ... ἔλθομ (see the note on line 29),

1. The same subject has been examined for Gregory's De Vita Sua and Arcana by Jungck (pp.31-34) and Sykes (Appendix A) respectively.
and c) three are potential optatives without ἄν contingent: 1.1.35.12, 1.1.37.7 and 1.1.36.27 (see the note ad loc.). Henry too mentions the examples of (a) (see pp.74-83, particularly p.82), but none of (b). Furthermore, in the case of (c) she classes under this category only the first example: 1.1.35.12 (see pp.25-28, particularly p.27); while she considers the optatives in the other two examples as assimilative found in relative purpose clauses after a wishing optative, although she goes on to observe that they 'could be analyzed as pure potentials in relative characteristic clauses as most probably they are.' (see p.66).

Another feature to discuss in the present hymns is the use of the interjection ὧ in order to see whether it conforms with the practice followed in Greek pagan hymns, prayers and other addresses to gods. God is generally invoked with vocatives used without ὧ: 1.1.33.5, 6, 1.1.34.14, 15, 19, 1.1.35.1, 1.1.36.1, 8, 19, 28, 1.1.37.2, 6, 1.1.38.6, 2.1.38.1, 5-11, 15, 27-28, 37, 1.1.31.12, 1.1.30.36, 48, 1.1.32.2, 46, and 1.1.29.13. This is the normal pattern of prayers and addresses to gods in early Greek epic poetry (Homer, Hesiod)1, adhered to also by the Alexandrian epic writers (Callimachus, Apollonius Rhodius)2. However, there are seven instances of ὧ vocatives in our hymns which may be divided into three types: 1) 1.1.33.1 = 1.1.34.1, 12: ὧ ἰδντων ἔσκαλε, 1.1.29.1, 16), 2) 2.1.38.26: ὧ φῶς, and 3) 1.1.36.31: ὧ ἄνα χριστέ. The first and second types follow the

1. This has been elucidated by J.A. Scott, 'The vocative in Homer and Hesiod', AJP, 24(1903), 192-6.
practice of tragedians (Aeschylus, Sophocles) by conforming: the first to Scott's rule that 'the interjection must be used with an adjective in the vocative, when the adjective is used without a substantive, unless the substantive idea is given by the context'; and the second to his rule that 'the interjection must be used in addresses or apostrophe to inanimate objects or abstract qualities'.

The use of ω in the third case may be explained by analogy to the religious epicletic formula: ω ἄναξ(ξ) ≠ name of Apollo (or even Zeus) which is found first in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo (179,526), later in early lyric poets and sparingly in Greek tragedy (see Giangrande art.cit., pp.25ff. and MacLennan on Callim. hymn. Jov. 8 for such vocatives in Callimachus).

We may say in conclusion that in avoiding ω the poet of our hymns adheres with a high degree of accuracy both to the stylistic usage of the vocative as fixed in epic genre by Homer and to the style of NT in which ω completely vanished from prayers (see Scott, AJP, 26 (1905), p.43 n.1) in opposition for instance to the contemporary epic writer Quintus Smyrnaeus who uses ω in Scott's estimations seventy times in less than 125 vocatives, although he is an otherwise extremely accurate Homerist (see Scott, AJP, 24 (1903), p.195).

A feature similar to the above is the avoidance of the article in an elevated, sacred or religious context such as the hymn (see Adami p.242). While 1.1.33 and 1.1.35 have no articles, in 1.1.34, 1.1.29, 1.1.36, 1.1.37 and 1.1.38 this is used once or twice, usually needed by the meaning: e.g. 1.1.34.2 τὰ νοματα, τὰ ὁρατα and 1.1.36.11: τὴν (standing for the pronoun τὴν). In the two elegiac hymns (2.1.38, 1.1.31) it is used four and five times respectively sometimes

---

1. See J.A.Scott, 'Additional notes on the vocative', AJP, 26 (1905), 32-43 and Idem,'The vocative in Aeschylus and Sophocles', AJP, 25 (1904), 81-84 where both rules appear (p.82f.).
unavoidably. However, great departure from this rule is seen in 1.1.30 and 1.1.32 in which it is used thirteen and nineteen times respectively. This may be explained from the fact that both hymns are written in a 'sermo vulgari' (or 'Umgangssprache')\(^1\), and a somewhat 'loose' metre (anacreontics and non-quantitative metre) so that their style departs from the solemnity of the previous hymns (written in hexameters or elegiacs).

With regard to the word-pattern of the hexameter and the elegiac couplet we observe that the poet occasionally employs the stylistic device whereby an adjective (or participle) and the noun it describes occupy each: a) the first _sedes_ of the two lines in an elegiac couplet: 2.1.38.21-22: /ἀπλωνές .../ ἀπέρες (see the note _ad loc._), or, b) the first and last _sedes_ of the same line: 2.1.38.46, 1.1.35.9: ταφαρσῶν ... ἐςεύων following thus a common pattern in epic poetry (see the note _ad loc._ and Wifstrand, _Von Kallimachos zu Nonnos_, pp.133ff.).

The hexameters are usually not self-contained, since the poet expands the sentence to more than one line by the regular use of enjambement. An important type of enjambement is that where the sense continues into the first foot or second princeps of the following line, after which there is a break or pause: 1.1.33.3, 8, 9, 1.1.34.2, 17, 1.1.35.2, 3, 1.1.36.11, 13, 15, and 1.1.29.9. Such enjambement is extremely common, among others, in Callimachus (see McLennan on Call. hymn. Joy. 11 and his Appendix I, and West, _Greek Metre_, p.153) and in Nonnus (see West p.177).

In the case of the elegiac couplet we see that the poet follows the earlier elegists in largely avoiding enjambement between two or

---

1. The two terms are taken from Scott, _AJP_, 26 (1905), p. 42 and Giangrande, _art.cit._, p.32 respectively.
more successive elegiac couplets (see McLennan’s edition of Callima-
chus’s Hymn to Zeus, Appendix I, particularly pp.140ff.).

Self-contained lines of the form abba (or other similar types)
in which two adjectives are attributed to two nouns do not appear
in these hymns and are very rare in other hexameters of Gregory as
well (see Sykes pp.58ff. and Wifstrand, op.cit., p.138).

The symmetry and balance in our hymns is the result, not only of
the careful arrangement of the various themes, but also, and above all,
of the extensive use of rhetorical figures: a) antithesis which may
be produced either by μέν - δὲ (1.1.32.25,27), or by the juxta-
position of antithetical words: ἡμιβροτής μου βροτής ἔτε (2.1.38.27),
b) anaphora, isocolon, homoioteleuton (1.1.29.2a,3a), c) chiasmus
(1.1.30.20-21), d) asyndeton or polysyndeton (2.1.38.8-12a; 1.1.31.11),
e) repetitions1 and anadiplosis (1.1.29.1=16, 1.1.32.30f.), f) oxymoron (1.1.29.10b) and g) alliteration (of –σ– in the three-
syllable sigmatismus in 1.1.29.2,3; see the note ad loc.).

The use of such figures is common in Gregory’s poetry in general
(see Pellegrino pp.93ff., Jungck p.24 n.13, Cummings p.76f. and
Knecht on carm.1.2.29, Index C (pp.142-44)); and is generally thought
to be the result of the influence of rhetoric upon him, so that the
view of Carpenter that Gregory was a rhetorician in his poems and a
poet in his orations seems to have some validity3.

We come now to the question of imagery and themes in our poems.
Since they are hymns of a concise length there is little space in

1. See below Appendix III.
2. Such figures are abundant in Gregory’s orations too: see M.
Guignet, S. Grégoire de Nazianze et la rhétorique, (diss.,Paris,
1911),106ff. and Ruether pp.59ff.
3. See M.Carpenter, ’The paper that Romanos swallowed’, Speculum,
7 (1932), 3-22 (p.22); cf. Norden, Die antike Kunstprosa, vol.2,
pp.562ff.
them for extended use of imagery. However, they occasionally contain some similes and metaphors: a) the series of four metaphors all taken from the natural world in 2.1.38.34-36 (see the notes ad loc.), b) the comparison of the sun (overshadowing with its light the stars) with Christ (surpassing the 'minds') in 2.1.38.15-16 (see the notes ad loc.), c) the image of the creation (as a whole, or in various parts) praising its Creator is a very common theme in our hymns (1.1.30.5-12, 1.1.31.7-10, 1.1.29.6-7), d) various Biblical images: the picturesque scene of the throne in heaven in 1.1.34.4-13, and the Exodus theme and the calming by Christ of the sea-storm in 1.1.36.3-11 and 17-18 respectively, and finally e) various light-images (so common a theme in various philosophico-religious areas), mainly used to describe the relationship of the three persons of the Trinity (2.1.38.5,6,8,26, 1.1.36.28, 1.1.38.6 and the entirety of 1.1.32). Such images are commonly used by Gregory, above all in his orations. Examination of the imagery in Gregory's poetry may be found in Pellegrino pp.49ff, and Sykes pp.61-65, in his orations in Ruether pp.86-105 and Guignet, op.cit., pp.131-86, and in his epistles in Gallay, Langue et Style, pp.82-87.

The use of divine epithets in our hymns has particular importance since, as happens also in the Greek pagan hymns, this is one of the main ways of praising God. (see above p.25ff.) They may be divided into: a) universal epithets as they are used of many Greek gods in-

---

1. Ruether (p.86) remarks that from the study of Gregory's use of images in his orations it becomes clear that there is no essential difference in the way he uses simile and metaphor.'


differently: ἀμβροτος (1.1.33.11), ἀφθωνος (1.1.30.1), b) epithets of a restricted application, used of only one or a few Greek gods: εὐρυμέδων (2.1.38.8), πανεπίσκοπος (1.1.35.1: see the note ad loc.), c) epithets originating in Greek philosophy: δημιουργός (2.1.38.11), or extensively used in Greek philosophy as the negative epithets: ἀναρχος (2.1.38.7). In our hymns there are nine such epithets, some of which are the poet's own coinages. An explanation for Gregory's use of both negative and positive epithets to describe God may be found in his or.28.9 (Gallay p.118; M.36.37A): δει προς τῷ εἴηετν ἢ μὴ ἐστι, καὶ δ ἐστιν εἴηετν ... ξα ἐκ τῆς ἀναρεύεσσες ὧν ὦκ ἐστι, καὶ τῆς οὗ ἐστι θεότερος, περιλαμβάνεται νοοῦμενον1. A final category of epithets (d) includes those which apply only to the Christian God and are: 1) used by other patristic writers: πανσθενής (2.1.38.10), 2) taken from the Bible: σοφαγίς, εὐκόμον (2.1.38.7)2, and 3) formed by the poet himself: πατροφάνης (2.1.38.5), πανώμυμος (1.1.29.13).

According to Gregory these epithets (προσηγορίας, κλήσεως) may describe God's οὖσα (or.30.18 (Gallay p.262; M.36.125B)), or His attributes (ἰδιότητες) in which case they may be subdivided into: a) προσηγορία τῆς ἐξουσίας, and b) προσηγορία τῆς οἰκονομίας (ib.19 (p.264f.;128BC))5.

From the above it appears that the poet of our hymns combines the trends of Greek pagan hymnographers (particularly of the later period) in using categories (a) and (b). (although he avoids complete-

1. An accumulation of eight negative epithets may be found in or. 41.9 (M.36.441B), used of the Holy Spirit. On Gregory's negative theology in general see Moreschini pp.1374-78, Gottwald p.19, Smolak p.443 n.58 and Sykes on carm.1.1.3.41.
2. All the divine epithets appearing in the Bible and early Christian texts have been collected and examined by Deichgräber: see R. Deichgräber, Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit, (Göttingen, 1967), particularly pp.87ff. and pp. 178ff. for God's and Christ's epithets respectively.
3. See or.28.13 (Gallay p.126; M.36.410).
4. See or.30.19 (Gallay p.266; M.36.128C).
5. See Theodorou art. cit., p.243f, and below the note on 1.1.33.1.
ly for obvious reasons epithets related to an anthropomorphic conception of God) with epithets applying to a monotheistic conception of God (used not only of the Christian God, but featuring also in Greek philosophy and other relevant areas).

A final point to discuss in this chapter is the allusions to previous authors. Apart from the range of pagan and Christian hymns and prayers, and the texts from various philosophico-religious areas (which are all compared in certain aspects with our hymns below in the commentary) one may here refer briefly to some allusions to other texts. First come the Homeric formulae in 1.1.33.11 (Il.8.539), 1.1.34.9a (Il.7.415), ib.23 (Il.5.2), 2.1.38.45b (Il.20.350) and 1.1.37.4a (Il.9.238).

The poet uses the periphrasis ὄμμα τὸ νυκτὸς of the moon recalling Pind. Olymp.3.20 and Aesch. Sept.390 (see the note below ad loc.) and in 1.1.35.14b he recalls Aristoph. Nubes 357. The phrase in 2.1.38.41b may be compared to AP.7.439.4 (Theodor.).

Most of the Biblical allusions are easily recognizable and so do not need here any particular comment apart from the observation that the poet appears innovatory in presenting Biblical ideas mainly with epic language and above all in replacing the Biblical words with philosophical ones (see below the note on carm.2.1.38.26: νόες οὐρανύωνες).

A collection of allusions to Greek literature in Gregory's poetry in general may be found in Dubedout pp.81-96, Stoppel pp.3-19, A.Rzach, 'Zu den Nachklängen hesiodischer Poesie', Wiener Studien, 21 (1899), 198-215, Sykes pp.65-68 and Cummings pp.61-64 (including also Biblical allusions). As has been observed, the echoes of and allusions to Greek literature in the writings of a trained rhetorician like Gregory do not necessarily imply direct knowledge of the original source; many such passages may have been known to him simply as excerpts transmitted by the rhetorical tradition.' (see Cummings p.61).
I.5. Metre

Following the practice of other scholars in this chapter I examine first various metrical aspects of the hexameter and elegiac hymns (quantity, hiatus, caesura and diaeresis, the long monosyllable, the proportion of dactyls and spondees) in order to assess the place of these poems in the history of these types of metre.

I then analyse the metre of 1.1.30 in connection with other poems written in a similar metre. In the case of 1.1.32 I summarize the various theories provided to explain its metrical structure and, finally, I examine all the hymns of the present research with regard to the position of the final accent in each line.

A) Hexameter and Elegiac Hymns

Examination of these hymns may begin with the question of prosody.

1. The short vowel before a combination of a plosive and a liquid or nasal consonant remains short (as happens sometimes in Homer: see Monro, Homerian Grammar, 370), or becomes long according to the metrical requirements. This may be illustrated with the following examples where, as we see, the poet uses in close position the same (or cognate) word but with a different quantity.

a) ἄχρον - ἄχροτατον both in 2.1.38.6
b) ἑγρετο - ἑγρετο 2.1.38.44 - 2.1.38.40
c) δὲ πρός - σὲ πρῶτον 1.1.36.15 - 2.1.38.1
d) οὐ βροτός 1.1.33.8

e) τὲ δρόμον - ὑφίδρομος 1.1.36.9 - 2.1.38.15
f) Πάτρος - πάτρος 2.1.38.7 - 1.1.35.7
Similar observations have been made by Sykes (p.47) on Gregory's Arcana poems (in hexameters), Davids (p.147f.) on the elegiac poems: carm.1.2.31, 1.2.29, 1.2.14 (910-15,884-908,755-65), Stoppel (p.20), on Gregory's iambic poetry, and Cummings (p.50f.) and Jungck (p.35) on De Vita Sua.

The above practice is followed in other late epic poems too: see for the Orphic Hymns Quandt p.40* and for the Hymns of Proclus Vogt p.43.

2. In the present hymns there is one example of a short vowel which does not become long before \( \nu \): 1.1.37.4 τέμνω. For other examples in Gregory's poetry see Werhahn's note on Comparatio Vitarum 33 (p.35) and Cummings p.51.

3. Short syllables ending in a consonant are lengthened in arsis, although the next word begins with a vowel. There are four examples of this licence in our hymns: 1.1.36.2 ὄδὸς ἔστα (also in 1.1.37.3), 1.1.36.18 μετὰ ἁμέραν ἄνεμου, 1.1.36.33 ἐσθλὸν ἐπ', and 1.1.38.3 οὐρανόθεν ὀσας. This licence appears in Homer (see Monro 375) and in Callimachus and Euphorion (see Maas 128). However, the above examples appear rather to conform to the practice followed in the Orphic Hymns (see Quandt p.40*). The same licence has been observed in Gregory's Arcana (see Sykes p.49). See also West p.156 and 179.

4. In these hymns there are some examples where the quantity of \( \alpha, \iota, \upsilon \) varies for the same word. These are: ἀνευσφημω - ἀναγώ (both in 1.1.31.2), νὸῦ (1.1.36.33) - νὸῦ (1.1.38.5), ἀδῦνα (2.1.38.41) - ἀδύνατος (1.1.33.8). Such variable quantities are common in

5. The practice described in (3) and (4) is followed also in the pentameters when a short vowel precedes the middle caesura: 1.1.31.10 

| u | v | o | v | u |

This licence has been observed by Dubedout (p. 107) who gives other examples taken from other elegiac poems of Gregory, (see West p. 181f.)

**Hiatus**

Most examples of hiatus in these hymns conform to the regular Homeric patterns and they may be divided into the following categories:

a) Epic corretion. There are thirty-three cases where hiatus is used to shorten a preceding long syllable and these are arranged in the hexameter as is shown below.

| u | v | u | v | u | v | u |

On hiatus in Homer and other Greek poets see Monro 380, Maas 129 and West, *Greek Metre*, p. 11f., and in Gregory's *De Vita Sua* and some of his elegiac poems see Cummings p. 60 and Davids p. 148f.; also Sykes pp. 51-53.

Two further cases of hiatus appear also in the pentameter:

| u | v | u | v | u | v | u |

in 1.1.31.12 and 2.1.38.32 respectively.

b) Hiatus where the preceding vowel is short occurs in 1.1.36.25 and 2.1.38.17 at the trochaic-caesura of the third foot and in 1.1.37.1 and 2.1.38.13 before the bucolic diaeresis (see Monro 382 and for the same practice in the Orphic Hymms Quandt p. 41).

c) The hiatus in the third foot diaeresis in 1.1.34.28 appears
also in carm.1.1.7.93 (446) and may find, according to Sykes (p.53) its parallel in II.24.593. For other cases in Greek poetry (particularly of the later period) of this licence see R.Keydell, 'Quaestiones metricae de epicis Graecis recentioribus. Accedunt critica varia' (inaug. diss., Univ. Berlin, 1911), p.30f., and in the Orphic Hymns Quandt p.41*.

d) Hiatus before words originally beginning with the digamma (see Monro 388-90 and West p.15). In this category belong five cases, all involving the word ἀναξ: 1.1.36.1, 1.1.37.2,6, 2.1.38.1 and 1.1.36.31 (although this case may fall also under (e)). However, the digamma is not always observed as we see from 2.1.38.15: σολ μεν, ἀναξ. The same attitude towards 'Digamma hiatus' appears in Gregory's Arcana (see Sykes p.51f.; also cf. Dubedout p.107f.) and may be compared to that followed in the Orphic Hymns (see Quandt p.41*) and other late Greek poets (see Keydell, op.cit. p.45f.).

e) In hiatus the preceding long vowel or diphthong may remain unchanged in arsis and seldom in thesis (see Monro 380). In this category belong the cases in 2.1.38.3,41, and 1.1.29.11 (where the diphthongs ωυ and ου are in the arsis) and that in 1.1.36.20 (where ωαξ in hiatus remains long at the fourth biceps).

This kind of hiatus has been observed in Gregory's iambics as well (see Werhahn p.10 and Jungck p.38) and may be compared to that followed in the Orphic Hymns (see Quandt p.41*), and those of Proclus (see Vogt p.44).

In the same category falls also the hiatus occurring once in 2.1.38.20 after the third princeps and before the middle caesura of the pentameter. This kind of hiatus has already been observed in Gregory's pentameters by Bertels (see J.Bertels,'De Pentametro Inscriptionum Graecarum Quaestiones' (diss., Münster, 1912), p.23f.). For examples on this from Greek poetry see West p.158.
Caesura and Diaeresis

From Table 1 (in Appendix I) we see that in 145 hexameters weak (trochaic) caesura in the third foot occurs in 98 lines, strong caesura in the third foot occurs in 47 lines and strong caesura in the fourth foot appears nowhere. This shows a preponderance of the trochaic third caesura. According to similar investigations made by Sykes (p. 53f.) in Gregory's Arcana the ratio between trochaic 3rd and strong 3rd caesurae is 79% : 16.5%, namely far greater than what happens in our hymns where the ratio is 67.59% : 32.41%.

In Homer the ratio is 58.27% : 40.43% (see Monro 367), while in Proclus the trochaic 3rd is used 134 and the strong 52 times, namely in a ratio 72.04% : 27.96% (see Vogt p. 42', and for other epic writers Davids p. 142ff.). Thus, the poet of our hymns shows the influence of post-Homeric verse-techniques (see West p. 177f. and 153f.).

Most of the lines which have a strong 3rd caesura follow the practice of other epic writers (Callimachus, Nonnus) in having also a secondary caesura after the fourth princeps (7th element) or a bucolic diaeresis, or both (see Maas 93). There are two exceptions to this in 1.1.34.5 and 1.1.35.10.

The caesura in the fourth foot, which in Homer occurs once in 100 lines (see Maas 85), is absent from these poems, but appears 35 times in 773 lines of Gregory's Arcana (see Sykes p. 54).

With regard to diaeresis we observe that the poet follows epic practice in avoiding it at the end of the third foot (see Maas 86).

In our hymns there are five cases of a σπονδεύτων hexameter: 1.1.34.4, 10, 1.1.31.7, 1.1.37.7 and 2.1.38.21. In all these cases, as well as in nine more from Gregory's Arcana (see Sykes p. 55), the verse ends with a four-syllable word following the Homeric practice of avoiding diaeresis after the spondee of the fifth foot (see Monro 368; also West p. 154 and 178).
Finally, the caesura after the second princeps featuring in 1.1.33.3, 8, 9, 1.1.34.17 and 1.1.35.2, 3 is discussed in connection with the feature of enjambement above (p. 45f.).

The long Monosyllable

From Table 2 (in Appendix I) it appears that the poet avoids the long monosyllable in the 3rd and 6th principes (5th and 11th elements) and 5th and 6th bicephala (10th and 12th elements), while he uses it mainly in the 1st, 2nd and 5th principes (1st, 3rd and 9th elements). In this he follows the practice of post-Homeric epic poets (see A. Wifstrand, Von Kallimachos zu Nonnos, Publications of the New Society of Letters at Lund, 16 (Lund, 1933), pp. 55ff., and Maas 99). Similar practice has been observed by Sykes (pp. 55ff.) for Gregory's Arcana.

The Proportion of Dactyls and Spondees

In their study of Gregory's hexameters Sykes (p. 57) and Davids (pp. 143ff.) pointed out that dactyls outnumbered spondees in the proportion of 5 to 1. As we see from Table 3 (Appendix I) for our poems this proportion is 4 to 1. In Homer and Hesiod the ratio of dactyls to spondees is roughly 2½ : 1 and a similar figure may be given for Callimachus and Asclepiades, while later writers tend to employ fewer spondees: in Quintus the ratio is 4½ : 1, and in Nonnus and Proclus 5½ : 1 (see Davids pp. 150ff.). Our poet thus appears to follow the practice of late epic writers (see West p. 177f. and 154).

The above observations apply also to the pentameters as we see from Table 5 (Appendix I). Here the spondees are absent from the second hemiepes.

B) Carm. 1.1.30

We come now to examine the metre of 1.1.30. The poem is written in ionic dimeters: uu--uu-- (b), or ionic dimeters with anaclasis:
uu-u-v-\(\text{-}\) (a) (known as anacreontics: see West p.168 and D.S.Raven, *Greek Metre* (London, 1962), p.84). There is, however, one irregularity in the metre of line 3 where the word δεξιότης, scanning \(-u-\), stands in the place of \(-v-\). This has been noticed by Boissonade who emended it by replacing, in his edition of this hymn, this word with δυνάςτην (see J.F. Boissonade, *Lyrici Graeci. Poetarum Graecorum Sylloge*, vol. 15 (Paris, 1825), pp. 161-63 (text) and p. 216f. (notes)). However, since there is no evidence from the MSS for such emendation I would rather agree with Nissen to retain δεξιότης by regarding the metre of this line as a variant of the anaclastic form (a) (see T. Nissen, 'Die Byzantinischen Anakreonten', *Sitzungsber. Bayer. Akad. Wiss., Philos.-hist. Kl. Abteilung*, 3 (München, 1940), p. 7). The poet seems here to have been influenced by the accent of this word and treated its accented short syllable as long and the preceding unaccented long as short (see West p. 164).

In line 19 the metre is uu---u-\(\text{-}\). In order to restore the ionic dimeter Scheidweiler emended τψ with τζ (see Scheidweiler, *BZ*, 49 (1956), p. 346). This has been suggested earlier by Nissen too (p. 7). However, as it stands, the metre of this line has been used occasionally, among others, by Synesius (see Terzaghi p.xxxiif. and West p.168).

As we saw in the case of hexameter and elegiac hymns, here too the short vowel before a combination of a plosive and a liquid may either remain short (\(\upsilon \varphi p : 28, \upsilon \chi p : 51,44\)), or become long (\(\tau \rho p; 27, \tau \chi p : 35\)).

The poet uses alternately the above two types of metre, beginning with (a), namely abab etc. Nevertheless, this order is reversed: 1) in lines 8-9 (where instead of ba we have ab), 2) is broken after line 16 (b), (as the following line is also (b)), and 3) in line 19 (which, as we have said above, is a form of (a), while the order requires (b)).
The second disturbance in the sequence of the two types of metre, namely the absence of an anacolastic dimeter (a) between lines 16 and 17 has been observed by Scheidweiler and Musurillo. To restore the order the former scholar claims that line 16 should be omitted because it repeats the content of line 13 (see Scheidweiler, art. cit. p.346); while the latter thinks that 'a line has been lost after line 16, which must have referred to the union of the Father and the Son in the creation of the world' (see H. Musurillo, 'The poetry of Gregory of Nazianzus', Thought, 45(1970), 45-55 (p.53 n.24). The rejection of both suggestions is made below in the commentary on 1.1.30.16.

Dubedout (p.99) remarks that this poem may be divided into five strophes of unequal number of lines (12,12,11,12,4). However, since these units are of unequal length and there is no metrical agreement between them (see West p.5), I do not think that this remark can be taken seriously, although these units correspond to sense-divisions (see below the introductory analysis to this hymn).

Gregory wrote another poem with the same metre, namely carm.1. 2.7 (648f.). It consists of ten lines only in the order bbbaaaaaba. Hanssen and Mercati have shown that the epitaph in Paulum :carm.2. (epit.)2.129 (M.38.79-82), also in anacreontics, is spurious.¹

The anacreontic was a popular metre in the imperial period, particularly in many of the Anacreontea (see West p.168). Yet, neither in these, nor in the poems of John of Gaza, Georgios Grammatikos and others, which are found in the Appendix Anacreonticorum (PLG iii pp.339-75 Bergk), are the ionic dimeters used in so great a degree and alternately to anacreontics as happens in our hymn.

¹ See G.S. Mercati, 'Di un carme anacreontico spurio e mutilo di Gregorio Nazianzeno', BZ, 17(1908), 389-96 and F. Hanssen, 'Accentus grammatici in metris Anacreontico et hemiambico quae sit vis et ratio explicatur', Philologus, Suppl. 5 (1889), 197-228. (p. 204 n.11).
In writing his hymn in this metre Gregory in not alone. Synesius too wrote his fifth and ninth hymns in the same metre using not only the two types mentioned above, but also \( uu--u-u \) (as in line 19): see Terzaghi p.xxxiiif., Nissen, op.cit., pp.9-13 and Wilamowitz, Sitz. Berlin.Akad.,i (1907), p.290f.

C) \textit{Carm.1.1.32}

Let us now discuss the metre of 1.1.32. This hymn, together with \textit{Exhortatio ad Virgines} : \textit{carm.1.2.3} (632-40), is generally regarded as written in an early form of a non-quantitative metre (see West, p.162ff.). The peculiarity of its metre seems to have been the reason why the hymn is preserved in the poetic and prose MSS in three forms: 1) in 50 short lines, 2) in long lines (of two short verses each), and 3) in prose form, although even here the cola are usually marked with dots.

In non-quantitative metre the accent is regulated in each line and the total number of metrical syllables is the same (after taking into account any synecphoneis/synizesis)\ldots This has led Christ and Paranikas in their edition of the first 28 lines of this hymn to violate it by making arbitrary changes to its text, so that all lines (with the exception of line 13) became heptasyllabic (see W. Christ - M.Paranikas, \textit{Anthologia Graeca Carminum Christianorum} (Leipzig,1871), p.29 (text) and p.xiiif.). They went on to consider this heptasyllabic line as an accentuated hemiamb (based not on the

\[\text{\begin{footnotesize}1. This type of poetry is called by some 'rhythmic' (see Pellegrino p.77 and Meyer, 'Die zwei rhythmischen Gedichte des Gregor von Nazianz', p.141) or 'unprosodic' (see Hanssen, \textit{Philologus} 44 (1885), 228-235); while Maas 24 speaks of a 'Byzantine (stress-regulated) metric'and Wilamowitz, \textit{Die Griechische Literatur und Sprache} (Berlin-Leipzig, 1912), p.297 of 'Akzentierende Poesie'.\end{footnotesize}}\]
quantity of the syllables, but on the dynamic accent) in the form: $x \times x \times x \times x \times x$. In this they seem to have been influenced by a scholion in Cod. Monacensis gr. 416 (Mo) which describes the metre of this poem as hemiambic (see apparatus criticus of 1.1.32).

Hanssen (Philologus, 44, p.232), followed by Nissen (Die Byzantinischen Anakreonten', p.8f.), rejected this idea, because hemiambics, as the metre of jocular and satirical poetry are used in carm.2.1.88 (1435-42), but are in his view inappropriate to the hymnic content of this poem.

Another scholion which is found in various forms in a number of MSS could throw some light on the problem of the metrical construction of our hymn. In Cod. Parisinus Coislianus gr. 56 (D) it reads: ύμνος ἐπερμνός ἤτοι πρὸς τῷ τέλει εὐρυμένος·δύονος τῷ κερὶ παραευν-ας (see also the appar. crit. ad loc.). But the metre of Exhortatio ad Virgines is no less obscure. The only thing we know about it comes from another scholion found at the beginning of this poem in a number of MSS in which we are told that in this poem Gregory has imitated Sophron, the mime writer from Syracuse: 'Ἐν τούτῳ τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ Συρακούσαν εὐφροσύνα μιμεῖται· οὗτος γὰρ μόνος κοινήγων εὐθύμων τιτι (τιτιν /V/, τε Billy) καὶ κάλως ἐχρησάτο μετρικῆς (κοινηκῆς D, Billy) ἀναλογίας καταφρονήσας (L,D,/V/). According to the Suda Sophron wrote mimes καταλογίδονυ. This testimony is interpreted by Körte (RE s.v. 'Sophron', 1103) as meaning that Sophron wrote in prose. On the other hand, Norden in his Die antike Kunstprosa, vol. 1, p.46ff. divided into cola some of Sophron's fragments which are edited in Kaibel, CGF,i,p.152ff. following the scholion on the Ex-
hortatio ad Virgines. The long papyrus fragment of a mime, most

probably belonging to Sophron and discovered in recent years sheds some light to the way Sophron wrote his mimes. For its text see e.g. Page, Greek Literary Papyri, fr. 73 (pp. 328-31). It is written in cola of unequal number of syllables (varying from seven to ten, with the octasyllabic cola predominating) in which the colon-end coincides with the word-end (see G. Vitelli - M. Norsa, 'Da un Mimo di Sophron', Stud. Ital. Filol. Clas., 10 (1932), 119-24 (p. 120)). Despite Gallavotti's attempt to explain the metrical structure of this fragment, our problem remains unsolved, since Gallavotti disproves the validity of the scholion at the beginning of 1.2.3 and thus sees no real connection with regard to metre between 1.2.3 and Sophron's Mime (see C. Gallavotti, 'Per il nuovo Sophrone', Riv. di Filol., 11 (1933), 459-76 (p. 470).

Another view expressed by Meyer and Bouvy is that both poems (1.1.32, 1.2.3) are written in rhythmic hexameters (see Meyer op. cit., p. 50 and Pellegrino p. 79 n. 1; also Christ-Paranikas, AGCC, p. xiv). However, such a view was correctly challenged by Pellegrino (p. 79f.). He compared both poems (divided in long lines) with the first one hundred hexameters of carm. 1.2.1 (520-30) and showed that while the majority of the hexameters contains 16 or 17 syllables, in the case of the two rhythmic poems the lines with 14 syllables prevail. Moreover, the first hemistich of the hexameters is usually shorter than the second, while in the rhythmic poems it is usually equal or longer.

The majority of the 14-syllable lines led Dubedout (p. 110) and Pellegrino (p. 80) to reject the opinion of Lambeccius that the two poems are written in catalectic or catalectic iambic tetrameters.

A final theory with regard to the 'metrical accent' is that provided by Hanssen (art. cit. p. 234f.). He first observed that the fifth syllable of the heptasyllabic and octasyllabic cola is unaccented with the exception of 1.2.3.34b, 56a, 1.1.32.17, 181, and that

1. The accent of prepositions, articles and monosyllabic particles is not taken into account.
therefore the heptasyllabic cola are never proparoxytone. He then went on to suggest that these cola are somehow a catalectic form of the octasyllabic in which the metrical accent (which sometimes coincides with the word-accent) is distributed in the form: - - - - - - . To this form he adjusted the heptasyllabic cola by lengthening the penultim: χρώστε μου, λόγε θε-ς -ού (1.1.32.2) and τρύγιοι φωτός εξίς με-λί-αν (ib.5). In the case of the two 9-syllable lines (1.1.32.9,13) Hanssen says that they must be considered as having lengthened the penultim. However, this is only a theory - certainly the most plausible of all.

D) Position of the final accent in the line

A final point to discuss on the metre of our hymns is the place of the final accent. It has been observed that the change from the quantitative to the accented metre took place by the gradual placing of the dynamic accent at a regular position in the line, and that from the first century A.D. there became a trend to end quantitative verses with a paroxytone word (see West pp.162ff. and Maas 21).

From Table 6 (Appendix I) we see that in the case of the hexameters 54.48% of the lines are stressed on the penultim, 26.90% on the antepenultim and 18.62% on the ultim. Similar is the versification of Nonnus who avoids proparoxytones and oxytones of more than two syllables in which the last is short (see West p.180).

In the case of the pentameters we observe a complete aversion to an accented syllable at the end of the line, a tendency which begins in the Hellenistic period and is gradually increased in the imperial times (see F.Hanssen, 'Ein musikalisches Accentgesetz in der quantitirenden Poesie der Griechen', Rhein.Mus.,N.F.38 (1883),
In Hanssen's calculations (p.231) in 1473 pentameters Gregory ends only 14 lines with an accented syllable (i.e. 1%). The predominance of the lines in a stressed penultim is even higher than in the hexameters: 88.57%.

The position of the final accent in Gregory's anacreontics has been examined by Hanssen (Philologus, suppl., 5(1889), 197-228 (p.211)) who gives similar figures to the present ones: 78.7% of the lines end with a word stressed on the penultim, 8.2% on the ultim and 13.1% on the antepenultim.

Finally, similar figures apply in the case of 1.1.32, as well as for Gregory's iambics in which the ratio is 18.9% (final accent on the ultim), 64.3% (penult.) and 17.8% (antepenult.) : see Hanssen, Rhein. Mus., 38(1883), p.236f., West p.184 and Cummings p.53f.). From Table 7 (Appendix I) we see that the majority of the cola in 1.1.32 are the heptasyllabic most of which are stressed on the penultim.
I. 6. Manuscripts

The task for the production of a critical edition of the Gregorian poetic corpus was first attempted by Leo Sternbach and his collaborators under the auspices of the Academy of Cracow. Unfortunately, in the disaster of the second world war all the unpublished material disappeared\(^1\). Later, H.M. Werhahn made a collection of microfilms and collations from the various MSS with Gregorian poems, the study of which led him to divide them into twenty groups. The result of this research is the unpublished 'Übersichtstabellen zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung der Gedichte Gregors von Nazianz' (Aachen, 1967). Since 1971 Werhahn's research project has been taken over by Prof. M. Sicherl of the Institut für Altertumskunde in the University of Münster under the auspices of Görres-Gesellschaft\(^2\). The complete works are published in the series 'Forschungen zu Gregor von Nazianz', and the first two volumes have already come to light\(^3\). But, although the research in groups I, XI, XVIII and XX was announced in the second Symposium Nazianzenum to have reached an advanced stage, nothing has been published yet\(^4\).

Professor Sicherl was very kind to send me the first collation of the majority of the MSS containing my poems. I have at my disposal also some photographs or photostats with the hymns under discussion.

I have seen in the original only Cod. C (see below). From this it becomes obvious that only a provisional text may be established, the final and more accurate form of which will appear only after consulting all the MSS in the original and when the research on their stematic relationship, undertaken by Prof. M. Sicherl and his colleagues is completed. However, as may be seen from the Abstract, the establishment of a critical text, as accurate as the external evidence allows it to be, is not the primary purpose of the present research.

The hymns under discussion may be divided into four groups according to the MSS in which they appear. The first group contains 1.1.31, and 1.1.33 - 1.1.35 which are found in two MSS only, while 1.1.31 appears also in Cod. Np. None of these MSS is included in any of Werhahn's twenty groups of MSS.

The second group is formed of 1.1.36 and 2.1.38. These poems appear in MSS from Werhahn's group V and XVIII. Two of these MSS include also 1.1.37 and 1.1.38. The third group contains 1.1.30 and 1.1.32 which are both found in MSS belonging to Werhahn's group XX, while the former poem alone appears also in Werhahn's group XII and the latter in XI. Besides, the latter poem is also extant in Syriac and Arabic MSS. In the fourth group belongs only 1.1.29 which (with regard to its Gregorian MSS) is found in Werhahn's group XX.

Group A (1.1.31 and 1.1.33 - 1.1.35)

W = Vindobonensis Theologus 43 (s. xv)

It is a miscellaneous codex the first part of which contains

1. See André de Halleux, 'La Version syriaque des Discours de Grégoire de Nazianze' and Jacques Grand Henry, 'La Tradition manuscrite de la Version arabe des "Discours" de Grégoire de Nazianze', both in II. Symposium Nazianzenum, pp.75-111 (particularly p.87f.), and pp.113-18 respectively.
an anthology of 126 Gregorian poems (see D. Nessel, Catalogus ... Codicum MSS Graecorum ... Bibliothecae Caesareae Vindobonensis, vol. 1 (Vindobonae, 1690), p. 126f.). According to the information I received from Prof. Sicherl the MS contains 1.1.30, 1.1.32 in ff. 79v-80r (vv. 29-40/ 41-50: W) - cited in short lines - and in ff. 110v-111r (vv. 1-50: W II), 1.1.34 in f. 80rv (1-21/ 22-30), 1.1.31 in f. 80v, 1.1.33 in f. 86v (with incorrect verse-division between lines 4-6, although the end of each line is marked with an angle L) and 1.1.35 in ff. 86v-87r (1-11/ 12-13) (also with incorrect verse-division in lines 3-4). All the poems, apart from 1.1.30 and 1.1.32 (W II), are available to me on photostats.

Werhahn considers these poems dubious because they are found only in Cod. W (in his view in a dubious environment) and in Cod. Bg which is described below (see Werhahn, TU 92, p. 342f.).

Let us see in more detail from the photostats what poems precede or follow our hymns and how. In f. 79v, before 1.1.32.29-50, there are lines 2-14 and 15-20 of Gregory's carm. 1.1.16 (477f.) cited as two separate poems and written in iambics. The latter section (i.e. lines 15-20) is entitled 'Ελλωσαλον θεοματα and without even ending with a fullstop it is followed by 1.1.32.29-50, a poem with far shorter lines, without any sign to show that this is part of a different poem. The style of the handwriting shows that the scribe is the same in both poems. However, the change from one poem to the other was noticed by a Latin annotator who added in the margin: 'Desunt: o versus hic, qui in Paris. extant.' and 'haec non videntur huc pertainere, extant in hymno vespertino, infra. suntq(ue) illius extremi'. The first marginal note refers to carm. 1.1.16 and informs us that a number of 5 (70?) lines are missing which are found in the Paris edition (possibly that of 1609-11 by de Billy - Morel). However, from 1.1.16 only lines 21-30 (i.e. 10 lines) are omitted. In the
second note the annotator correctly observes that the short verses belong to 1.1.32 (Hymnus Vespertinus) which appears in its complete form later in ff.110v-111r.

Between the two poems (1.1.16 and 1.1.32) there is a lacuna of at least 39 lines (i.e. the last 10 lines of 1.1.16 and the first 28 of 1.1.32). The most probable explanation for this is that one or more leaves of the MS from which Cod. W was copied had been lost and the scribe of Cod. W was too careless to have noticed it.

After 1.1.32, 29-50 follow 1.1.34 and 1.1.31. A Latin marginal note (of a different handstyle than the one mentioned above) at the beginning of each poem informs us that these poems are absent from the extant editions: 'deest in editis'.

Following the above poems and before 1.1.33 and 1.1.35 are in turn carm.2.1.21, 1.1.17 and 2.2.8 which is entitled 'Ἀμφιλοχίου ἐκκοιμήσεως Ἰδοῦντος' and 2.1.99 with the heading 'τοῦ θεολόγου' (which implies that the poems from 2.1.99 onwards belong to Gregory).

Werhahn was led to consider the hymns of this group as dubious by the fact that: a) 2.1.21 reappears in Cod. W in f.111r (as does also 1.1.32), b) 1.1.17 is separated from its sister poem 1.1.16 and c) 2.2.8 is a non-Gregorian poem. However, repetitions of the same poem in MSS need not surprise us, since these appear also in the edition by de Billy (ed.1609-11), most probably because it was based on MSS containing such repetitions. On the other hand, the separation of 1.1.16 from 1.1.17 appears also in the same edition by de Billy (in which different poems are inserted between the two poems). Finally, and contrary to what Werhahn thinks, the attribution by the

copyist of 2.2.8 to Amphilochius supports the Gregorian authorship of our hymns and so does also the addition of the heading τοῦ θεολόγου at the end of 2.2.8 and before 2.1.99. It appears therefore that Werhahn casts doubts on the authenticity of these poems without strong reasons.

Bg = Vaticanus Borgianus gr. 22 (s. xv) in membr. (ff. I, 168).

The codex consists of two main parts: one with the Ps.-Dionysian De Divinis Nominibus (ff. 5-115), and the other with the Platonic Epinomis (ff. 116-145) and fragments of Platonic epistles (ff. 146-154v). The part with ff. 156-167 (in chart.) has been inserted in the MS and contains excerpts of philosophical works by Thomas, Proclus, Plotinus and Plato which were written in Latin possibly by Marsilius Ficinus (see P. F. de' Cavalieri, Codices graeci Chisiani et Borgiani (Rome, 1927), p. 137f.).

In this MS 1.1.30-1.1.35 appear in various folia. From the photostats at my disposal I see that 1.1.30 is found in ff. 1v-2r (1-40/41-51) — where two verses with no clear demarcations are written in the same line — followed by 1.1.32 in f. 2rv (1-32/33-50) under the title ἔμνος ἐσπερνός and written in long lines. Next comes 1.1.34 in f. 2v (1-14) and is completed only in f. 155r (15-30), where it is followed by 1.1.31 in f. 155rv (1-2/3-12) and 1.1.33 in f. 155v. Finally, 1.1.35 appears, unfortunately very badly preserved, in f. 168r with incorrect verse-division in lines 3 and 4 (as happens also in Cod. W).

The first poem (1.1.30) bears no title, but on the top margin one reads in parenthesis: 'gregorius nazanzenus'. The poems are written by a second hand, possibly that of Marsilius Ficinus in de' Cavalieri's view. This fact, together with the way they appear in the MS (particularly 1.1.34 which is written on two well-distant folia), show that the hymns are inserted in the MS. A further reason
in favour of their insertion is the fact that (always according to de' Cavalieri) the folia on which our poems appear (ff.1,2,155,168) do not belong to any quire but are loose. Finally, in the top margin of f.168r and above 1.1.35 appears the name of Marsilius Ficinus which de' Cavalieri is right not to consider as indicating the authorship of the poem (as did the 18th-19th cen. Latin annotator: see his note in f.1r), but as only showing the possessor of the codex.

From the above observations we may derive the conclusion that our poems have no authorship connection with the writers of the works included in this MS. The reason for their inclusion in this MS should be sought in the desire of the second hand scribe (most probably that of Marsilius Ficinus) to introduce and end his MS with poetic texts, possibly for the same reason for which 1.1.29 was inserted in the Ps.-Dionysian and Proclean MSS (see below group D).

Now, whether Marsilius Ficinus took all or some of these hymns from a Gregorian MS is for the time being impossible to decide. Nor, is it clear who added Gregory's name in Latin on the top margin of f. 1v. If this was written by Ficinus himself, he is likely to have copied all the poems from a Gregorian MS. However, since Gregory's name appears on top of a non-disputed hymn (1.1.30) it is, I think, more probable that it was added by a much later annotator who knew (possibly from the early editions of Gregory's poems) the ownership of 1.1.30 and implied the same authorship for the rest of the hymns.

Whatever the case may be one thing is certain: the inclusion in Cod. Bg of this group of authentic and disputed hymns shows that they should have something more substantial in common than simply being only hymns to God.

Of these hymns 1.1.31 is found also in:

Np = Neapolitanus Borbon. gr. 128 (II D 32) (s. xv)

The MS contains a 'Dictionarium Graeco-Latinum et Latino-

The hymn is found in f. 130\(^v\). Unfortunately, and despite my repeated efforts I have not yet been able to get hold of any readings of this MS.

Group B (1.1.36 and 2.1.38)

C = Oxoniensis Clarkianus 12 (s. x)

This is the oldest extant MS of the Gregorian poetic corpus and the only one I had the opportunity to see in the original. According to Sternbach Cod. C is the oldest representative of family \(\Omega\), while Cod. L (which is described below) of family \(\Psi\) (see L. Sternbach, EOS, 30 (1927), 349).

The MS contains 1.1.36 on ff. 150\(^f\)-150\(^v\) (1-3/4-26). As we see the hymn is unfortunately preserved incomplete, since the rest of it, together with four other poems, should have been on the missing two leaves after f. 150. Such a loss may be easily attested: a) from the fact that the MS contains, with the exception of the last quire and that with the number \(\Xi\), quires of eight leaves, while quire \(\Xi\) (which includes 1.1.36) contains only six leaves; and b) from the numeration of the poems: while 1.1.36 has in the MS the number \(\Xi\), the first poem in the following leaf has the number \(\Xi\). From this we may imply that the presumed two lost leaves should have contained four poems and the last lines of 1.1.36. The numeration of the poems may explain also why the last unnumbered quire contains only six leaves. In this case the lost leaves are the first two. Quire \(\Xi\) appears between f. 120 and 121 and to be differentiated is marked with an asterisk: ff. 121\(^*\)-126\(^*\). Here too, the last two leaves seem to be missing.

The second hymn (2.1.38) is found in ff. 148\(^v\)-149\(^v\) (1-22/23-45/
The same MS contains also 1.1.30 and 1.1.32 (see below group C).

L = Laurentianus plut. 7,10 (s. xi)

It is the second oldest MS which contains most of Gregory's poems and has been collated by R. Varia Egyetemes philologiai közlöny. Our poems appear in vol. 21 (1897), p. 141f.

From the photostats of the relevant folia I see that 1.1.36 is on f. 57r (1-30/ 31-33), with its two parts separated by the insertion of 1.1.37 and 1.1.38, while 2.1.38 is found in f. 56rv (1-35/ 36-52). Poems 1.1.37 and 1.1.38 bear no title and the only sign which shows that they form different poems is their first letter which is in larger size than the rest and the sign ... in the side margin. The same sign appears in the margin beside line 39 of 2.1.38, while the first letter of the same line is also enlarged. This may imply that possibly the two parts of 2.1.38 (1-38, 39-52) form two different hymns (if this sign, as equivalent to a paragraph (−), does not simply denote here the division of the poem into two main parts). Such a possibility with regard to the internal evidence is discussed below in the introductory analysis to 2.1.38.

The titles of both hymns appear to have been written by a second hand. The same codex contains also 1.1.32 (see below group C).

Am = Ambrosianus H. 45 sup. (= 433) (s. xi)

This is a miscellaneous MS including a collection of poems by Gregory in ff. 13v-60.

Hymn 2.1.38 appears in f. 40v (1-5) and f. 45rv (6-35/ 36-52), and 1.1.36 in f. 46rv (1-9/ 10-30) with its last three lines missing. The latter hymn is followed by 2.1.3 (632-40) which is entitled ἡλλα (sc. ἐνδοσα) in the margin.

I see from the photographs of the above folia that beside the title of 2.1.38 (which is written with capital letters) there is a marginal note: 'edita', while the sign \( \text{;} \) is used to show the beginning of every poem. From the description in the catalogue of this MS we learn that the order of the folia is wrong and that, among other changes ff.45-60 should be placed immediately after ff.31-40 (see A. Martini - D. Bassi, Catalogus Codicum graecorum Bibliothecae Ambrësia-\( nae \), vol.1 (Milan, 1906), pp.522-24). In this case the apparent break between lines 1-5 and 6-52 of 2.1.38 disappears.

Beside the first line in f.45\( ^r \) (i.e. beside line 6 of 2.1.38) there is a marginal note: 'edit.', while the text of lines 26-34 is for the most part illegible because it appears to have been covered by an ink spot. Beside line 39 there is another marginal note written (as it seems) by a second hand: \( \delta \tau \epsilon \ \nu \nu \delta \sigma \chi (\alpha) \ \epsilon \gamma \rho \delta (\pi) \). The total number of lines included in the hymn is cited in the margin at the end of it.

At the beginning of 1.1.36 there is the same marginal note: 'edita' and the number \( \lambda ' \) (30) at the end indicates the total number of lines.

MQ = Mosquensis Synodalis 156 (s. xii)

According to Prof. Sicherl's list of MSS this codex contains 1.1.36 and 2.1.38 the readings of which have unfortunately not been available to me. The following two MSS (again according to Prof. Sicherl) descend from this codex.

N = Neapolitanus Borbon. gr. 24 (II A 24) (s. xiv)

Hymn 1.1.36 appears in f.104\( ^v \) and 2.1.38 in ff.110\( ^v \)-111\( ^v \). See also G. Pierleoni, Catalogus Codicum Graecorum Bibliothecae Nationalis Neapolitanae, vol.1 (Rome, 1962), pp.82-85.

D = Parisinus Coislianus gr. 56 (s. xiv-xv)

According to the description of it the MS is formed of
two parts, both with Gregorian poems (see R. Devreesse, Bibl. Nationale: Catal. des MSS grecs, vol.2, 'Le Fonds Coislin' (Paris, 1945), p.52f.). In the first part (ff.1-168) the poems are followed by an anonymous paraphrase as happens in Cod. Vb (see below) and with interlinear glosses. In this part one finds 1.1.36. and 2.1.38 with their paraphrase in ff.118-19 and 124v-26 respectively. The second part (ff.169-94) is without any marginal notes or interlinear glosses. In this part we find 1.1.30 and 1.1.32 (see below group C).

A copy of the first part of this MS is according to Astruc-Concasty the part with Gregory's poems in the following miscellaneous codex.

\[ Ps = \text{Parisinus Suppl. gr. 1090 (s. xvi)} \]


\[ Lb = \text{Laurentianus Plut. 32,16 (a. 1283)} \]

This is a miscellaneous codex part of which (pp.322-79) contains Gregorian poems, among them 1.1.36 in p.360 and 2.1.38 in p.366. See A. M. Bandini, Catalogus Codicum MSS Bibliothecae Mediae Laurentianae, vol.2 (Leipzig, 1961), pp.140-46.

From this MS descends, according to Gertz, the following codex (see N. Gertz, 'Der Palatinus graecus 90', Scriptorium, 35 (1981), 65-70).

\[ Vp = \text{Vaticanus Palatinus gr.90 (s. xiii-xiv)} \]

This is a miscellaneous MS consisting of two volumes. See H. Stevenson, Codices Manuscripti Palatini Graeci Bibliothecae

---

Vaticanae (Vatican, 1885), p.43f. In the first volume and among a section with forty-four Gregorian poems one finds 1.1.36 and 2.1.38 in f.92rv and ff.96v-97v respectively. According to Gertz (art.cit. p.68f.) the Aldine edition of 1504 is based on this MS.

Ma = Marcianus gr.82 (s. xiii)

A brief description of this MS may be found in A.M.Zanetti-A.Bongiovanni, Graeca D. Marci Bibliotheca Codicum MSS per Titulos digesta, vol.2 (Venice, 1740). The codex contains 1.1.36 (but only lines 1-30) in ff.217v-218v and 2.1.38 with a paraphrase in ff. 229v-231v.

Vb = Vaticanus gr.497 (s. xiii)

This is a miscellaneous codex which contains in section 12 fifty-six Gregorian poems accompanied by a paraphrase. See R. Devreesse, Codices Vaticani Graeci, vol.2 (Rome, 1937), pp.325ff.

According to the photostats at my disposal 1.1.36, followed by its paraphrase, appears in ff.290v-291r. Two verses well distinguished from each other are written in the same line, while the paraphrase is in prose. Hymn 2.1.38 with its paraphrase is found in ff.295v-296r (1-6/ 7-52 and paraphr.) written in the same way as 1.1.36. An apograph of this MS, according to Prof. Sicherl is the codex which follows.

I = Hierosolymitanus Hag. Taph. 254 (s. xvi)

See A. I. Papadopoulos - Kerameus, Ιεροσολυμιτικὴ Βυ-βλοθήκη ..., vol.1-5(Saint-Petersburg,1891-1915). Hymns 1.1.36 and 2.1.38 appear in ff.234v-236r and ff.249v-250v respectively.

Va = Vaticanus gr.482 (s. xiv)

This is a miscellaneous codex which includes a section of various Gregorian poems (ff.19v-144v) among which 1.1.36 in ff.110v-111v (lines 1-30 as No 92) and f.112r (31-33 as No 96), and 2.1.38 in ff.108v-109v. See R. Devreesse, Cod. Vat. Gr., vol.2 (Rome,1937), pp.
284-90. The poems which are written between the two parts of 1.1.36 are: *carm. 2.1.22. 1-12 (in f.111v as No 93) and 1.1.37 and 1.1.38 (in f.112r as Nos 94 and 95 respectively). From the photostats I have I notice that the only indication that a new poem begins after 1.1.36.30 is the enlarged first letter whereby 2.1.22 begins; while for 1.1.37, 1.1.38 and 1.1.36. 31-33 there is no such indication but on the contrary they appear as if belonging to 2.1.22.

**Pj = Parisinus gr.1220 (s. xiv)**

This is another miscellaneous codex containing a section with Gregorian poems among which 1.1.36 in f.145rv and 2.1.38 in ff.149r-150r. The same codex contains also 1.1.30 and 1.1.32 (see below group C). For the description of this MS see H. Omont, *Inventaire sommaire des MSS grecs de la Bibliothèque nationale et des autres Bibliothèques de Paris et des Départements*, vol.1: 'Ancien fonds grec' (Paris,1886), p.270f.

**Vt = Athos Vatopedi 120 (s. xiv)**


**Cg = Rom. Colleg. gr. 8 (s. xv)**

This is a Gregorian MS. See Sp. Lambros, 'Τὸ ἐν Ρώμῃ Ἑλληνικὸν Ἐγγυόμενον καὶ οἱ ἐν τῷ ἄρχεττον αὐτοῦ Ἑλληνικὸ ἑωίκες', *Neos Hellenomnememon*, 10 (1913), p.16f. Hymn 1.1.36 is found in p.437rv and 2.1.38 in pp.461v-466v. From this MS descends the following one:

**Pe = Parisinus gr. 992 (s. xv)**

See Omont, *Inventaire*, vol.1, p.198. In it 1.1.36 appears in ff.244r-245v and 2.1.38 in ff.253v-255v.

**Ld = Leidensis Vossianus gr. 0.10 (s. xvi)**
This MS is based on the Aldine edition of 1504. (see Gertz, *art.cit.*, p.69) and contains 1.1.36 in f.125\(^{rv}\) and 2.1.38 in f.130\(^{rv}\).

Apart from the above MSS 2.1.38 may be found also in the following two codices:

**Bs** = Basiliensis F viii. 4 (s. xv)

See H. Omont, *Catalogue des MSS grecs des Bibliothèques de Suisse* (Leipzig, 1886), p.18f. The hymn appears in ff.269\(^{v}\)-271\(^{r}\).

**Ie** = Athos Iviron 193 (s. xvi)

See Sp. P. Lambros, *Catalogue of the Greek MSS on Mount Athos*, vol.2 (Cambridge, 1900), p.55. The hymn is found in f.1\(^{rv}\).

**Group C (1.1.30 and 1.1.32)**

I have decided to put these two poems in the same category because they are both written in short verses and the MSS containing 1.1.30 contain also 1.1.32. The latter poem shows some peculiarity in its MS tradition, since it is found not only in poetic MSS, but also in prose ones. Therefore, in order to facilitate things, I shall mention first the MSS containing both 1.1.30 and 1.1.32, then the rest of the poetic MSS which contain only 1.1.32 and finally I shall refer in brief to some of the prose MSS in which 1.1.32 is appended among other texts.

**a) Poetic MSS containing both 1.1.30 and 1.1.32**

**C** = Oxoniensis Clarkianus 12 (s. x)

The description of this MS is given above under group B. Here it is sufficient only to mention that 1.1.30 (as No 40) appears in f.127\(^{rv}\) (1-30/31-51). Two verses are written in one line with enough empty space between them. In the outside margin and beside the first line appears the number 185 which indicates the page on which the poem is found in the edition of 1609-11 by de Billy; while beside the last line the number 51 indicates the total number of lines in the poem.
Hymn 1.1.32 precedes 1.1.30 (as No 39) and is found in ff.126⁷⁻¹²⁷⁷ (1-36/37-50). It is written in the same way as 1.1.30 and the total number of lines in the hymn is cited also in the margin beside the last line. The same MS contains, as we have seen, also 1.1.36 and 2.1.38.

Mo = Monacensis gr. 416 (s.xii)

This is another fairly early Gregorian MS. See I. Hardt, Catalogus Codicum MSS Bibliothecae Regiae Bavaricae, vols 1-5 (Munich, 1806-12). It contains 1.1.30 in ff.161⁷⁻¹⁶²⁷ (1-22/23-46/47-51) and 1.1.32 in f.169. The text of the former poem is available to me on photographs.

Pj = Parisinus gr. 1220 (s.xiv)

The description of this MS may be found under group B as it contains 1.1.36 and 2.1.38. Hymn 1.1.30 is in f.207⁷ and 1.1.32 in ff.207⁷⁻²⁰⁸⁷.

D = Parisinus Coislianus gr. 56 (s.xiv-xv)

The MS contains 1.1.36 and 2.1.38 and therefore its description is found above under group B. Hymn 1.1.30 and 1.1.32 appear in the second part of the MS in f.193⁷⁻¹⁹³⁷ and f.193 respectively.¹

P = Papiensis 80 (s.xv)

This is another Gregorian MS which contains 1.1.30 in f.20⁷ and 1.1.32 in f.20. See E. Martini, Catalogo di Manoscritti greci esistenti nelle Biblioteche Italiane, vol.1. part 1 (Milan, 1893), p. 211f. The same MS contains also 1.1.29 in f.11⁷ (see below group D). Apographs of this MS according to Prof. Sicherl are the following five MSS:

a = Ambrosianus gr. Z 78 sup. (=753) (s.xv)

For the description of this MS see A. Martini - D. Bassi, Catalogus Codicum Graecorum Bibliothecae Ambrosianae, vol.2 (Milan, 1906), p.862f. Hymn 1.1.30 is in f.32⁷ and 1.1.32 in f.31. The same

¹ After Cod.D follows Cod.G (described below on p.81).
MS, as well as the rest of the apographs of Cod. P, contains also 1.1.29 (see below group D).

\[ v = \text{Vaticanus gr.} 480 \text{ (s. xvi)} \]

See R. Devreesse, Cod.Vat.Gr., vol.2 (Vatican,1937), pp. 280-82. Hymn 1.1.30 appears in ff.29\textsuperscript{v}-31\textsuperscript{r} and 1.1.32 in f.29\textsuperscript{rv}.

\[ M = \text{Monacensis gr.} 582 \text{ (s. xvi)} \]

The description of this MS is not included in Hardt's Catalogue. As an apograph of Cod. P and following the order in which the various Gregorian poems are cited in the latter MS, we infer that both hymns (1.1.30,1.1.32) should have been written somewhere on pp.49-64 which are now missing from Cod. M. See the description of this MS in Amphilochius Iconiensis, Iambus ad Seleucum, edited by E. Oberg (Berlin,1969), p.6.

\[ R = \text{Vaticanus gr.} 1347 \text{ (a. 1554)} \]

A description of this MS is, as far as I know, not yet available. Hymn 1.1.32 is found in ff.180-181\textsuperscript{r}, while for the exact position of 1.1.30 in this MS I have unfortunately no information.

\[ V = \text{Vaticanus gr.} 1949 \text{ (s. xvi)} \]

From the description of this MS in P. Canart, Codices Vaticani Graeci, Codd 1745-1962 (Vatican,1970), pp.734-62 (particularly p.745) it appears that the MS contains only 1.1.32 in f.200\textsuperscript{rv}.

A MS descending indirectly from Cod. P (according to Prof. Sicher) is the one which follows:

\[ Mr = \text{Marcianus gr. II 55} \text{ (s.xvi)} \]

Hymn 1.1.32 is in ff.6\textsuperscript{v}-7\textsuperscript{v} (1-18/ 19-42/ 43-50) and is followed by 1.1.30 in ff.7\textsuperscript{v}-8\textsuperscript{v} (1-17/ 18-42/ 43-51). As I see from the photostats of these folia Cod. Mr is an inferior MS with omissions and repetitions.

\[ Bg = \text{Vaticanus Borgianus gr.22} \text{ (s.xv)} \]

The description of this MS is given above under group A,
since it contains also the poems of that group. Hymn 1.1.30 is
found in ff.1^1v^-2^r (1-40/41-51) and is written in long lines each
containing two verses which are not always distinguishable from one
another. Immediately after it comes 1.1.32 in f.2^rv (1-32/33-50)
written also in long lines of two short verses each.

W = Vindobonensis theologus gr.43 (s. xvi)

This MS contains also the poems of group A and therefore its
description is given under that group. Hymn 1.1.32 appears, as we
have seen, twice: in f.79^v (29-50: W^I) and f.110^v (1-50: W^II). For
the exact position in the MS of 1.1.30 I have unfortunately no inform-
ation.

b) Poetic MSS containing only 1.1.32

L = Laurentianus Plut. 7,10 (s. xi)

The description of this MS is given under group B since it
contains also the poems of that group. Hymn 1.1.32 is found in f.
165^v (1-50). From the photograph of this folio I see that in the
side margin there is a paragraph (—) after lines 6,12,18,20 and 32
which is very likely to have been used in order to mark the subdivi-
sions of the hymn (see E.G. Turner, Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient

K = Athos Karakallou 74 (s. xiv)

This is a miscellaneous codex containing, among other texts,
some groups of Gregorian poems in one of which we find 1.1.32 in f.
387^rv. For the description of this MS see Sp.P. Lambros, Catalogue
137f.

Vi = Vaticanus gr. 1226 (s. xvii)

As far as I know no description of this MS is at present
available. Hymn 1.1.32 is in ff.33^v^-34 written in long lines. The
same MS contains also 1.1.29 (see below group D).

c) Prose MSS containing 1.1.32

Hymnus Vespertinus (1.1.32), together with Exhortatio ad Virgines (carm.1.2.3 in M.37.632-40) and some other prose texts (Significatio in Ezechielem, Metaphrasis in Ecclesiasten, Epistles 243,202,101 and 102, Vita Gregorii, Testamentum, scholia and other minor texts) is appended to a large number of prose MSS (containing Gregory's orations)\(^1\). Sinko divided these MSS in two families (N,M) according to the total number and the order of the orations included in them. The first includes MSS containing 52 orations and the second 47\(^2\). Of these MSS I have the readings of twenty-one (eighteen sent from Munster and three on photostats). But before listing them I think it is necessary to mention that our hymn (together with Exhortatio ad Virgines) has been edited also by Hanssen\(^3\) and Meyer\(^4\) who used both poetic and prose MSS. However, the sigla they used for the same MSS usually differ from one another, while some are the same as those employed here for the poetic MSS. In order to avoid any confusion, and at the same time enable the reader to distinguish the prose from the poetic MSS, I have decided: 1) to keep the sigla Meyer used for his prose MSS, 2) to replace with new the sigla used by Hanssen, 3) to invent my own sigla for the three MSS I have on photostats, and 4) to enclose each of them in parallel lines : /P/.

The list of prose MSS used in the present edition has as follows:

2. See Sinko, op. cit., p.2 and pp.84ff.
The first two MSS have been used by Hanssen as Codd A and B respectively, together with the poetic MSS: Mo, D, W, W and a; while the rest by Meyer, together with the poetic MSS: L, D, W and Mo. I received from Prof. Sicherl the readings of the following MSS as well:

/T/ = Vindobonensis theologus gr. 30 (c. a. 1000) ff. 257\textsuperscript{v}-258\textsuperscript{r}

/Ab/ = Vindobon. theologus gr. 19 f. 95-96

/Ac/ = Vindobon. theol. 79 f. 310

/Ad/ = Vindobon. theol. 80 f. 327

/Ae/ = Vindobon. theol. 84 f. 255

/Pa/ = Patmiacus 33 (a. 941)

In addition to these MSS I have photostats of three more:

/Va/= Vaticanus gr. 497 (s. x ) ff. 256\textsuperscript{v}-257\textsuperscript{r}

/Vb/= Vaticanus gr. 469 (s. xi) f. 71\textsuperscript{v}

/Vu/= Vaticanus gr. 97 (s. xiv) f. 304\textsuperscript{v}

---

1. The description of all the Paris MSS may be found in J. Mossay, Repertorium Nazianzenum, passim. Some of the folia given above denote the beginning of 1.2.3 when 1.1.32 follows it.

For the Paris MSS with 1.1.32 see J. Mossay, Repertorium Nazianzenum, Paris. gr.518,532,552,560,562 and Paris. Suppl. gr.154; while the Catalogues of the Vatican MSS mention about ten such MSS on top of those already mentioned above.

Before proceeding to examine group D I must add here a codex belonging to the first category of poetic MSS containing both 1.1.30 and 1.1.32 which I failed to mention above on p.76, after Cod. D.

This is:

G = Laurentianus Plut. 7,2 (s. xv)

This is a Gregorian MS in which 1.1.30 appears in p.137 and 1.1.32 in p.136. See Bandini, Catalogus, vol.1, p.201.

Group D (1.1.29)

The MSS with 1.1.29 are divided into two groups: α, β mainly on grounds of their three different readings: 12:καὶ οὐδὲν ἐκ -ὑπὸρχεῖς (β); 13: πανδύμει (ω) -πολύκλογε (α), 14: ὑπερφάνης (ω) -ὑπερφάνης (β).

Group α : Lines 8-10 are missing (see below pp.305, 313ff.).

Vh = Vaticanus gr. 485 (s.xiii)

The MS contains an anthology with works of Gregory, Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite and Maximus the Confessor. See Devreesse, Cod.Vat.Gr., vol.2, pp.294-98. Hymn 1.1.29 appears in f.167v at the beginning of a section which includes some of Gregory's hexameter poems. The discussion on the position of the poem in the MS is given below in the introduction to 1.1.29.
Vaticanus gr. 484 (s. xvi) is a copy of this MS (see Devreesse, op. cit. pp.293f.).

P = Papiensis 80 (s. xv)

The description of this MS and its apographs is given above under group C since it contains also 1.1.30 and 1.1.32. Our hymn is found in f.11v. The following MSS derive from Cod. P:

a = Ambrosianus Z 78 sup. (=753) (s. xv) in which 1.1.29 is in f.18r,
v = Vaticanus gr. 480 (s. xvi) with 1.1.29 in f.16rv,
M = Monacensis gr. 582 (s. xvi) with 1.1.29 in p.32,
R = Vaticanus gr. 1347 (a. 1554) with 1.1.29 in f.181r. As I see from the photostat of this folio there are three marginal glosses: γρ. πολύλογες (for πανώνυμε of the text: 13), γρ. σεύ (instead of the second σεύ in line 11) and γρ. ύπερθεώρετος (for ύπερθεώρετος of the text: 14). These glosses, together with the interlinear gloss τολύλογε (above πανώνυμε:13) in Cod. P, show that groups a and β have been contaminated at some stage of the MS transmission. In Cod R the hymn bears no title and follows immediately after the text of 1.1.32.

V = Vaticanus gr. 1949 (s. xvi) with 1.1.29 in f.200.

Vj = Vaticanus gr. 1282 (s. xvi ex.)

The hymn appears in f.1v. As I see from the photostat of this folio the hymn is entitled : Τοῦ ἁγίου Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου. "Ὑμνος εἰς τοῦ θεόν.

Vi = Vaticanus gr. 1226 (s. xvii)

In this late MS 1.1.29 appears in f.33r. Unfortunately, the text of it in the photostat is in the most part illegible. The poem carries a heading which seems to read: Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου. "Ὑμνος εἰς θεόν.

Group β

Vk = Vaticanus gr. 1525 (s.xi,xii)
This is a Ps.-Dionysian MS, partly of the 11th and partly of the 13th century (see C. Giannelli, *Codices Vaticani Graeci, Codd 1485-1683* (Vatican, 1950), pp. 80-82). The hymn appears in f. 88v and is a later interpolation by a 14th cen. scribe (see the discussion below in the introduction to 1.1.29).

**Lr** = *Laurentianus Plut.* 5,32 (s.xv)

This is another Ps.-Dionysian MS with 1.1.29 in f. 135 introducing the scholia on the preceding Ps.-Dionysian works (see below the introduction to 1.1.29). The text of the hymn is cited in Bandini's *Catalogue*, vol. 1, p. 57.

**Pl** = *Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 39 (s. xv)*

This is too a Ps.-Dionysian MS in which the hymn (attributed to Ps.-Dionysius himself) appears in f. 138v-139r (1-4/5-16) after the text of *De Divinis Nominibus* and before *De Mystica Theologia* (see below the discussion on this MS in the introduction to 1.1.29). The appearance of the hymn in this MS was first noticed by J. B. Pitra who then published it as belonging to Ps.-Dionysius in his *Analecta Sacra*, vol. 2 (Typis Tusculanis, 1884), p. xlvif.

**Ms** = *Monacensis gr. 547 (s. xv)*

This is a Proclean MS in which the hymn appears written on an interpolated parchment leaf :f.IIv (see below the discussion on this MS in the introduction to 1.1.29).
I.7. Editions

The hymns under discussion all appear only in Cadllau's edition of 1840 (which was reprinted by Migne in 1862: see the Table of editions below in Appendix II)¹.

A) Carm.1.1.31, 1.1.33 - 1.1.35

These poems appear first published by Tollius, nearly two centuries after the editio princeps of the Gregorian poetic corpus: J. Tollius, Insignia itineris Italici (Traiecti ad Rhenum: Franciscus Halman, 1696)². This edition was reprinted in: Bibliotheca veterum Patrum antiquorumque scriptorum ecclesiasticorum ... edited by Presbyter A. Gallandius, vol.6 (Venice: J.Baptista, 1770).


B) Carm.1.1.36, 2.1.38 (1.1.37, 1.1.38)

These are the only poems of the hymns under discussion to have been included in the editio princeps of Gregory's poetry, namely the Aldine edition of 1504: Gregorii Nazianseni carmina ad bene beateque vivendum utilissima e Graeco in Latinum ad verbum conversa ab Aldo Manutio Romano et eiusdem typis excusa Graece et Latine (Venice: Ald.

¹ The task of collecting the information used in this chapter has been extremely laborious, not only because such old books (as these edd are) are difficult to be found (unless a number of visits to the major British Libraries - and not always with success - are undertaken), but also because, as will be seen, our hymns are not included only in Gregorian edd. Therefore, I fear that some edd might have escaped my attention for which I beg for the reader's appreciation.

² The exact page on which each poem appears is listed in the Table of Editions (below Appendix II ) and the same applies to all edd.

³ As Cummings showed (p.24), this ed. is based on the ed. of 1609-11 and Codd Paris. Coisl. 56 (D) and Vat. gr. 480 (v).
Manutius, 1504). The dependence of this edition on Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 90 (Vp) has been shown by N. Gertz (see in I.6.C. the description of Cod. Vp).

The two hymns are found also in the Basel edition of 1550 which is largely based on the previous one: Gregorius Nazianzenus, opera omnia, graece et latine (Basel: Joh. Hervagius, 1550). They were included in Löwenklau's latin rendering in 1571: Operum Gregorii Nazianzeni tomi tres, ... quorum editio ... elaborata est per Joannem Levvenklaium, vol.2 (Basel: J. Hervagius, 1571). As Löwenklau says in his edition (f.4r) the contents of vols 1-2 are all taken from the de Billy edition (of 1569?), while in the third volume (which includes 1.1.29, 1.1.30 and 1.1.32 and is characterized by him as 'Cygneorum carminum liber') he includes poems based on a MS at his possession.

Unfortunately, I have not been able to consult the de Billy edition which seems to include these two poems and contains only a latin rendering of Gregory's works: Divi Gregorii Nazianzeni opera omnia ... nunc primum latina facta sunt J. Billio Prunaeo labore (Parisiis: Joan. Benenatus, 1569). This edition was later revised in: D. Gregorii Nazianzeni ... Opera omnia quae extant ... in duos tomos distincta ... J. Billio Prunaeo ... interprete et scholiaste (Paris.: Nic. Chesneav, 1583).


4. On this edition see Sykes p.85f.
ed (p.19ff.), was based on the Basel edition of 1550 and the exemplar of Codd P,M,a,v - listed in group C - (see also Jungck p.48).

Hymn 2.1.38 appears among other Gregorian poems in the edition of Zimmermann in 1647: Divi Gregorii Nazianzeni Theologi, Poemata quaedam selecta. Addita est ... interpretus, maximam partem metrica (Lunaeburg: M. Lamprecht, 1647).

Finally, the two hymns are found in the Paris edition of 1840 by Caillau (reprinted by Migne in 1862); while 2.1.38 alone is included also in the Anthology of Christ - Paranikas: Anthologia Graeca Carmi-

The two short hymns: 1.1.37 and 1.1.38 are first published by Muratori in 1709: Anecdota Graeca, quae ex MSS codicibus nunc primum eruit ... Ludovicus Antonius Muratorius, vol.2 (Patavia: J. Manfrè, 1709). The same edition was reprinted in Monumenta Graecae veteris Ecclesiae ... ed. Bandini, vol.2 (Florent., 1762) and in Bibliotheca veterum patrum ... ed. A. Gallandius, vol.6 (Venice, 1770). They were later edited by Vari in his collation of Cod. Laur. plut. 7,10 (see above p.70). Finally they were included in Caillau's edition (1840).

C) Carm. 1.1.30, 1.1.32

The two hymns appear first in Synesius's edition of 1568 by Portus: ... Synesii Cyrenaei episcopi Ptolemaidis Hymni vario ly-
ricor. versuum gener. Gregorii Nazianzeni Odae aliquot. Utris-
que, nunc primum in luce prodeuntibus. Lat. interpretationem adiunxit Fr. Portus Cretensis ([Geneva]: H. Stephanus, 1568). Unfortunately, of 1.1.32 only the first twenty-eight lines are included. The Greek text of the entire hymn appears only in 1696 in Tollius's edition, although it is included together with 1.1.30 in vol.3 of the Latin

1. See Lefherz p.21.
2. See Terzaghi p.xxxixf.
edition of Löwenklau in 1571 (see above).

A number of editions (all Synesian apart from the last) seem to have been based on that of Portus: 1) Synesii Cyrenaei Episcopi "Ὑμνον ἐκα, Γρηγορίου τοῦ Ναζανηνοῦ, ὡς τέσσαρες ... (Paris : I. Benenatus, 1570), 2) Συνεσίου τοῦ Κυρηναίου ἐπισκόπου Πτολεμαῖος "Ὑμνον ἐν ὀλίσθοις μέλεσι" (Rostoch : St. Myliander, 1586), 3) Synesii Cyrenaei ... Hymni ... Gregorii Naz. Odae ... Lat. interpretatio Fr. Porti Cretensis (Paris : Cl. Morel, 1618) and 4) the edition of Zimmermann in 1647 (mentioned above).

Hymn 1.1.30 alone appears in the small Paris edition of de Billy of 1575 : D. Gregorii Nazianzeni ... opuscula quaedam, nunc primum in lucem edita, aliáque item versibus reddita, magnáque ex parte Cyri Dadybrensis episcopi commentariis illustrata. Interprete Jacobo Bil- lio Prunaeo ... (Paris : I. Benenatus, 1575), but only in latin; and later in the major edition of 1609-11 (see above) and that of Boissonade in 1825 (see above p. 56 ); while 1.1.32 is included in the ed. of Gallantius in 1770 (see above).

Both hymns, finally, occur in the edition of Caillau in 1840, that of Migne in 1862 and in the Anthology of Christ - Paranikas in 1871 (in which only lines 1-28 of 1.1.32 are edited).

In 1890 1.1.32 was edited by Sakkelion : Joh. Sakkelion, Πατρικὴ Βυζαλοσήπην (Athens, 1890), p.23. Its text is based on Cod. Patm. gr. 33 (／Pa／) as Lefherz informs us (see Lefherz p.66).

The more recent editions of 1.1.32 by Hanssen and Meyer are mentioned above (p. 79).

D) Carm.1.1.29

The hymn appears first in the editio princeps of Synesius's works by Canter in 1567 : Synesii De dono ... Hymni carmine. ... interprete

1. See Sykes p.83f.
Gulielmo Cantero (Basel : I. Oporinus, 1567).

The hymn appears among Gregorian poems in vol. 3 of the Latin edition by Löwenklau in 1571 (see above), and in Greek only in the de Billy - F. Morel edition of 1609-11 in which verse 6 is missing from the Greek text, but not from the Latin verse-translation which accompanies it, so that this omission should be regarded as a simple typographical error.

Later we find 1.1.29 in the edition of Caillau in 1840 (which is reprinted in 1862 by Migne : see above).

Finally, the hymn was edited by Jahn : A.H. Jahn, 'Hymnus in Deum platonicus' in Eclogae e Proclo de philosophia Chaldaica sive de doctrina oraculorum Chaldaicorum (Halís Saxonum : M. Pfeffer, 1891), p.76 (where the text is based on Monacensis gr. 547 (Ms) and the hymn is attributed to Proclus); and by J.B. Pitra in his Analecta Sacra, vol.2 (1884), p.xlvif., based on Cod. Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 39 and attributed to Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite (see below the introduction to 1.1.29 and, above I.6.D, the description of these MSS).

---

1. See the introduction to 1.1.29, Terzaghi p.xxxviiff. and Jahn p.49ff. for a discussion on the edd of 1.1.29.
II. Sigla - Text

As I have said in the introduction to the chapter on manuscripts, the hymns under discussion may be classed into four groups with regard to their MS tradition, as this is not the same for all of them. This classification, together with the metrical structure of each hymn, determines the order in which I have arranged their texts below and the subsequent commentaries on them. Besides, to enable the reader I cite the sigla of the various MSS and editions used at the beginning of the *apparatus criticus* in each hymn, as these usually differ from one hymn to the other. I also mention there for which MSS I have readings available on photostats or photographs and for which I rely on the readings I received from Munster (i.e. from Prof. Sicherl).

In the *apparatus criticus* I avoid mentioning common errors related to orthography (i.e. iotacism and the like), particularly when these appear in inferior MSS. However, I have decided to use all the MSS for which I have the readings, even if this results in having an over-loaded *apparatus criticus* (particularly in the case of 1.1.32), since the stemmatic relationship of these MSS has not been fixed yet by Prof. Sicherl and his colleagues (who are still working on it; see above p.63, n.3).
Carm. 1.1.33

1 Εἰς χάρις, ὡς πάντων βασιλεῦ, πάντων δὲ ποιητά.
οὐρανὸς ἐπιλήθη ὁδηγὸς σέο, πᾶσα τε γαίᾳ
σῆς σοφῆς. θεὸς ὦδε ὁ σῶς ῥήγος ἐκτισε πάντα.
οὖν ἄγιον Πνεῦμα ζωὴν πάντεσσά χορηγεῖ.
5 ἔλθον κάσιμῳ θεοὶ Τριῶν· ἔλαθε δ᾿ ἡμῖν,
ﲇε θεοῦ κατὰ πνεῦμα καὶ ἀνθρώπου κατὰ σάρκα,
ὃς ἔτι σταυρὸς μόρον τέτληνας ἐκποεῖν,
οὰ βροτὸς· τριώτητι δὲ πύλαι λύτες ἀδόνησος,
οὰ θεός· θανάτου γὰρ ἐλυσας δεσμὸν ἀναστάς
10 καὶ βροτεῖς γενεῖ φύσιν ἐπάσας, οὰ καὶ ἡμῖν
ζῶειν ἡματα πάντα, σὲ δ᾿ ἀμβροτον αἰεὶν ἀείδειν.

Codd.: W, Bg (readings available on photostats)
tit.: προσευχή ἡρωίκη W, omit. Bg
7. δὲ τις W 10. ἡμῖς Tollius] ὑμεῖς W, ὑμῖν Bg

Carm. 1.1.34

1 Εἰς χάρις, ὡς πάντων βασιλεῦ, πάντων δὲ ποιητά.
οὸς χάρις· δὲ τὰ νοοτὰ λύψι, τὰ θ᾿ ὄρατα κελεύσει
στῆσας τ᾿ οὐ πρὸν ἐντα καὶ ἐς ἀφανοὺς κατέδειξεν.
οὖν ἄρθον ἀμφικτουρον ἀχροτοι ὑμητηρει.
5 ἐνθεν μυριάδες καὶ χιλιάδες πάλιν ἐνθεν,
ἀγγελικῆς σταρτῆς πυρόες χερός, ἀφθοτο όρχαι·

Codd.: as above
tit.: προσευχή ὡς ἡρωίκη W, omit. Bg
1. δὲ] τέ Bg 3. τ᾿ omit. W; ἐξαφανοὺς W 6. ἀρχαὶ Bg
ἀρχὴν W
λαοὶ πρωτοτόκων καὶ λαμπομένων χορδὲς ἄστρων,
πνεῦματα θεσπεσώμενα ἀνδρῶν, ψυχαὶ τε ὄλυκων,
pάντες ὑμηρεῖς καὶ σὸν θρόνον ἀμφιέκοντες,

10 γνωσθεῖτε τε φῶς τε ὑμνεῖτε ἄειδουσι
οὕνων ἀνυμνεῖοντες ἀκήρατον ἦ καὶ ἄκατωτον·
'sοι χάρις, ἡ πάντων βασίλευς, πάντων δὲ ποιήτα.'
οὗτος ἀκήρατος ὦνων ἐκ' οὐρανίου χορῷο.

ναὶ, λύσομαι κἀγαί, Πάτερ ἀφθιτε, καὶ γόνω κάμπτω

15 ἡμετέρης κραδύς, Πάτερ ἀμβροτε, καὶ υἱὸς ἔνδον
κρηνῆς σοῦ προκάρολε· κάρη δὲ μοι ἐς χθόνα νεύει
λυσσομένη· κεῖμαι δ' ἵκέτης καὶ δόξην χειμω.
οὔδ' γὰρ δέξιος εἰμί πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἀυτὰ λεύσειν.

16 ἀλλά σὺ μ' οἰκτεύρως, ἐλέειος Πάτερ, ἔλαιος ἔσσο

20 σφ κυνωρὴ θεράποντι· σαῦ δὲ με χειρᾳ τανύσας
εῖς οὐνόμων θανάτου νοήματα πάντα καθήρας.

25 ἀπογυμνώσῃς σοῦ Πνεῦματος, ἀλλ' ἔτι μᾶλλον
χειρὶ μένος καὶ θάρσος ἐνι στήθεσιν ἐμοίουν,
ὅφρα δὲ καὶ κραδύς καὶ χεῦλεσι καλὸν ἀείω.

20 ἐμὴ γενετὴρ, τεῦθθει δεῖ 

30 καὶ ἐμοὶ καθαρὰν βίστον, καθαρᾶν τε τελευτήν,
ἐλπιδῆς τε τιχεόν ἀγάθην, ἐλεόν τε, χάρων τε.

πάντα δ' ἀμαλόδυνης ὅσο' ἠλιτον ἐκ νεότητος

35 ὥς ἀγαθὸς βασίλευς· δότι σοι χάρις ἦματα πάντα,

30 σοι χάρις ἦματα πάντα καὶ εἰς αἰῶνας ἀκαντας.

11. ἡ omit. W, sed ἥδε in marg. ἀνυμνεῖον καὶ Bg

21. ὥς αὐτοὶ Tollius 26. θᾶτον W 28. ἀμαλόδυνης ὅσο' codd.,
29. ὅτι Tollius j ἀμαλόδυνει ὅσο W, ἀμαλόδυνει ὅσο Bg, ἀμαλόδυ
30. ὅτι j ἡττε τοῦ ἐν marg. W
Carm. 1.1.35

1 Κλαθε, Πάτερ Χριστό ο πανεπίσκοπε, τούδε λυτάων ἥμετέρων· μολπὴν δὲ χαρᾶζε οὕθε τεράτων
θεοπεσίς; ταῦτα γάρ έστι ἄπατον ἔχοντος ἦλαυνεν ὀδός, ὥσ αὐτογένεσθαι ἐνί ζωῆς θεοῦ ἔγνω
5 καὶ Χριστόν θυμωοῦν ἀλεξίκακον βασιλείαν.
δὲ ποτ’ ἐκολοκτείρας μερότων γένος αὐτὰ παθόντων
Πατρὸς ὑπὲ ἐννεούρυν ἑκὼν ἡλλάξατο μορφῆν·
γεύνετο δὲ θυντὸς θεοῦ ἀφθυτος, εἰς δὲ πεῖνας
tαρταρών μογέοντας ὑπ’ αὐξατο λύσατο ὑεσοῦν.
10 ἀείρ’ ἐν νῦν, ιερῆς καὶ ἀχαρατῆς ἀπὸ βιβλίου
ψυχὴν σῆν ἀτύταλλε θεολειπόντος ἐνί μυθῶς.
ἐνεία γάρ ἀφρήστες ἀληθείᾳ θεράποντας
ματιών ἀγγελέοντας ὑπ’ οὐρανομικῆς φωνῆ.

Codd.: the same as for 1.1.33
tit.: ἐπεκλήσις διὰ ἡρώων W, omit. Bg
2. χαρῆς W. 3. ἐλαύνει scripsi] ἐλαύνων codd, ἐλαύνων
Tollius 4. αὐτογένεσθαι ut vid. W; ζώως W. 7. ὑπεννεο-
σίπον W 8. γεύνετο Tollius] γεύστονα W, γύγνετο Caillau,
ἀφθυτος W. 9. ταρταρών W; λύσατο ut vid. W

Carm. 1.1.36

1 Χριστῇ άναξ, δὲ πάντα τέλεις σοφίαν μερόπεσιν
ἐσθαλα καὶ ἐν πάντεσιν ὁδὸς ὑθετα tετυβαι,
δὲ κυρὶ καὶ νεφέλη στρατὸν ἤγαγες, δὲ θ’ ὁδὸν εἴδρες

Codd.: C (consulted in the original), L,Am,Vb,Va (readings available on photocasts or photographs), N,D,Lb,Ma,Cg (readings sent from Munster), Mq,I,Pe,Vp,Vt,Pj,Ld,Ps, (readings not available).
tit.: ἐνδόπα L,Am,D,N,Lb,Vb, ἐνδόπα δι’ ἐπὸν C
1. σοφοῦ Am,D,N,Vb, Ma,Cg; μερόπεσιν Vb. 2. πάντεσιν Vb;
ἡσθατα ut vid. Vb. 3. καὶ post primum δὲ Va
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ἐν πελάγει τυμβόντι φύλος, θαραώ δ' ἐκάλυψας,
5 ἀρτον δ' οὐρανόθεν ἔξων ὑπάσας, ἐξ δ' ἀρα πέτρης ἔβλυσας ἀκροτόμου ρόδου, μέγα θαῦμ', ἐν ἔρημῳ·
δυσμενέων δ' ἄνδρῶν στῆσας μένος, εὐτε διέσχε σταυρὸν ὑποκλιάς Μωσῆς χέρας, ἀλκαρ ἔμεσο·
μήν δ' ἡλίος τε ὅροισσον σχέδουν. ὡς δὲ ἰέρεθρον
10 εἴσεν ἐπελευμένουσιν, ὁδὸς δ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν ἐτύχῃ ῥήματι, τὴν αὐτὸς ὑπέσχεσθαι καὶ κατένευσας.
αὐτὸς δ' οὐρανόθεν οἶχον μερόπεσθαι ζέειως
όστατον, ἀρχαίοι δὲ νέπν ἐπέμειξας ἀταρπόν,
εὐτε θεὸς θυντὸς τε κραδεῖς ἐπὶ γαῖαν δῦεισας
15 ἡμετέρην· οὖν δὲ πρὸς οὐρανόν ἐπεθεὶς ἀερθεῖς
ζέαν ἐλδομένους φαντασμὸν ἃ τὸ πάροιχεν.
αὐτὸς καὶ πελάγους ἐπεβήσασθαι, σοῦς δὲ πόδεσσιν
οἶχον πέσεν, χαλεπούς βιωτόμενον ἀνέμοισιν. ἀλλά, μάκαρ, καὶ ἐμοὶ γε συνεκμερομένοι ἐλθεὶς καλεῦντι
20 σήμερον, εὐδοῦν δὲ πόροις καὶ ἀγγελὼν ἐσθολῶν,
πομπῶν, ἀλεξιπτῆρα, βοηθῶν, ὄφρα με πάντων
ἡματῶν νυκτῶν τε κακῶν ἀπο τηλοθ' ἐξίργων
καὶ τέλος ἐσθολῶν ὀδὸς χαριζόμενοι μογέοντι
οἴκουσιν ἀρτεμέωντα καὶ οἰκαδὲ μ' αθές ἀγυνοι

7. δ' omit. Cg, Pe, edd 1550, 1609-11; στησάμενος edd 1504, 1550; διέσχεν Vb, C, Va 8. ὑπὸ σκιάν Am; χέρας] μέγας L

ἐπεμύγχας Am; ἀταρπόν Vb 14. τε post θεὸς Vb; δῦεισας
scripsit] δῦεισας C, Vb, ὑπεύξα Vb, ὑπεύξας cett codd et
edd 15. δ' omit. Am 16. ζε' ἐπελευμένους Lb, ζε' ἐπελ-
dhcp. Cg, edd 1504, 1550, ἐξειλελοῦν D, ζεαὶ Vb; φαντα-
τερπον C, Vb 17. ἐπεβήσας D; πόδεσιν C, πόδεσιν Vb 18.
πέσει D, N, Vb, post scr. n supra lin. Cg; ἀνέμοισιν C 19.
γε' ed. 1840] σ' L, omit. cett codd, et edd; καλαμῶντι Vb
20. δέ] τε N 22. ἡματῶν νυκτῶν] νυκτὸς ἡματῶν Am; τηλο-
θεῖν εξίργων L 23. ὁδὸν omit. Ma 24. ἀρτεμέωντι Vb; μ']
μὲ edd 1504, 1550, omit. Am; ἀγυνοὶ] ἀγυνοὶ Va, ἀγυνοὶ Cg
25 ηποδειν τε φίλους τε ὧν βίου ἀμφιέπουσιν·
ἐνθα σε νύκτα καὶ ἡμαρ ἐλεύθερος ἀτρεμέως τε
λυσομιᾶν κακότητας ἀμνείᾳ σου βίου ἐλκών,
σοὶ τε νῦν περιδέντα, βίου φάσος, αἷν ἁείρων,
μεσφ' ὅτε καὶ πυμάτην ἐυνήν ὀδὸν ἐξανύσαμεν.
30 ἐς δὲ μονὴν ἐλθομιν, μόγου τέλος εὐσεβεσθο.
σοὶ τῷ, σοὶ λιλέω, σοὶ δ' ἐξουαὶ, δ' ἀνα χριστέ,
σοὶ δ' αἴρω ποιός ἐχνος, ἐπεὶ σὺ με χειρὶ καλύπτεις·
ἀλλὰ με καὶ νῦν ἄγους ἐσθολὸν ἐπὶ τέρμα πορευῆς.

Carm. 1.1.37

1 Ὦθη ἐστ' οὖν μοι ὁμοίος χωρίς σέο ἐχνος ἀειραὶ
Χριστε ἄναξ, ὃς πάντα πέλεις σοῦσιν μερόπεσαν
ἐσθὰλα καὶ ἐν πάντεσιν ὀδὸς ἱδεία τέτυξαν.
σοὶ πῦσυνος καὶ τήνδε τίμων τρῖβον. ἀλλὰ με πέμποις
5 ἁσκηθῇ καὶ πάντα πόροις, δό' ἔλλεται ἦτορ,
καὶ με, ὁἈναξ, παλύνοροσον ἄγους ἐπὶ ὀμα πενυχρὸν,
ἐνθα σε νῦκτα καὶ ἡμαρ ἐλεύθερος ἐλασκούμεν.

Codd : L, Va (readings available on photographs)
tit. : Omit. codd
1. χωρίς σέο edd ] σέο χωρίς codd 5. δόσ' ἔλλεται Va
Carm. 1.1.38

1 Ὅς κυρὶ καὶ νεφέλη στρατοῦ ἡγαγεῖ, ὡς θ' ὅδὸν εἴδες ἐν πελάγει πήξας κύματ' ἐλαυνομένους,
ἀρτὸν δ' οὕρανόθεν δόσας ἔξων οὐ δοκέουσιν,
ἐκ δὲ πέτρης πηγήν ἐβλυσας ἄκροτόμου,
5 καὶ νῦν σφ θεράποντι συνεξιπορος ἐλάθε καλεῦντι,
Χριστὲ, φῶς μερίσων, δεξιὰ πάντα φέρων.
Codd : the same as in 1.1.37
tit. : omit. codd
2. καὶ post πελάγει L 3. δόσας ] βλύσας sed corr. in marg. Va

Carm. 2.1.38

1 Χριστὲ ἀναξ, σε κρῶτον, ἐκεὶ λόγων ἡρή δόξα
dηναιὸν κατέχων, φθέγξου' ἀπὸ στομάτων,
ἀγνοτᾶτου λειψος ἀγνὸν Θόος, εἰ Θέμες εἰκεῖν,
τόνδε λόγων προχέων ἡμετέρου νόσου.
5 πατροφαές, μεγάλου Νόου λόγε, φέρτερε μυθοῦ,
φωτὸς τ' ἀκροτάτου φῶς ἄχρον, οἰόγονε,
εἰκὼν ἀθανάτου Πατρὸς καὶ σφηνῖς ἀνάρχου,
Πνεῦματι τῷ Μεγάλῳ συμφαές, εὐρυμέδων,
αἰώνος περήψει, μεγακλεές, ὀλβιόδωρε,
10 ὑψίθρον', οὐράνιε, καυσωνέες, άσφαμα νόσου,
Codd : the same as for 1.1.36 plus Bs and Ie the readings of which are not available.
tit. : ὥμοιος εἰς Χριστὸν μετὰ τὴν συμφήνην L,Am, add. δὲ 'ἐλ(εγεῖ·
ων) C, εν τῷ Λάοχα Vb, μετὰ τὴν συγήν, ὥμοιος τῷ κυρίῳ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάτων Va 5. μύθων Vb 6. φωτὸς Cg; τ' ed. 1550 ]
ἀπ᾽ L,Am, Ma, Va, omit. Vb, D, N, C, Lb, sor. εἰ supr. lin. Cg 8. εὐ-
ρυμέδον Ma, Lb; συμφαίες L 9. μεγακλέος Ma 10. ὑψίθρων G, Vb
νωμητα κόσμου, φερέσθω, δημιουργὴ
δύναν, ἐσομένων. σοι γὰρ ἀπαντα πέλει,
ὅς κόσμου ἁλεθεῖλαι καὶ ὀπότοσα ἐστὶ θέλοντος
δημόσιων φόρεσις νείμαισιν ἀπλανέως.

15 σοὶ μὲν, Ἄναξ, φαέθων ψιλόρομος ἀστρα καλύπτει
kύκλον ύπερτέλλων ἐμπυρον, ὡς σὺ νῦσ.
σοὶ ζώει φανοῦσει τὸ ἀμουβαδίς δῆμα τὸ νυκτὸς,
μὴν πλησιώτας αὖθις ἐπερχομένη.
σοὶ δὲ εὐσκόρος το κύκλος καὶ μέτρα χορεῖς

20 ἁρας μέτρα φέρει ἡπεια κυριακέναις.
ἀκλανέες τε πλάνου τε καλύμπορον ἀδοσούνες
ἀστέρες ἐγαθείς εἰςοι λόγοι σοφίας.
σὸν ψάος εἰσοί ἀπαντες, ὃςοι νῦσ ὁφαντόινων
μέλπουσιν Τριάδος δέκαν ἐπουρανίς.

25 σὸν βροτὸς ἀλ κλέος ἑστόν, ὃν ἰγκελον ἐνθέδω ἔθηκας
ὑμνοτόλου τῆς σῆς, ὁ ψάος, ἀγλαίς.
ἀμβροτὸς μοι βροτέει τε, παλλυγγενές, ὕψος ἀδαρκον,
ὑστάτων θυσίων πήμασι σαρκοφόρε,
σοὶ ζῶ, σοὶ λαλέω, σοὶ δ' ἐμπνοός εἰμι θυπήλη,

30 ἥ μουνη κτεάνων λεύπτει ἀφ' ἡμετέρων.
sοι καὶ γλῶσσαν ἔδοχα καὶ οὐασι μύθον ἔλεσα.
λύσσομαι ἀλλὰ πόροις ἀμφότερ' εὐαγγέως.
φαγεγομάλ, ἁς' ἐπεόουεν' ἑ δ' οὐ θέμις οὐδὲ νοησω.
ῥεῦσι μαργάρεον, βόρβορον ἀσάμενος·

11. δημιουργὴν Va 12. ἐσομένων Vb 13. θέλοντος ] μέλοντος
Va 14. ἀκλανέων Vb, ἀκλανέως L 17. φανοῦσει ] μηνοῦσει L
22. ἡγαθεῖς Va 24. ἐπ' οὐρανιῶν C 25 ὑπετοι σο σὸν L,Am; αὖ
edd ] omit. Ma,Vb,D,N,C,Va, post. ser. supr. lin. Cg 27. βρο-
tοει] βροτεύτει Va, βροτεύτευ ed. 1609-11 32. λύσσου' L ;
ἀμφότερα Va 33. ἁς' ] ἁς' Vb, ἁς' L,N,Ma 34. βόρβορον]
βόρον C,Vb,D
35 χρυσὸν ἀπὸ φαμάθου, ὅδιον κραναθὶς ἀπ’ ἀκάνθης,
λέξιον ἀπ’ ἀσταχών σοτον ἄφεις καλάμην.
tauτά σοι ἡμετέρου θαλύσσα, Ἑρμήτε, πόνολο
γλῶσσ’ ἀπερευγούμενη πρῶτον ἄνηθεν ἔπος.
σήμερον ἐκ νεκρῶν Ἑρμήτος μέγας, οἶκον ἐμύχθη,
40 ἔγγετο καὶ θανάτου κέντρον ἀπεσκέδασε
καὶ τροφορὶς πυλεόντας ἀμειλήτου ἄδαιο
ῥήξατο καὶ ψυχαῖς δώκεν ἐλευθερίαν.
σήμερον ἐκ τύμβου θορύν μερόπεσσα φαῦνη,
οἷς γένεθ’, οἷς θάνεν, οἷς ἔγγετ’ ἐκ νεκρῶν,
45 ὡς κυ αἰπλυγγενές τε καὶ ἐκ θανάτου φυγότες
σοι συναερώμεσσ’ ἐνθεν ἀνερχομένης.
σήμερον αὐγιλάεις σε μέγας χορὸς ἀμφιγεγήθην
ἀγγελικὸς μέληπων ύμνον ἐπιστέφον.
σήμερον ἥχον ἐπενευσα μεμυκτα χεύλα συγῇ
50 λύσας’ ἀλλὰ μ’ ἐχοὺς ύμνοπόλον κινάρην.
Νη ποὶ ἐνὸν ἔρεξε, Λόγης λόγον’ αὐτὰρ ἕπελτα
ἄθεω καὶ Μεγάλῳ Πνεύματι, ἦν ἔθελη.

Carm. 1.1.31

1 Δόξα θεῷ τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ παμβασιλῆι.

δόξα πανευφήμῳ Πνεύματι παναγῷ.

Codd : W,Bg (as for 1.1.33), Np (readings not available)
tit. : ἐξουσιληγοὺς καὶ δοξολογεῖ δι’ ἡρωκῆς καὶ ἐλεγεύων W, 
omit. Bg 1. πανβασιλῆι Bg
ἡ Τριάς ἐς θεός ἐστιν, δέ ἐκτισε πλησεῖ τε πάντα,
οὕρανον ὀὕρανύων, γαῖαν ἐπικυρήσων.

5 πάντων καὶ ποταμοῦς καὶ πηγᾶς πλησεῖν ἐνυδρών
πάντα χωγονῶν πνεύματος ἐς λόγου,
διόσοι σοφῶν κτήσειν πάσα κτέσις ὑμνήσεως
tοῦ ζήν τοῦ τε μένειν αὐτῶν ἄντα μόνον,
ἡ λογικὴ δὲ μάλιστα φύσις ὡς πάντος άείως

10 ὡς βασιλῆα μέγαν, ὡς ἀγαθὸν κατέρα.
πνεύματι καὶ φύσι καὶ γλάττῳ καὶ διανοιᾷ
δός καὶ ἐμοὶ καθαρῶς δοξολογεῖν σε, Πάτερ.

3. ἔστι W; πλησεῖ τε] πλησεῖαν Bg 8. κεῖν Bg 10. βα-
σιλεῖα W

Carm. 1.1.30

1 Σὲ τὸν ἀφθονὸν μοναρχήν
δός ἀνυμνεῖν, δός ἀείδειν
τὸν ἀνακτα, τὸν δεσπότην,
ὁ ὅν ὡμος, ὁ ὅν αἴνος,

5 ὁ ὅν ἀγγέλων χορεία,
ὁ ὅν αἴωνες ἀπαυστόν,
ὁ ὅν ἡλίος προλύμπτει,
ὁ ὅν ὁ ὁμός σελήνης,
ὁ ὅν ἄστρων μέγα κάλλος·

Codd : C (consulted in the original), Mo, Mr, Bg (readings available on photostats or photographs), G, D, W, Pj, P (readings sent from Munster)
tit. : ὡμος ὀλὰ λυρικοῦ C, D, P, G, W, τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὡμος ὀλὰ λυρι-
κοῦ μέτρων Pj, omit. Bg, Mr
2. omit. Mr; αἰειθύν ut vid. Pj
3. ἀνακτον W 4. omit.
Mr 5. χορειαν P, Mr, Bg, et ed. 1568 9. κάλλος] κλέος P, Mr
δι' δὲν ἀνθρώπου οὐ εἰσῆλθεν τὸ θεόν
λογικῶν ζῷοιν ὑπάρχοντων.
σὺ γὰρ ἐκτόσος τὰ πάντα
παρέχων τὰξιν ἐκάστῳ

συνεχῶν τε τῇ προνοίᾳ·
λόγου ελπίδας, πέλεν ἔργον.
ὁ λόγος σου θεὸς ᾨλὸς·
οὐσιόσιος γὰρ ἐστίν,
οὐσίας τῷ τεκόντι,

δὲς ἐφημοσευ ὑπὸ πάντα,
ἐνα πάντων βασιλεύσῃ.
περιλαμβάνον δὲ πάντα

Τριάδα ἔσθη σε ἔρῳ·
ἐνα καὶ μόνον μονάρχην,
φύσιν ἄτρεπτον, ἀναρχον,
φύσις οὐσίας ἀφράστου,
σοφίας νοου ἀνέφλεκτον,

κράτος οὐρανῶν ἀπαυστον,
ἀτερ ἀρχῆς, ἀπέραντον·
ἀκατασκέπητον αὐγήν
ἐφορώσαν δὲ τὰ πάντα,
βάθος ουδέν ἀγνοοῦσαν

35 ἀπὸ γῆς μέχρις ἀβύσσου.
Πάτερ, ζελευσ γενού μου
ὅλα παντὸς θεραπευεῖν
τὸ σέβασμα τούτο δός μου
τὰ ὁ ἀμαρτήματα ἐλύσων

40 τὸ συνειδὸς ἐκκαθαρίσων
ἀπὸ πάσης κακονολαίας,
ζνα δοξάω τὸ θεῖον
όσιας χεῖρας ἐπαίρων,
ζνα Χριστὸν εὐλογήσων

45 γόνυ κάμπτων ἱκανεύσω
τότε προσλαβεῖν με δοῦλον,
ὅτε ἀν ἔλθῃ βασιλεύσων.
Πάτερ, ζελευσ γενού μου,
ἐλεον καὶ χάριν εὐρώ

50 ὡς δέξα καὶ χάρις σου
ἀχρίς αἰώνος ἀμέτρου.

39. ἱερον Pj 42. δοξάζω P,Mr 45. κάμπτων Mo,Pj, κάμπτων D; ἱκανεύσως Mr 46. τότε ed. 1568 I δέ codd 47. δέ codd Bg, Mr, et ed. 1568; ἔλθῃ βασιλεύσων ed. 1568] ἔλθῃς βασιλεύσων codd, ἔλθῃ βασιλεύσων ed. 1609-11 51. αἰώνας ἀμέτρους C,W

Codd poet.: C (consulted in the original), Bg, W, Mr, L, Vi (readings available on photostats or photographs), W , K, G, Mo, D, P, a, v, V (readings sent from Munster), Pj, M (readings not available). Codd in pros.: /Vυ/, /Vε/, /Vβ/ (readings available on photostats), /Co/, /Bs/ (= Hanssen A, B), /P/, /V/, /L/ (= La.b), /M/ (= Ma.b.c ), /A/ (= Aa.b.c.d.e), /B/ (= Meyer P, V, L, M, A, B), /T/, /Af/ , /Pa/ (readings sent from Munster).

tit.: omit. C, Mr, T/, /Af/, Aa.c.d.e , /Vυ/, /Vβ/, ὑμνος ἐσπερινός (L, Bg, P, M, L/ ) ἔτου (ἐντὸς K) πρὸς τῷ τέλει εὐρημένος (K) δῆμος τῷ περὶ παραθενάς (πρὸς παραθένοις P, a, v, V, Vi ) D,
Σὲ καὶ νῦν εὐλογοῦμεν, 
χριστὲ μου, λάγε θεοῦ, 
φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς ἀνάρχου 
καὶ Πνεύματος ταύτα

τριττοῦ φωτὸς εἰς μίαν 
ἀδεξαν ἀθροιζομένου· 
δὲς έξυπνάς τὸ σκότος, 
δὲς ὑπέστησαι τὸ φῶς, 
ἐν' ἐν φωτὶ κτύσης τὰ πάντα

καὶ τὴν ἄστατον ὅλην 
στήσησις μορφῶν εἰς κόσμον 
καὶ τὴν νῦν εὐκοσμημένη· 
δὲς νῦν ἐφάτυσας ἀνθρώπου 
λόγῳ τε καὶ σοφίᾳ

λαμπρότητος τῆς ἀνω 
καὶ κάτω θείς εἰκώνα, 
ἐνα φωτὶ βλέπῃ τὸ φῶς 
καὶ γένηται φῶς ὄλου.

Πίνακας 101

1. Σὲ καὶ νῦν εὐλογοῦμεν, χριστὲ μου, λάγε θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς ἀνάρχου καὶ Πνεύματος ταύτα

5. τριττοῦ φωτὸς εἰς μίαν ἀδεξαν ἀθροιζομένου· δὲς έξυπνάς τὸ σκότος, δὲς ὑπέστησαι τὸ φῶς, ἐν' ἐν φωτὶ κτύσης τὰ πάντα

10. καὶ τὴν ἄστατον ὅλην στήσησις μορφῶν εἰς κόσμον καὶ τὴν νῦν εὐκοσμημένη· δὲς νῦν ἐφάτυσας ἀνθρώπου λόγῳ τε καὶ σοφίᾳ

15. λαμπρότητος τῆς ἀνω καὶ κάτω θείς εἰκώνα, ἐνα φωτὶ βλέπῃ τὸ φῶς καὶ γένηται φῶς ὄλου.
σο φωστήρουν οὔβανον

20 κατηγόρασας πολυάρους.

σο νύκτα καὶ ἠμέραν
άλληλαις εἰκεν ἡπίως
ἐτάξας νόμον τιμῶν
ἀδελφότητας καὶ φυλάξας.

25 καὶ τῇ μὲν ἔπαυςας κήπους
τῆς πολυμόθου σαρκὸς

τῇ δ' ἣγευρας εἰς ξρόγον
καὶ πρᾶξες τὰς σοι σέλας,
ἔνα τὸ σκότος φυγόντες

30 φθάσωμεν εἰς ἠμέραν,

ἡμέραν τὴν μὴ νυκτὶ

τῇ στυγνῇ λυμένην.

σο μὲν βάλλους ἐλαφροῦν

ὕπεν ἐμοῖς βλεψάροις,

35 ὡς μὴ γλώσσαν ὑμνησόν

ἐπὶ πολὺ νεκροῦσθαι,

μὴτ' ἀντύφωνον ἀγγέλων

πλάσμα σον ἰσχαζοῦ.
σώ γολ δε κούπη ευσεβείς
40 ἐννοούσας ἔταξέτω,
μηδὲ τι τῶν ὑπαρῶν
ἡμέρας νῦς ἐλέγξῃ,
μηδὲ παζύμα νυκτὸς
ἐνύπνια θροεύτω.
45 νοῦς δὲ καὶ σώματος δίχα
σοῦ, θεέ, προσκυλεύτω,
τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Ὁὐρ
καὶ τῷ ἄγγεὶ Πνεύματι,
ψε τυμή, δόξα, κράτος
50 εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας, ἀμήν.

39. κούπην α,β,γ,δ; εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ corv. D, εὐσεβεῖς /Va/, /Vb/ /Va/, /Pa/, /T/, /Aa.c.e./, /P/, /V/, /M/, /L/, /Co/. 40. ἐννοούσας εὐνοούσας /Pa/; ἔταξέτων ἐξεταζότων K, /M/, /Bg, ἐξηταζότων /Va/ /Vb/ /Pa/ /T/, /Aa.c.e./, /P/, /V/, /M/, /L/, /Co/. 41. μηδὲ τι μηδὲ τι C, K, D, /M/, /P, Mr, /Va/, /Vb/, μηδὲ ἔτι L, V, G, /M/, /P/, ed. Meyer 42. ἐλέγξῃ D, ἐλέγξῃ V, ἐνύπνια Bg, ἐξεταζότειν α, ἐλέγξουσιν /B/; ἡμέραν Mr, κέρας L 43. μηδὲ C, /M/, /Mr, /Va/, /Vb/, /Va/ /Vb/ ; μέτα ὑπὸδέ /Va/, /Pa/; 44. θορεύτω L 45. δὲ omit. /Va/, /Vb/, /T/, /Aa/, /Aa1/, /Aa.c.e./, /P/, /M/, /L/, /B/, /T/, /Aa.c.e./, τῷ δὲ /T/, /Aa/, /Aa2/, /Aa/; προσκυλεύτων Mo, προσκυλεύτων /Va/, /Pa/ 48. τῷ omit. /Vb/, /T/, /Aa.c.e./, /P/, /M/, /L/, /B/, 49. wers. omit. /Va/, /Vb/, /Pa/, /T/, /Aa.c.e./, /P/, /M/, /L/, /B/, /Co/; δόξα omit. a,β,γ,δ 50. τῶν αἰώνας Mr, νῦν καὶ δεῖ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων ἀμήν /Va/, /Va/, /Ab/, εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων /V/, /Co/, /Pa/
Carm. 1.1.29

1 ΤΩ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΕΠΕΚΕΙΝΑ ΤΩ ΓΑΡ ΘΕΜΑΣ ΆΛΛΟ ΣΕ ΜΕΛΕΤΕΙΝ;
   ΠΩΣ ΛΟΓΟΣ ΥΨΙΝΗΣΕ ΣΕ; ΣΟ ΓΑΡ ΛΟΓΨ ΟΥΔΕΝΙ ΟΠΤΩΣ.
   ΠΩΣ ΒΟΣ ΑΘΡΗΣΕ ΣΕ; ΣΟ ΓΑΡ ΒΟΨ ΟΥΔΕΝΙ ΛΗΠΤΩΣ.
   ΜΟΘΝΟΣ ΕΩΝ ΑΦΡΑΣΤΟΣ ΕΓΕΙ ΤΕΚΕΣ ΩΣΑ ΛΑΛΕΤΑΙ.

5 ΜΟΘΝΟΣ ΕΩΝ ΑΓΝΩΣΤΟΣ ΕΓΕΙ ΤΕΚΕΣ ΩΣΑ ΝΟΕΤΑΙ.
   ΠΑΝΤΑ ΣΕ ΚΑΙ ΛΑΛΕΟΝΤΑ ΚΑΙ ΟΥ ΛΑΛΕΟΝΤΑ ΛΥΓΑΙΝΕΙ.
   ΠΑΝΤΑ ΣΕ ΚΑΙ ΝΟΕΟΝΤΑ ΚΑΙ ΟΥ ΝΟΕΟΝΤΑ ΓΕΡΑΙΡΕΙ.
   ΞΥΝΟΙ ΓΑΡ ΤΕ ΠΘΟΙ, ΞΥΝΑΙ Δ' ΩΔΕΙΝΕ ΑΠΑΝΤΩΝ
   ΑΜΦΙ ΣΕ ΣΟΙ ΔΕ ΤΑ ΠΑΝΤΑ ΠΡΟΣΕΥΧΕΤΑΙ ΕΙΣ ΣΕ ΔΕ ΠΑΝΤΑ

10 ΣΥΝΘΕΜΑ ΣΟΙ ΝΟΕΟΝΤΑ ΛΑΛΕΙ ΣΥΓΚΛΕΙΝΟΝ ΩΜΟΝ.
   ΣΟΙ ΕΝΙ ΠΑΝΤΑ ΜΕΝΕΙ ΣΟΙ Δ' ΑΘΡΟΑ ΠΑΝΤΑ ΘΕΩΤΕΙ.
   ΚΑΙ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΤΕΛΟΣ ΕΣΟΙ ΚΑΙ ΕΙΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΝΤΑ ΚΑΙ ΟΥΔΕΝ,
   ΟΥΧ ΕΝ ΕΩΝ, ΟΥ ΠΑΝΤΑ' ΠΑΝΩΝΤΕΜΕ, ΠΑΣ ΣΕ ΚΑΛΕΣΩΝ
   ΤΟΝ ΜΟΘΝΟΝ ΑΚΛΗΣΤΟΤΩν; ΥΠΕΡΝΕΦΕΑΣ ΔΕ ΚΑΛΩΤΡΑΣ

15 ΤΩς ΒΟΣ ΟΥΡΑΝΩΝΕΣ ΕΙΣΘΕΣΤΑΙ; ΩΛΑΟΣ ΕΙΗΣ,
   Ω ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΕΠΕΚΕΙΝΑ' ΤΩ ΓΑΡ ΘΕΜΑΣ ΆΛΛΟ ΣΕ ΜΕΛΕΤΕΙΝ;

Codd : α : Vh,P,R,Vi,Vj,Mr, β : Vk,Lr,Ms,Pl (all the readings are available on photostats apart from P,Lr which are sent from Munster ).

tit. : θυνος εις θεον Vh,P,Vi,Vj, omit. Mr,R, εις το περι
   θειων ουνοματων Vh, στυχοι εις το περι θειων ουνοματων Lr,
   θυνος ηρωικς Ms, το άγιου Διονυσίου θυνος Θεος δια στυχων
   ηρωικων Pl

2. θυνησει P 3. νος j λογος Lr ; άθρηση P ; νός j να-
   ω Lr vers 3 post v. 4 non. β 6. vers. 6 post v. 7 pos.,
   sed in marg. litteris ordin. rest. Vh 7. κα' prius j omit.
   Lr 8-10 omit. a 8. ωδενας Pl 9. β' prius j omit.
   Pl 11. ενι Vh,Mr, ενι P,Lr ; σοι secund. R,P supr. lin.j
   σεν α, Vh,Ms,Lr, in marg. R, σεν θ' Pl 12. τελος] σελας
   Vh ; και ουδεν a]υπαρχεις β 13. πανωνμε a] πολυλογε β,
   γρ. και καλονυ Vh 14. υπερνεφεας j υπερφανεας β, R sed in
   marg. υπερνεφεας 15. εισδοσεται Vh,Pl, εισδοσεται Lr
III. Commentary

I have chosen the form of a commentary as the best way to analyse these hymns and show their place in the literary genre to which they belong.

My particular aims in each commentary are:

1) To give a number of parallels from other authentic Gregorian works in order to support the disputed authenticity of some of the hymns under discussion,

2) To underline any common or rare features and topoi of the Greek pagan and early Christian hymns which are used in our hymns,

3) To clarify when possible any difficulties in understanding the text with regard to its content and structure,

4) To find the obvious or possible sources of the various ideas and expressions used in them, and

5) To note the allusions to, or similarities in terms of parallel ideas and expressions with earlier Greek pagan and Christian writers.

Since my approach to these hymns is purely literary, in my commentary I have not placed great emphasis on theological aspects arising from the religious content of these texts.

In each commentary I begin by stating the particular problems arising in each hymn. I then give a detailed analysis of its content accompanied by a brief survey of the type of hymn it represents together with any other informative material if available. At the end of the actual commentary I draw some conclusions with regard to the form and structure of the hymn.

Before proceeding to give the commentary on each hymn, I think it is necessary to explain the order in which they have been arranged in this research. In deciding this I took into account their metrical construction and MS tradition. Therefore, I first give the
hexameter poems (1.1.33-1.1.36), then the elegiac (2.1.38, 1.1.31)
and then those written in short verse: anacreontic and non-quantitative (1.1.30, 1.1.32) leaving the disputed hymn to God (1.1.29) last.

The two short poems: 1.1.37 and 1.1.38 (one in hexameters and the other in elegiacs) are appended to 1.1.36 since they have a similar subject matter to 1.1.36. With the exception of the position of 1.1.31, the above order corresponds also to that followed in my exposition of their MS tradition according to which these poems are divided into four groups: A) 1.1.31, 1.1.33-35, B) 1.1.36, 2.1.38, C) 1.1.30, 1.1.32, and D) 1.1.29 (see above p.64).

III.1. Carmina 1.1.33 - 1.1.35

We begin our investigation with the first three hymns, namely 1.1.33 - 1.1.35, which have survived only in two MSS (Codd Bg and W) and have thus been described by Werhahn as dubious. As has been shown in the exposition of their MS tradition (see above pp.64ff.) the extant external evidence is not sufficient to determine their authorship which seems to depend, at least until further such evidence comes to light, entirely on internal evidence. Consequently, in the commentary on these poems (as well as that on 1.1.31 and 1.1.29) a great emphasis has been placed on parallel passages from authentic Gregorian works in order to support the poems' authenticity.
Carm. 1.1.33

To pass on now to 1.1.33: this is a short hexameter hymn in 'du-Still' and may be divided into: I. Introduction (1), II. Praise (2-4: of the Godhead and 6-11: of the Son of God), and III. Prayer (5a: to the Trinity and 5b: to the Son of God). As we see, Praise is interwoven with Prayer so that the poem does not follow the straightforward division of the majority of the Greek pagan hexameter hymns (see above p. 21).

Lines 1-4 are addressed to the Godhead (or, more precisely to God the Father), but the poet does not actually use the usual words ἀ δός or ἡ αῖ. On the contrary, he addresses God by the general appellations (πάντων) βασιλεὺς and (ἰάντων) νομιμός. The first hemistich of line 5 is addressed to the Trinity and from line 5b onwards the address is made to the Son of God.

The theme of the Godhead's praise (2-4) is the creation and preservation of the world (accomplished by all the three persons of the Trinity); while the Son of God is praised (in lines 6-11) by reference to the mystery of redemption: incarnation, crucifixion, victory over death and restoration of the divine nature of mankind. Both of them are traditional Biblical themes: the former occurs in OT (primarily in the Psalms and other prayers) and the latter in NT (mainly in the so-called Christological hymns). However, Greek gods - above all Zeus - were also praised for being the creators/begetters and lords of all (see Keyssner pp. 20ff., 48ff., 53f. and above p. 29).

The theme of both requests in line 5 is that of 'mercy' which is commonly found in the Greek pagan and Christian hymns and prayers alike.

Finally this poem (as well as 1.1.34) falls in the category of thanksgiving hymns (see below the discussion on σολ χάρις: 1).
I. Introduction (1)

1. Σολ χάρως: In the Migne edition this poem (as well as 1.1.34) is entitled Εὐχαριστήριον (A thanksgiving) although, as it seems without any MS support. This title is justifiable as the hymn begins by addressing the expression χάρως (sc. εἶναι) to the Godhead. The usage of this expression in a thanksgiving context has its origins in St Paul as one may discern from: 1Cor.15.57, 2Cor.2.14, 8.16, 9.15, Rom.7.25 and 6.17 where phrases similar to τῇ δὲ θεῷ χάρως are used. Such usage may be also attested from Origen. orat. 15.2 (GCs 2 p.334.17f.): εὐχαριστοῦντες οὖν οἱ ἄγιοι ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς ἐαυτῶν τῇ θεῷ διὰ Χριστοῦ Ἰσορ αἱ χάριται ὑμολογοῦσιν αὐτῷ. See Deichgräber p.43f.

The more common verb εὐχαριστεῖν was here avoided since in liturgical language it is primarily used in a eucharistic context (see Lampe s.v.); while ἐξομολογεῖσθαι is mainly restricted in LXX Psalms.

Generally speaking the thanksgiving was not considered by the various hymn-classifiers as a particular type of hymn (see above p.14ff.), although, undoubtedly hymns should have been composed and performed in order to thank gods for delivering men from this or that bad situation, or for bestowing on them various benefits. See e.g. Aesch. Agam.821f., Eur. Heraclid.870, Maiistas Praescr. lines 20f. (Coll.Alex. p.69), and LSJ s.v. εὐχαριστήρια and Cairns p.75f.

Unlike what happens in the majority of Greek pagan hymns, the name of the recipient of the present hymn is replaced by σοι (while in 1.1.30.1 by σε), partly because the poet may want to underline his close connection to a 'personal' god, and partly because the Christian Godhead has no proper name, but is always addressed by one or more of His characteristics or appellations. According to Gregory such appellations may refer to God's nature (οὐσίας ὑνώματα)
in or.30.18 (Gallay p.262; M.36.125C), or to His power and divine 
'economy' (προσηγορίαν ἐξουσίας καὶ οἰκονομίας: or.30.19(p.264;128B)).

Apart from this introductory second person pronoun, in the hymn 
there are five more such pronouns which determine the style of the 
hymn. This feature of extensive usage of such pronouns appears in 
most of the hymns under discussion, so that they appear to comply 
with the characteristics of Greek pagan hymns from the later period 
(see Haldane p.108). An instance from the Psalms where such a 
pronoun is used to introduce a Psalm is LXX Ps.64.1: σοὶ πρέξεις οὖνος 
ὁ θεὸς (cf. 73. 13-17 where οὗ or οὐ is used eight times).

1. ὅ πάντων βασιλεὺς: The use of the interjection ὅ (found 
also in 1.1.34.1,12 and 1.1.29.1,16) complies with the practice of 
Greek tragedians (see above p. 43f.). For this appellation cf. 
carm.1.2.1.409 (553): πάντων βασιλῆς (sc. God) and 2.1.1.599f. 
(1014): σοὶ ... βασιλεῦτατε ὅς πάντων κρατεῖς καὶ μοι σθένος ἐσ-
σί μέγαστον (sc. Christ). The title βασιλεὺς is common of any 
god: pagan or Christian (see above p. 25f.). However, there are 
very few examples of the combination πάντων βασιλεὺς as it appears 
here. These are: Pind. fr.169.1 (ed. Snell-Maehler, 1975): Νόμος 
ὁ πάντων βασιλεὺς/ θνατῶν τε καὶ ἁθανάτων and Pap.Mag.Gr-xii.264:
ὁ πάντων μόναρχος βασιλεὺς. From the Christian texts see Serap. 
Euch.5.11: σὺ γὰρ εἶ ... ὁ πάντων κύριος καὶ βασιλεὺς καὶ 19.1: 
βασιλεὺ καὶ κύριε τῶν ἄμαντων.

The origin of this phrase should be sought in a philosophical 
context as for instance in Demodritus fr.30 (H. Diels, Vorsokr. ii 
p.151): βασιλεὺς οὗτος (sc. Zeus) τῶν πάντων and Plat. Crat.396a 
where Zeus is called by Socrates βασιλεὺς τῶν πάντων. See also 
Idem Epist.ii.312e 1-2, Orph. fr.21a.7 (Kern) and ib.168.5.

Different expressions of the same idea, namely that Zeus governs 
everything, may be found in the following poetic texts: Pind. Isth.
5.53 (ed. Snell-Maehler 1971): Ζεὺς ὁ πάντων κύριος, Soph. O.T 903f.: ζεὺς κρατῶν ... Ζεῦ, πάντ᾽ ἀνάσσων and above all the philosophical hymn to Zeus by Cleanthes: Ζεῦ, φύσεως ἄρχηγε, νόμου μετὰ πάντα κυ-βερνῶν (2). (cf. also lines 14 and 35). Further examples on these and other expressions may be found in Keyssner pp.30ff. and 83.

Finally, the kingship of God was a theme particularly celebrated in the Psalms: e.g. LXX Ps.46.8.

In this hymn there are six expressions with πᾶς. Such expressions are common in all the hymns of the present research: in 1.1.34 (nine times), 1.1.35 (once), 1.1.36 (three times), 1.1.37 (three times), 1.1.30 (four times), 1.1.32 (once) and 1.1.29 (eleven times). The particular emphasis the poet places on these expressions may be explained by the fact that they are used directly or indirectly to praise God by underlining the universality of His power or dominion. (see above p. 26 ). The use of such expressions is a common feature of both Greek pagan and Christian hymns, examples of which may be found in Keyssner p.30ff. and Deichgräber p.102 n.3 respectively.

1. πάντων δὲ ποιητά : Cf. Const. Apost.8.48.3: θεὸς ... τῶν δ-λων διὰ χρώστου ποιητῆς, 37.2 and Serap. Euch. 21: σοὶ (sc. God) τῷ τῶν πάντων ποιητῇ. The common epithet ποιητῆς stands here instead of the Biblical κτύστης (used in 1.1.31.7), or γενετήρ and γενετήρ (both used of the Greek pagan gods: see Keyssner pp.20-22 for such examples).

The transition to the Praise is made asyndetically as happens also in 1.1.31.3 and 2.1.38.5 (see above p. 27f.).

II. Praise A (2-4): Creation and preservation of the world

2f. οὐρανὸς ... σοφὴς : 'the heavens were filled with your glory and the earth with your wisdom'. With these two images the poet seems to show in a way reminiscent of Biblical images how God's glory and wisdom is revealed in Creation. The first image may therefore be compared to LXX Ps.18.1: οὐ οὐρανὸς δυνατοι τῶν ἢθου
and 112.4: ἐπὶ τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἡ ὀδὸς αὐτοῦ, whereas for the second image the closest Biblical passages I could find are: LXX Pr.3.19: ὁ θεὸς τῷ σοφῷ ἐγερμένως τὴν γῆν and Ps.103.24: πάντα ἐν σοφῷ ἐκουσάς. However, a better parallel (which combines both images) seems to be a passage from Abacuc's prayer in LXX Abac.3.3: ἐκάλυψεν οὐρανοὺς ἡ άρετή αὐτοῦ, καὶ αἰνεῖτις αὐτοῦ πλήρης ἡ γῆ, although σοφία (as a specific characteristic of God) is replaced with the more general άρετή, and ὀδὸς with its equivalent αἰνεῖτις, both used in a reversed order (i.e. άρετή with heavens and αἰνεῖτις with earth). To this one may add a variation of the hymn of the Seraphim in LXX Is. 6.3: ... πλήρης ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ τῆς ὀδοῦ σου as this appears in e.g. Liturg.Jac. (Brightman p.51.1).

The restriction of the poet in mentioning only heavens and earth when analysing the content of πάντων (1), seems to follow that in Ep.Col.1.16: ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτύσθη τὰ πάντα, ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

The enjambement in line 2 and the strong caesura after the second princeps/longum of line 3 are common features of the present hymns (see above p.45).

Lines 3b-4: These lines were possibly added in order to show the function and participation of all the three persons of the Trinity in the creation and preservation of the world. The importance of this subject for the Fathers in general (see e.g. Irenaeus haer. 4.38.3 in M.7.1108B), and for Gregory in particular may be attested from a number of Gregorian passages. Apart from 1.1.30. 13-16, 20-24, 1.1.31. 3-6, 1.1.32. 7-12 and 2.1.38. 11-14 (which are discussed below ad loc.), one may refer to or.34.15 (M.36.256A), or.39.12 (348A): ' mamma δὲ εἰς θεὸς ὁ Πατήρ, εἰς οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ εἰς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἐν πνεύμα ἁγίου, ἐν δὲ τὰ πάντα (cf. Ep.1Cor.8.6 and Rom.11.36), or.45.7 (M.36.632A) = or.38.11(321C)
where Logos is called ὁ δημιουργός, or. 32.10(185A): Ὅδοι ... τοῦ πάντα ὁ δημιουργήσαντος, ib.7(181B): ὁ διακοσμήσας Ὅδοις and or.41.14 (448A) where the Holy Spirit co-creates with the Son: Τούτῳ τὸ Πνεῦμα συνδημιουργεῖ μὲν Ὁλῷ καὶ τὴν κτίσιν καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν.


3. θεὸς Ὅλος ὁ σῶς Ὅδοις: One may discern a didactic tone behind the phrase. The same tone is found also in 1.1.34.3 where the poet supports the view of the creation ex nihilo (see below the note ad loc.), 1.1.35.3-5 and 1.1.31.3a. In most cases the didacticism in Christian hymns in general refers to various dogmatic beliefs which form the content of confessions so that Kroll seems to be right to suggest that 'a confession-like formula can easily find its place in a hymn which can then receive an expressly doctrinal character' (see Kroll, p.16 n.2). This dogmatic character of early Christian hymns later becomes a primary feature of Byzantine hymnography (see e.g. P.N. Trempelas, 'Ἐκλογὴ Ἐλληνικῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ὑμνογραφίας (Athens, 1978), p.8.

3. Ὅδοις ἐκτευς πάντα: Cf. carm.1.1.10.14 (466): Ὅ τοῦ θεοῦ Ὅδοις τε καὶ κτίστης ὅλων. In the fourth theological oration Gregory attempts to explain Christ's by-name Λόγοι as: Ὅδοις ἐξ (sc. ἐστὶν ὃ Χριστός), δι' οὗτως ἔχει πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα, ὡς πρὸς νοῦν λόγοις ... Τά-χα δ' ἂν εὐχὼ τις, δι' ἐκαὶ ὡς ὅσοι πρὸς τὸ ὄρφημων, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τοῦτο λέγει ται λόγοι: or.30.20 (Gallay p.266f.; M.36.129A); cf. also Mason's note ad loc., or.23.11 (Mossay p.302; M.35.1161C), or.45.30 (M.36.664A), carm.1.1.3.64 (413) and the discussion on this by-name in Moreschini p.1382f.

However, the choice of this particular by-name in a passage
dealing with the subject of creation has not been made without strong reasons. To prove this we may refer e.g. to Or.41.14 (M.36.448A) where Gregory appears to support the participation of the Son of God in the creation by reference to LXX Ps.32.6 which he cites as: τῷ Λόγῳ Κυρίου οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἐστερέωθησαν. The implication is obvious: the Psalmic λόγος is interpreted as the Logos (i.e. the Son of God). The same interpretation may be found also in 1.1.30.16f. with the close position of λόγος (referring to the Biblical exposition of the act of creation) and Λόγος (the second person of the Trinity).

Line 4: Cf. carm.1.1.31.6 (and the note ad loc.). In the various Creeds the Holy Spirit is called ζωοποιόν (see A. Hahn, Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der alten Kirche, third edit. by L. Hahn (Breslau: E. Morgenstern, 1897), pp.130,135,146,164). The same appellation is used by Gregory in Or.33.17 (M.36.237A); while in carm.1.1.3.6 (408) the Spirit is called: οὐρανῶν χθονῶν τε φερέσθη- ον (cf. 2.1.38.11 and the note ad loc.). The Spirit is called ζωο- ποιόν in the triadological doxology whereby a number of liturgical prayers end. Cf: Liturg.Jac. (Brightman p.31.13, 32.13,22, 36.12 etc.) and Liturg.Marc. (Idem p.122.6, 123,30 etc.). The above passages show that the idea that God is a life-giver became a characteristic restricted to the third person of the Trinity, although at first this was used of God in general: see e.g. in the prayer of Anne (LXX 1Reg.2.6): Κύριος θανατος καὶ ζωογονεῖ, in St Paul's speech on Areopagus (Act.17.25): αὐτὸς διόδους πᾶσι ζωῆς καὶ πνεύμα καὶ τὰ πάντα (cf. Ep.1Tim.6.13), Serap. Εὐχ.30.1 and Const.Apost.8.12.22: σὺ ... εἷς τῆς ζωῆς χορηγός.

The same idea, namely that gods are life-givers, occurs in the Greek pagan hymns as well and is expressed particularly with the epithets βιοδότωρ: Orph. hymn.73.2, and βιοδότης: Orph. hymn.29.3, 55.12 (see further examples in Keyssner p.125).
The usage in lines 1-4 of second person pronouns (five times) produces a similar stylistic effect as that in Aristotle's hymn to Arete (PLG ii p.360f. Bergk), or in the hymn to Zeus by Cleanthes.

III. Prayer (5)

The request for mercy (which appears also in 1.1.34.19, 1.1.29, 15 and 1.1.30.36,48) is found very often both in pagan and Christian hymns and prayers. Various propitiatory expressions to pagan gods are collected in Keyssner pp.91-93 (see also above p.31).


5. ἔρθω: Cf. Gregory's carm.2.1.1.403 (1000), ib.632 (1017) and 2.1.22.22 (1282); also Hom.hymn.20.8, Callim. hymn. Cer.138, Mag. hymn. Helius 24 (Abel), Procl. hymn.7.40 and Synes. hymn.1.113,114.

5. θεός Τριάς: The poet departs from using ἀγαθ (the more common attribute of Trinity) and chooses θεός instead (which corresponds in sense to δοξ, an epithet of general application to Greek pagan gods and men alike: see above p. 26).

In 1.30.25 the Trinity is characterized as τὸν θεόν and in 2.1.38.24 as ἱεραρχοῦν (see the notes ad loc.); while in 1.1.31.3 it is not accompanied by any epithet.

IV. Praise B (6-11): Mystery of redemption

Line 6: It is a brief declaration of the Christological dogma of incarnation. The same subject appears also in 1.1.35. 6-8, 1.1.36.14 and 2.1.38.27f, and is discussed very often by Gregory, particularly in his orations, the two epistles To Cledonius: ep.101,102 (Gallay p.36-94; M.36.176A-201C), the second Arcana poem On the Son: carm.1.1.2 (401-08), 1.1.9. 31-84 (459-63) and the two dogmatic poems On Christ's incarnation: 1.1.10, 1.1.11 (464-71). From these texts I choose two passages where there are verbal similarities with our hymn. These are: or.38.2 (M.36.313Bf.): ο (sc. Christ) ἄγαθος σωρευταὶ ... ὤλος τοῦ θεοῦ ὤλος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου γύνεται (cf. or.39.
13, (348D) and or. 40.45 (424B)), and or. 45.9 (633D) = or. 38.13 (325Bf.): (ο τοῦ θεοῦ ἄδειγος) ... ἐν ἐκ δύο τῶν ἐναντίων (sc. γῆς ταυτ.), σάρκις καὶ πνεύματος, ὅποτε μὲν ἔθεσε, τῷ δὲ ἔθεσθαι.


The expressions ὕλη θεοῦ and (sc. ὕλη) ἀνθρώπου are Biblical: see e.g. Ev. Mt. 16.16, 20.18.

Finally, note the contrast: ὕλη θεοῦ - (Ὕλη) ἀνθρώπου and κατὰ πνεῦμα - κατὰ σάρκα and the word-arrangement: a-b-a-b. Such a style is typical of Gregory (see above p. 46).

Lines 7-11: The result of Christ's incarnation

This section may be compared with Gregory's or. 44.4 (M. 36.612B): Ἐνετέθη (sc. from Christ's incarnation) θάνατος καὶ ταφή καὶ ἀνάστασις. Ἐνετέθη καὶ καλύπτης κτῶσις (cf. ib. 2 (608C-609A) and or. 45.1 (624B)), and or. 45.9 (636A) = or. 38.13 (325C): μεταλαμβάνει τῆς ἐμῆς σαρκός, ἕνα καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα σώματι καὶ τὴν σάρκα ἀναστάσιος. Both these passages help us in understanding ψώσω (10) in the present context as man's 'new nature in Christ'. To these passages one may add carm. 1.1.10.5f. (465): ἑπεὶ γὰρ οὖν ἐγγέννητ' ἀνθρωπος θεὸς/ θεὸς τελετ' ἀνθρωπος, 1.2.14. 90-92 (762) and 1.1.11.9f. (471).

7. μόρον ... ἐπισκέψη: This may be compared to the regular Homeric formula πότον ἐπισκέπτω which is used e.g. in Od. 24.31, 4. 562 and II. 6.412 (in the same sedes).

8. οἷα ἔροτάς: This expression is contrasted with οἷα θεός
and both occupy the first sedes in two successive lines. The anaphora produced and the strong caesura after both expressions mark emphatically Christ's dual nature. The same contrast between the human and divine nature of Christ may be seen in Gregory's carm.1.1.10.23f. (467): "Ολος θεος τε και θεοτος σωζων μ' ὀλον/ υιος νοομενος τε και ὁρομενος, ib.27: (sc. Άδου)/ αυτον θεον τε και θεοτον σωτηρον and carm.2.1.19.88 (1278): θεος θροις (sc. Christ).

Anaphora at the beginning of lines is found also in 1.1.34.1,2, 1.1.36.31,32, 2.1.38.15,17,19 (σοι'), 23,25 (σον'), 29,31, (σοι'), 39,43,47, 49 (σήμερον'), 1.1.31.1,2, 1.1.30.4-10 (εις ου'), 27,28 (φυσιν'), 1.1.32.7,8,13 (ος) and 1.1.29.2,3 (πασι), 4,5 (μοινος'), 6,7 (πάνα). This feature as a common Hellenistic device may be seen e.g. in Callim. hymn.6,7 (see also McLennan ad loc. where reference is made to Homeric instances exemplifying the same feature). An elaborate example of it from the later period of Greek literature is Procl.hymn.6. 1-3, 13-15 (χαζε).

8. κύλας ... ἄδονης: Cf. 2.1.38.41: κυλάωνας ἄδοαο, the Homeric phrase κύλαι τ' ἄδοαο in e.g. Ili.5.646, 9.312 and Od.14.156 (cf. Aesch. Agam.1291), and the Biblical κύλαν θάνου in Ev.Mt.16.18.

9. οὖ θεος: The phrase appears in the same sedes in carm.2.1.14, 379 (971,998). Cf. also 2.2.5.254 (1540).

9. σωτηριο ... ἀναστας: Cf. 2.1.38.40: σωτηριου κέντρου ἀνεσκόδασε and the note ad loc. The present passage may be compared also with two liturgical passages in Const.Apost.8.12.33: (πα) ... σωτηριου ἐξελπατω (sc. Christ) τουτου (sc. the dead), ... και ἤθη τα δεσμα του διαζδου and Liturg.Bas. (Brightman p.404.18) : ἐλεος (sc. Christ) τας ουδας του σωτηριου. Both passages are in the Anaphora: the first of the so-called Clementine Liturgy and the second from that of St Basil.

10. βοιτη γενεθ: The expression is used in the same sedes in
Nonn. Dion. 3.253. Cf. also Clem. Alex. hymn. Christ. 17 ap. Paed. (ed. Heitsch p.158), AP 1.22.2 and Orph. hymn. 18.5. The neuter form βροτευον γένος may be found in e.g. Eur. fr. 898.13 (Nauck ², TGF, p.648) and Aristot. hymn. Arête 1 (PLG ii p.360 Bergk); while βροτευον γένος in Orph. hymn. 59.6.

10. φύσιν: ‘man's divine nature'. On this interpretation see above the note on lines 7-11.

10f. φύσιν ... ἡματα πάντα : In order to have the obvious sense of this passage: 'you have granted the human race a nature such that we may live in eternity' οἱ should have been οἷον (see Smyth 2497, 2003). This change may possibly be explained as an attraction to the neuter form : ἡματα πάντα.

10. ἡμᾶς : This is a correction suggested by Tollius (see the note on 1.1.33 in ed. 1696) in the place of the obviously corrupted readings of both MSS.

11. γάρν ἡματα πάντα : This expression is used twice in the Homeric hymn to Aphrodite: 221, 240.

ἡματα πάντα : Cf. 1.1.34.29,30. This is a regular Homeric formula (cf. Il.8.539, 12.133) and seems to have been employed by the poet instead of the Biblical αἷμ-formula (see below the note on 1.1.34.30). It is found quite often in the Homeric hymns : hymn. Apoll. 485, hymn. Cer. 367, in Orac. Sibyl. 11.265, Mag. hymn. Ven. 10,13 (ed. Heitsch p.199) and Apoll. Met. Ps. 144.3,6, 90.32.

11. ἁμοροτον : Cf. 2.1.38.27, Carm. 1.1.18.37 (483) and 1.1.34.

15. This is a universal divine epithet used for instance of Dionysus in Orph. hymn. 30.7, of Apollo in AP 9.525.2 and of Athene in Soph. OT 159. See Bruchmann, Epitheta Deorum, for further examples and above p. 26. The same epithet may be found in Orac. Sibyl. 3.628, 693, 5. 66, 14.37, fr. 1.11.

11.(οἷον .. αἷμα ἀἐλυον : Cf. Hom. hymn. 21.4 where the same
expression (found in the same sede) is used of Apollo. The formula 
αὐτὸν ἀναπτάν (whereby the poet expresses his wish to hymn God cease-
lessly) is a regular feature of Greek pagan hymns and prayers. See 
e.g. Hesiod. Theog. 34, Theogn. 3f., Cleanth. hymn. 6 (Zeus) and Mesom. 
42f. The same notion may be expressed negatively as happens in Hom. 
hymn. Apollo. 177f.: οὐ λέξει ἐχθρόλον Ἀπόλλωνα/ ὑμνέων which may in 
turn find its Biblical parallel in the way Ezekiah's prayer ends in 
LXX Is. 38. 20: οὐ καθομαι εὐλογῶ σε ... πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ὑώς 
μου. The present phrase may be compared also to ὀλυνεχές (or ὦ 
παντὸς) ἀναπτάν in 1.1.34.10 and 1.1.31.9 respectively (see the notes 
ad loc.).

The hymn I have discussed here resembles in various aspects with 
the one which follows (1.1.34). The comparison between the two in the 
form of a brief analysis of their content, structure and sources is 
made at the end of 1.1.34. Therefore, as a conclusion to this poem I 
am confined to make only the following remarks.

With regard to hymn-features 1.1.33 provides an example of the 
αὐτὸν ἀναπτάν-formula, makes extensive use of expressions with ἑας, 
uses epithets with general application: βασιλεὺς, ἀμφοτερος, and the 
common request for mercy (5). The divergencies of the hymn from the 
Greek pagan ones lie, apart from the general Christian content of 
Praise (creation and mystery of redemption), primarily on the use of 
the introductory phrase χάριν εἶναι, on the replacement of the proper 
name or by-name of god with the personal pronoun ὁ and on the dida-
ctic tone which marks the Praise in general and line 3 in particular. 
All these are features found either in the early Christian hymnogra-
phy or in the Bible. 1

1. A Table of the main features appearing in the hymns under dis-
cussion may be found below in Appendix IV.
The present hymn is very carefully constructed as the theme of each part leads naturally to that of the following one. This may be illustrated as follows: The Introduction (1-2a), which is the same as that in 1.1.33 with the exception that $\chi\alpha\rho\varsigma$ is repeated in line 2, leads to the first theme of the Praise part (2b-13): the creation from non-existent matter of the intelligible powers and of the visible world (2b-3). The reference to angels leads consequently to the second theme of the Praise part, namely the scene of the throne of God surrounded by the choirs of hymn-singers: angels, the Church triumphant and stars who all raise a pure and ceaseless hymn to God (4-13). The repetition of the first line in line 12 shows that this verse itself may be the actual hymn sung by the heavenly choir, whereas line 13 serves to join the Praise part with the Prayer (14-29a) since it contains the key-word of the Praise part which is the epithet $\acute{\alpha} \chi\rho\pi\tau\sigma\varsigma$ used to characterize both the heavenly hymn-singers and their hymn (4,11,13).

The idea of purity expressed in $\acute{\alpha} \chi\rho\pi\tau\sigma\varsigma$ determines the content of the Prayer. First it brings the poet, who, as a human being, is liable to sin, into contrast with the sinlessness of the heavenly choirs and makes him, therefore, approach God as a humble suppliant (14-18). On the other hand, most of the requests are connected with the idea of purity: for mercy (19f.), rescue from eternal death (20f.), purity of thoughts (21b), or for pure life and death (26). The final section (29b-30) brings back the subject of the Introduction with the repetition of $\chi\alpha\rho\varsigma$ which serves, not only as an additional praise to God, but also, as a sort of promise to Him for a ceaseless hymn by the poet which thus corresponds to that of the heavenly choirs. In other words, the introductory address (1) is the core of the hymn since it serves, not only as a means, or idea, whereon the whole hymn is composed, but also as the actual heavenly hymn (12). This may be
further attested by the fact that the poet returns to the introductory address at the end of the hymn (although he repeats only $\sigma\iota\chi\alpha\rho\upsilon\zeta$ - possibly for reasons of variation) and, by doing so, he somehow encircles within it both Praise and Prayer, and thus he makes their content subordinate to that of the introductory address. In this way a sort of ring composition is produced. Further evidence for this ring composition is the introductory appellation of God ($\pi\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\nu$) $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ which is repeated towards the end of the hymn: ($\acute{\alpha}g\alpha\theta\omicron\varsigma$) $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ (29).

Another point worth mentioning is the particular appellations whereby God is addressed. In the introductory invocation and Praise God is called King and Maker of all. Both appellations present an objective picture of God i.e. that which is exemplified in the Psalms and other OT prayers. On the other hand, in the Prayer He is invoked as Father, a title which marks the poet's personal relationship with Him and is completely a NT feature (cf. e.g. The Lord's prayer in Ev. Mt. 6. 9-13). Therefore, we may say that the two major sections of the hymn: 1-13 and 14-30 present two ways of celebrating God: the impersonal (of OT) and the personal (of NT).
I. Introduction (1-2a)

Line 1 is the same as 1.1.33.1 (see the note ad loc.) and is repeated in line 12. The composition of two poems beginning with the same line, or the repetition of the whole or part of a line within the same poem are some of the techniques in verse-composition used in Gregory's undisputed poems (see below Appendix III).

2. σολ χάρμς (sc. ελνώ): The repetition of an introductory phrase at the beginning of the following line is another common feature in Gregory's authentic poems. See e.g. carm.2.1.54.1,2(1397f.). This feature appears also in 1.1.31.1,2 where the repeated word is the introductory verbal phrase of the hymn as happens in the present case. On the feature of anaphora in the hymns covered by the present research see the note on 1.1.33.8.

With the strong caesura after σολ χάρμς a ring-form is produced which shows that particular emphasis is placed on the phrase. Repetitions of the introductory verb or verbal phrase occur also in Greek pagan hymns: see e.g. Procl.hymn.1.1,2 and 6.1-3,13-15; and they must be due to the solemn style of hymns and prayers as is the case with the feature of anadiplosis, usually of the god's name: e.g. "Ερως, "Ερως in Eur. Hippol. 525. On this feature see also Norden, p.169 n.1.

II. Praise (2b-13)

The transition to the Praise part is made with the relative pronoun ὡς as happens also in 1.1.36.1 and its variation 1.1.37.2, and in 1.1.32.7 (see above p.27f.). Relative clauses in the Praise part are used in 1.1.35.4,6, 2.1.38.13, 1.1.31.3, 1.1.30.4-10,20, 1.1.32.8,13, and 1.1.36.3 (two). The repeated use of them in the present hymns, particularly in 1.1.36, 1.1.30, and 1.1.32, shows that our hymns comply with the characteristics of Greek pagan hymns from the later period of Greek literature (see Haldane p.108 and above p. 24f.).
The Praise part contains two subjects: the creation (2b-3) which shows God's power and is expressed in two relative clauses: ὁ... τέ...; and the scene of the throne (4-13) which may be further divided into two sections: the description of it (4-9) and the hymn of the heavenly choirs (10-13). The description is enclosed within the phrase σὸν θρόνον ἀμφιεπουσίν (4, -ποντες: 9), so that the ring form thus produced corresponds wonderfully to the circular arrangement of the choruses around the throne of God implied from ἀμφιεπαίν (4,9). This may be seen also in another ring form produced by ἐνθε... ἐνθε in line 5. The second section (10-13) describes the opposite feelings of joy and fear with which the heavenly choir raises the ceaseless hymn to God, the actual content of which seems to be line 12. Both the choir and its hymn are characterized as pure : ἀχράτος (4,11,13).

2b-3: Creation from non-existent matter

It is worth noticing that while the equivalent passage in the previous hymn (1.1.33.2f.) is based on the first antithetical pair: ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς of Ep. Col.1.16, the present passage is based on the second antithetical pair: τὰ ὀρατὰ καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα of the same passage. From what follows in the Pauline passage, τὰ ἀόρατα in it refers to the angels and this is very likely to be also the sense of τὰ νοητά in the present hymn. Such interpretation is supported by a passage from Gregory's or.38.9(M.36.320C) = or.45.5(629A): κρῶτον μὲν ἐννοεῖ (sc. God) τὰς ἀγγελικὰς δυνάμεις καὶ οὐρανίους' and ib.10 (321Af.) = ib.6(629C): οὕτω μὲν ὅθεν ὁ νοητὸς αὐτῷ καὶ διὰ ταύτα ὑπέστη κόσμος... δεύτερον ἐννοεῖ κόσμον ὑλικόν καὶ ὀρμημένων:καὶ οὕτως ἔστι τὸ ἐς οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς καὶ τῶν ἐν μέσῳ σύστημα τε καὶ σύγχρωμα. Here, ὁ νοητὸς κόσμος is also the angels. Elsewhere Gregory uses the Pauline pair ὀρατός-ἀόρατος to refer to κόσμος. See e.g. or.40.45(M.36.424A) : Πίστευε τὸν σύμπαντα κόσμον, ὅσος τε ὀρατός καὶ ὅσος ἀόρατος, ἐς οὐκ
The latter passage may be used as a parallel to line 3 since in both cases the patristic view of the creation from non-existent matter is stated (see below). To return to the meaning of τὰ νοητὰ: both the Pauline passage and the parallel ones from Gregory show that by τὰ νοητὰ the poet implies the angels. Furthermore, the preference for τὰ νοητὰ in the present hymn and for ὁ νοητὸς κόσμος in the Gregorian passage, instead of the Pauline term τὰ ἀδρατὰ, must owe something, at least in wording, to the common Platonic idea of the two worlds expressed as τὰ νοοῦμενα and τὰ φανέρωμεν, or as αἰσθητὸς, ὄρατος (sc. κόσμος) and νοητὸς (cf. e.g. Rep. 509d).

The distinction between the two worlds is used by Gregory in or.18.3 (M.35.988C): τῶν δύο κόσμων, τοῦ τε παρόντος καὶ ὧν ἔστωτος, καὶ τοῦ νοοῦμενου καὶ μένοντος when he contrasts man's present life with the life to come. See also or.2.74 (Bernardi, p.186; M.35. 481B) and or.7.19 (780B), and Gottwald, p.16 and Moreschini, pp.1356-57.

3. στῆσας: The form is not cited in Veitch s.v. ἔστησα and it thus seems to have been composed by analogy to other existing forms. Construction of such forms was a particular Gregorian habit (see above p.39 ). On the other hand, the choice of στῆσας in the sense 'to create' may be owed e.g. to LXX Ps.148.6: ἔστησεν αὐτὴ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, or Is.40.22. The same unaugmented form of aorist is used also in 1.1.36.7.

3. οὐ πρῶν ἔστη καὶ ἔξ ἀφανοῦς κατέδειξας: In carm.1.1.4(415-23), the fourth Arcana poem which is a didactic treatise on Christian Cosmology, the first section (1-23) discusses the Christian view of creation ex nihilo (implied also in the present hymn) as opposed to the Greek philosophical idea of creation from pre-existent matter (see Sykes, 'Arcana', pp.257-73, A.H.Armstrong, 'The Theory of the non-existence of matter in Plotinus and the Cappadocians', Studia Patristica, V(= TU 80, Berlin,1962),427-29 and G.V.Florovsky, 'The Idea of Creation in
The careful structure of this section, which is in accordance with Gregorian practice (see above page 46 on the rhetorical figures), may be seen, not only in the antithetical pair: τὰ νοητὰ and τὰ δρατά and the parallel one: λόγῳ - ἡκλεύςκε, which seems to derive from LXX Ps. 148.5: εἴκεν - ἐνετεῦκλατο, but also in the chiasmus: στὴσας(α) - οὕ τρον ἐθνα (b) - εἷς ἀφανοὺς (b) - κατέδεικτες (a) which is at the same time a form of pleonasm.

4-13: Scene of the throne

The picturesque description of the throne of God in heaven surrounded by angels, the Church triumphant and stars, who all raise a ceaseless hymn to God, is based on a combination of Biblical passages: Apoc.5.11f., Ep.Heb.12.22f., Isaiah's famous vision of inauguration (LXX Is.6.1-3) and various Psalmic and other passages of secondary importance e.g. LXX Ps.148.3 and Dan.3.62f. The same Biblical passages influenced a similar scene at the end of the anaphora of the Clementine Liturgy (cf. Const.Apost.8.12.27) and of that in the Liturgy of St James (ed. Brightman, p.50), so that both texts may be considered as indirect sources of the present hymn. Besides, similar elements appear also in the section 'Αρχή τῆς Προσκομιδῆς of the Liturgy of Gregory Nazianzen (M.36.708B-D), which is a variant of the Coptic rite (see the note in M.36.699-700). Cf. also Ser.Euch.13.9-11.

4. σὸν θρόνον ἀμφιεσθοῦν: The phrase is repeated in line 9b (but ending in -ἐπονθες) so that the section 4-9 appears to have a ring form which in turn seems to have been used in order to depict the circular arrangement of the hymn-singers expressed also in ἀμφι-ἐπελν, a verb used with angels also in carm.2.1.99.2(1452) in the same sedes as it appears in line 9. The present passage may be compared also with carm. 4. for Gregory's attitude to Apocalypse as uncanonical see carm.1.11.12 (472-74).
1.1.7.13f.(439):οὖ (sc. angels) ἰα θάνατον/ ἀμφὶ μέγαν βεβαιῶτες and
carm.2.1.45.287f.(1373): θεοῦ/ λάτρεις (sc. angels) ὑψιθρόνου πλησίον
έστατος. Worth noticing here is also a passage in Orph.fr.248.9f.(Kern)
= fr. 238.9f.(Abel): ὃς ὁ θάνατος τυράννης (cf. τυράννης in line 6) παρε-
στάσεως πολύμοχου/ ἄγγελου which, not surprisingly, is cited in Clem.
Alex. Strom.v.14,125.3 (GCS 2. p.411.7).

4. ἀκρατοῦ ὑμνητῆρες: The epithet ἀκρατοῦ is repeated twice in
lines 11 and 13 describing in both cases the hymn of the heavenly choirs.
The idea of purity which lies behind it seems to have particular im-
portance as it determines the content of prayer and, therefore, ἀκρα-
τοῦ must be seen as a key-word in the hymn. Cf. Synes.hymn.8.26.

ὑμνητὴρ referring to human beings is used in carm.1.1.8.69(452),
1.2.1.255(541), 2.2.(epit.)78.3(M.38.51), AP7.19.1(Leonid.) and Oppian.
Hal.3.7.

Line 5: Its structure with the ring form ἐνθεῦ ... ἐνθεῦ may be
symbolical of the circular arrangement of hymn-singers around the throne
of God.

5. μυριάδες καὶ χιλιάδες: It is a variant of Apoc.5.11 which is a
common Hebraism (see Blass-Debrunner-Funk, 164.1).

6. ἀγγελικῆς στρατηγῆς: The phrase is found in the same sedes in AP
1.9.3. Cf. also Apoll.Met.Ps.103.9. In carm.2.2(epit.)119.9(M.38.72)=
AP 8.3.3 angels are called after Ev.Lc.2.13 οὐρανίη στρατηγῆ. Cf. besides
Synes.hymn.5.45 and Nonn.par.Jo.1:52(M.43.706B). Furthermore, ἀγγελικῆς
χορὸς is often used by Gregory e.g.in 2.1.38.47f., carm.2.1.1.280(991),
2.1.42.29(1346),2.1.45.21(1355) and 1.2.14.117(764).

6. πυρός: The epithet is used of various Greek deities: Dionysus,
Hephaestus, Zeus etc. ; or of celestial bodies: stars and the sun
(examples may be found in Bruchmann's Epitheta Deorum). However, here
it applies to angels after LXX Ps.103.4 : ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ
πνεύματα καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πῦρ φλέγον . Besides, in Gregory's
works angels are often called πορ as in carm.1.1.7.15(440), 1.2.3.10 (633), or.45.5(M.36.629A)= or.38.9(320C); or δεύτερα φώτα as in carm. 1.2.1.18f.(523)= carm.1.1.7.11f.(439), or.44.3(M.36.609B) and or.40.5 (364B); or λαμπρότητες δεύτερα in or.45.5(M.36.629A)= or.38.9(320C).

6. ἀφθιτοὶ ἄρχαί: The reading ἄρχαί of Cod. Bg was preferred instead of ἄρχην of Cod. W as referring to one class of angels according to Ep.Col.1.16 (the same source for lines 2b-3). See also Ep. Rom.8.38 and Eph.3.10. In Orac.Sibyl.2.214 angels are called: ἀθανάτου θεοῦ ἀφθιτοὶ ἄγγελοι ἄγγελος. Cf. also Synes.hymn.5.40. The epithet ἀφθιτος, used here of angels, is very commonly used of many Greek gods as early as the Homeric hymns and Hesiod (Theog.389,397). See e.g. Pind.Pyth.4. 291 (ed. Snell-Maehler, 1971). For further examples see Bruchmann's Epitheta. In line 14 of the present hymn the epithet is addressed to the Father, while in 1.1.30.1 and 1.1.35.8 to the Godhead and the Son respectively. One finds it also in e.g. carm.1.1.2.83(408),2.1.2.30 (1019), 2.1.21.1(1280), 1.1.8.97(454), applied in all cases to the Son. As a divine epithet it seems to have replaced the Biblical ἀφθιτος (see Ep.1Tim.1.17 ,Rom.1.23 and Deichgräber p.101), and is used in Synes.hymn.6.10f.: ύμνησομεν ἀφθιτον/ θεον ,7.20 and quite often in Orac.Sibyl.e.g.5.298,358,12.132, and Apoll.Met.Ps.19.2.

7.: λαοὶ πρωτοτόκων: Source for this phrase seems to be Ep.Heb. 12.23: ἐπαλησία πρωτοτόκων ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἀπογεγραμμένων, a passage interpreted by a number of patristic writers who all take it to refer to the faithful and not to angels. From these I cite Clem. Alex.Prot. 9.82.6f.(GCS 1,p.62.25ff.;M.8.193B): ἀυτὴ γὰρ ἡ πρωτότοκος ἐπαλησία ἡ ἐν πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν συγκεκριμένη παιδῶν· οὕτως ἐστὶ τὰ πρωτότοκα τὰ ἐναπογεγραμμένα ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ τοσαύτης μυριάσον ἁγγέλων συμπανηγυρύζοντα· πρωτότοκοι δὲ παιδείς ἡμεῖς οὐ τρόφιμον τοῦ θεοῦ, οὐ τοῦ πρωτότοκου γνήσιον φύλον, οί πρῶτοι τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων τῶν θεῶν νεοηκότες and Chrys. hom.32.1f. in Heb.12:18-24(M.63.220): Τύνας δὲ πρωτοτόκοις καλεῖ λέγων,
καὶ ἐκκλησία πρωτοτόκων; Πάντας τοὺς χρονοὺς τῶν πιστῶν. Τοὺς αὐτούς ὅτι καὶ πνεῦμα τῶν ὑλικῶν τετελειωμένων λέγει ... (221): καὶ πνεῦμα τῶν ὑλικῶν τετελειωμένων. Τὰς ψυχὰς λέγει τῶν εὐδοκιμῶν. See also Euseb. hist. eccles. 10.4.70 (GC 2, p. 882; M. 20.877Bf.). Accordingly, it is very likely that λαός πρωτοτόκων of our hymn refers to the faithful and, more precisely, to the Church triumphant. Hence, πρωτότοκος is used in the sense it has in the Hebrews passage in order to describe the status of being a 'first-born' and not the chronological order in which λαοί were created. On the same passage (i.e. Ep. Heb. 12.22f.) is based also a section from Gregory's funeral oration to his sister Gorgonia: or. 8.6 (M. 35.796B): Γοργονία πατρίς μὲν ἡ δύν 'Ιερουσαλήμ, ἡ μὴ θλεομένη νουμένη δὲ πόλις, ἐν ἡ πολιτευόμεθα καὶ πρὸς ἡν ἑπελεημέθα: ἡς πολιτὴς Χριστός καὶ συμπολίται πανήγυρις καὶ ἐκκλησία πρωτοτόκων ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ περὶ τὸν μέγαν πολιστὴν ἑορταζόντων τῇ θεωρίᾳ τῆς ὁδεῖς καὶ χορευόντων χορεύ- ἀν τῇ ἀκατάλυτον. (The Neoplatonic overtones of the last sentence have been already noticed by Gottwald who compared it with Plot. Enn. vi. 9.8.44f.) The latter passage may be used in support of my interpretation of λαὸς πρωτοτόκων as referring to the Church triumphant. If this is the case, then Terzaghi is wrong when, commenting on Synes. hymn. 5.45, he cites lines 6-7 of the present hymn, implying thus that line 7 refers also to angels, possibly by taking πρωτότοκος as 'first-created'. In the same hymn of Synesius (5.42) angels are called τὸ πρωτόσπορον εἶ- δος, whereas in Clem. Alex. Strom. vi. 16, 143.1 (GC 2, p. 504.19) the ἄρχο- ντες ἀγγέλων are called πρωτόγονοι. In both cases the two epithets have been obviously used to show that angels were created first, before the creation of the material world and mankind. However, I have not come across any passage where πρωτότοκος is used of angels in this sense; neither have I found any passage with λαός referring to angels. In spite of these, there is a weak point in my interpretation: the disturbed order of the heavenly choirs, which, taking λαὸς πρωτοτόκων
to refer to the Church triumphant becomes: angels (5-6), the Church triumphant (7a), stars (7b) and again Church triumphant (8). But the order is restored if one takes stars (7b) in a metaphorical sense to refer also to the Church triumphant. This possibility, though slight, is discussed below ad loc.

7. καὶ λαμπτομένων χορὸς ἀστρων: Cf. Orac.Sibyl.1.140: ἀστρων μὲ (sc. God) χορὸς περιδέραομε πάντη/ (cf. also 8.450) and Synes.hymn.8.34f.: θάμβησε δ' ἀκήρατων/ χορὸς ἀμβρότος ἀστέρων /.

The inclusion of the chorus of stars among those of angels and the Church triumphant may be explained by a number of Biblical passages in which God appears to be praised by the various celestial bodies. See e.g. LXX Ps.148.3 (following the invitation made in verse 2 by the poet to the angels and powers of God to praise Him): αὕνετε αὐτῶν, ἡλίος καὶ σελήνη· αὕνετε αὐτῶν, πάντα τὰ ἄστρα καὶ τὸ φῶς and part of the hymn of the Three Holy Children in LXX Dan.3.62f. The same inclusion appears in the parallel scene from the anaphora of St James's Liturgy (Brightman p.50.16-19): Ὑψωθεὶς οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ οἱ οὐρανοὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ πᾶσα ἡ ὀὐρανιώτητα, ἡλίος τε καὶ σελήνη καὶ πᾶς ὁ τῶν ἄστρων χορός, γῆ καὶ θάλασσα καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς. The passage is followed by a reference to the hymn of the Church triumphant and then to that of angels; and the order is the reverse of that used here.

It would seem justifiable to take χορὸς ἀστρων also in a metaphorical sense according to Ep.1Cor.15.41: ἡλιος ὀξα άστρων, ἀστήρ γὰρ ἀστέρος ὄλοφέρει ἐν ὀξη (cf. also Ep.Phil.2.15 and Ev.Mt.5.14). The interpretation of the passage from 1st Corinthians, whereby the difference in brightness of the various stars shows metaphorically that of men in heaven, is given e.g. in Chrys.hom.41.3 in 1Cor.15:35f. (M.61.358): Τῇ τούτων ἐνεπεθεν (sc. from 1Cor.15.41) καταμανθάνομεν; ὅτι εἰ καὶ ἐν βασιλείᾳ πάντες, οὐ πάντες τῶν αὐτῶν ἀπολαύσομαι.

On these Biblical passages is based also Gregory's carm.1.2.1.213f.
(538): "(χορός ἀμφι Ἀνακτη "Ἀνακτη φαεσφόρου ἢπτατ');... λαμπτήρες κόσμου, δυ- 
αναγή ποτός ἐσπυρα/ οὔ θεόν εἰσορόσω/ καὶ ὤν θεός, οὔ τε θεοο/ which 
refers to the status of men in heaven. See also or.7.17(M.35.776B) 
where Gregory wishes that his brother Caesarius is among the angels 
and the Church triumphant: καὶ ἄγγελων ἑσπερεύοντος (sc. Caesarius ) χο- 
ρεάν, καὶ μακαρῶν ἀνόρων ὁδόσε τε καὶ λαμπρότητας. Another reason in 
favour of this interpretation is the balance produced in the section 
where two lines are used for angels (5,6) and two for men (7,8). 

Line 8: It seems to be based on Ep.Heb.12.23: καὶ πνεύματι δικαί- 
ων τετελεωμένων which is interpreted in Chrys.hom.32.1f. in Heb.12: 
18-24(M.63.220f.) - the passage is cited above on line 7a. Cf. also 
Apoc.6.9. Two close parallels are: a line from the hymn of the Three 
Holy Children (LXX Dan.3.86):ἐύλογεττε, πνεύματα καὶ φυχαὶ δικαίων, 
τὸν Κύριον and the Anaphora of Liturg.Jac. (Brightman p.50.21f.): πνεύ- 
ματα δικαίων καὶ προφητῶν, φυχαὶ μαρτυρῶν καὶ ἀποστόλων. 

9. πάντες ὅμηρες: Cf. Il.7.415 and 2.789, both in the same 

Line 10: Cf. carm.1.2.1.723(577): γηθόσυνοι μέλπωμεν ἐόρτων ὄμοι 
ἄνακτι (cf. Kaibel ep.1027.36),2.1.1.634(1017): γηθόσυνοι ὄμοις σε 
διηνεκέσσου γερακεῖν and Apoll.met.Ps.144.4f.:γηθόσυνοι μέλπω σε διη- 
nεκές.../ οὖν μου δ' ὑμνήσαμε τεν τυχεσον ὄροσες/. 

10f. διηνεκές ἀείδουσι / ὄμοιο... ἀπαντον: Cf. carm.2.1.54.20 
(1399) = 2.1.22.12(1281): διηνεκέσσου ἐν ὄμοισ/. The passage may be 
compared to the αὐξ ὅρ (or ὅλα παντος) ἀείδου εν expressions in 1.1.33.11 
and 1.1.31.9. See the notes ad loc. 

For the combination of fear and joy in the feelings of hymn-singers 
the closest Biblical parallels I could find are: LXX Ps.2.11: δουλεύ-
σατε τῷ Κυρίῳ ἐν φύσι, καὶ ἀγαλλιάσατε αὐτῷ ἐν τρόπῳ, Ecclus.1.12: φό- 
βος Κυρίου τέρψει καρδίαν, καὶ δώσει εὐφροσύνην καὶ χαράν and Ps.46.1f. 

On the subject of Greek and Christian gods alike causing fear to
inferior beings see e.g. Synes. *hymn.* 8.33 and the examples cited by Terzaghi *ad loc.* On the other hand, the description of gladness or fear of mankind and inanimate nature at the time of a god's birth or epiphany was a common feature of Greek pagan hymns (see above p. 28 n. 4).


11. ἡ καὶ ἁπαυστον: Cf. *carm.* 1.2.3.95(640): σὺν ἄγγελους χορεύ-σεως (sc. παρθένε) τὴν ἁπαυστον χορεύαν.

Line 12 = Line 1. Repetition of the same verse within a hymn may be seen also in *Mesom. hymn. Nem.* 1=15 (ed. Heitsch p. 26), although it is very likely that lines 16-24 of it form a separate hymn. The present verse seems to contain the actual hymn sung by the choirs of hymn-singers. This possibility is supported by ὁστός in the following line. The poet thus identifies the opening line of his hymn with the hymn sung by the heavenly choirs which in turn substitutes the *Tersanctus* i.e. the Seraphic hymn of the various liturgies (see Brightman p. 589).

13. ἐπ' οὐρανύος: The phrase may be taken also as one word: ἐ- οὐρανύος, an epithet used of the Trinity in 2.1.38.24.

13. οὐρανύος χοροτό: In the same *sedes* we find οὐρανύος χορεύζεις in *carm.* 1.2.1.188(537).

III. Prayer (14-29a)

The Prayer may be divided into two parts: the description of the poet as a suppliant (14-18) and the actual prayer (19-29a) consisting of various requests. The content of both parts (as has been said in the introductory analysis of the poem) is in accordance with and necessitated by the key-idea of the Praise, namely that of purity.

14-18: The poet as a suppliant

14. υαί: The transition to the Prayer is made by υαί which is found very often in Christian hymns and prayers and rarely in Greek pagan
ones (see above p. 30 n.3). Some Christian examples are: Ev.Mt.11.25ff. = Lc.10.21 (see also Apc.16.7 and Norden p.50 n.4), Synes.hymn.1.529, Clem.Rom.1Cor.60 (ed. Lightfoot p.177), Naassin.hymn. ap. Origen.Cels. vi.31 (GCS 2, p.100f.; M.11.1341ff.).

14. νατό̂μοι: The same expression is addressed by Nicobulus to his father in Gregory’s carm.2.2.4.100,101(1513). This is found also in AP 5.165.2 (Meleag.), IG ii/iii.2, 13134 (ed. in W. Peek, Griechische Vers-Inschriften, vol.1:’Grab Epigramme’ (Berlin,1955), No 1920.3), Procl.hymn.6.8,11, 7.45 and Nonn.Dion.12.26. Further examples of the common verb λύ̂σομαι, or λύ̂σομαι - in line 17 and 2.1.38.32 - which are used to introduce the Prayer part of Greek pagan hymns, are given in Adami pp.234f. (see also above p.31 n.4).

14. Πάτερ ἅφθοι: Cf. Πάτερ ἀμβροτε in line 15 and ἐλέους Πάτερ in line 19. On the other hand, Πάτερ alone is used in 1.1.31.12 and 1.1.30.36,48. The present expression is used of Apollo in Kaibel ep. 1025.4 and of Ocean in Orph.hymn.83.1 (in acc.). On the divine epithet ἅφθοι see above the note on line 6; while for Πάτηρ as a common appellation of many Greek pagan gods and in particular of Zeus see Keyssner p.23f., Ausfeld p.512f. and 522, and Beckmann p.34.

The renewal of the introductory invocation at the beginning of the Prayer, or inserted in it, is a common feature in Greek pagan and Christian hymns alike: see e.g. Cleanth.hymn.32 and Procl.hymn.1.33ff. for the first type of hymns and Synes.hymn.6.40 for the second (see also above p.31 ). Apart from the cases with Πάτερ cited above, other invocations to God in the Prayer part of the present hymns are found in: 1.1.33.5 (θεύτα Τριάς),6 (Υἱὲ θεοῦ), 1.1.36.19 (μάκαρ), 28 (βίου φάλας), 31 (ὁ ἄνω Χριστός), 1.1.37.6(‘Ἀναξ’), and 1.1.32.46 (θεός).

In lines 14b-18 the poet gives a description of himself as a suppliant of God (ἐκέντης:17) which consists of four elements, the first two taken in a metaphorical and the rest in a literal sense.
These are: 1) the kneeling of the heart (14f.), 2) the prostration of the mind (15f.), 3) the bending of the head to face earth (16) which is further emphasized as it is explained in a negative way (18), and 4) the shedding of tears (17). The Biblical overtones of the description will be discussed in detail below. Here, it would be interesting to show why the poet has chosen the way of supplication and not any other of the various manners of praying to Greek or Christian gods alike: e.g.: by raising the head and stretching the hands out to heaven, partly described in 1.1.30.43 (see the note ad loc.). (On the various postures of the body during prayer see RAC s.v. 'Gebet I', cols 1216f. and 1228-34.) The explanation for this may be found e.g. in Origen. orat. 31.3 (GCS 2, p.396.21ff.; M.11.552Af.) and Basil. Spir. 27(M.32. 192C). In the former passage Origen sees kneeling as an act of repentance through which one wants to receive forgiveness of sins and healing from God: καὶ ἡ γονυκλισία δὲ δτι ἀναγκαία ἔστων, δτε τις μέλλει τούν ἱδών ἐπὶ θεοῦ ἀμαρτημάτων κατηγορεῖν, ἵπτευσιν περὶ τῆς ἐπὶ τούτους ἰάσεως καὶ τῆς ἀφέσεως αὐτῶν. Basil on the other hand, sees kneeling as a confession of one's sins: καὶ καθ' ἐκάστην δὲ γονυκλισίαν καὶ διανάστασιν ἔργῳ δεύκνυμεν, δτι διὰ τῆς ἀμαρτίας εἰς γῆν κατεβρύθηνεν καὶ διὰ τῆς φυλανθρωπίας τοῦ κτίσαντος ήμᾶς εἰς οὐρανῶν ἀνεκληθήνεν. The content of the actual prayer in the present hymn is primarily the requests for mercy (19f.), and purification and forgiveness of sins (20f., 26, 28f.), on which all the other secondary requests depend. Therefore, the addition of lines 14b-18 with their description of the poet's supplicatory posture is obviously made to pave the way to the content of the actual prayer (19-29a).

and has, according to Lightfoot (see the note on Clem. Rom. 1 Cor. 57), a strong oriental character. The same metaphor is used also by Gregory in carm. 2.1.50.58 (1389): οὗτος σου (sc. δούλον) καμψάω γούνα-τ' ἐμῆς κραδίνης, while a similar one appears in Const. Apost. 8.37.6: τούς κάμψαντας αὐχένα καρδίας αὐτῶν and in Orac. Sibyl. 3.3.: κάμψηκε γὰρ ἐνδοθέν ἔτοτ (= 12.298). On the other hand, γόνυ κάμπτειν in its literal sense may be found in e.g. carm. 2.1.45.126f. (1362), 2.1.1.577 (1013), Synes. hymn. 2.234ff.: Γόνυ σου κάμπτων, / ὅς τούτο, λάτρεις / πόστω κατὰ γάς, / ἱκέτας ἀλάς and Orac. Sibyl. 3.616f.

15. ἡμετέρης κραδίνης: The phrase is used in the same sedes in Apoll. Met. Ps. 48.6. The possessive pronoun ἡμετέρης is used instead of the more appropriate ἐμῆς metri gratia and according to the common Greek practice followed from Homer onwards. Cf. Od. 10.334 and LSJ s.v.

15. Πάτερ ἀμπρωτε: On the divine epithet ἀμβρωτος see above the note on 1.1.33.11. However, I could not find any case where the invocation πάτερ ἀμβρωτε is addressed to any Greek god.

15f. καὶ νός ἐνδόν / πρῆνης σου προσάργονε: The metaphor of the prostrating mind seems to have been built by the poet according to the Biblical one: πνεῦμα συντετριμμένου, καρδιῶν συντετριμμένη καὶ τετα-πευμαθείνην in LXX Ps. 50.19 (cf. also ib. 12 and Is. 58.10) and: ταπεινοῖς τῷ πνεύματι in Ps. 33.19. Besides, the choice for νός instead of the Biblical πνεῦμα may be owed also to the influence of Greek philosophy as is the case with τὰ νοητά in line 2 (see above the note ad loc.). Note the alliteration of π and ρ in the second half of the sentence.

16. κάτω δὲ μοι ἐς χόνα νεῦει: The phrase ἐς χόνα νεῦει, though in the sense of dying, appears in the same sedes in carm. 2.1.13.53 (1231): καὶ γὰρ ἄγου πέκτωνος δῶς στρατὸς ἐς χόνα νεῦε, which, as Sajdak correctly observed, is the origin of the uncertain Orphic fr. 288 (Abel) (see J. Sajdak, 'Nazianzenica', part ii, EOS, 16 (1910), 91); while in 1.2.15.150 (777) the body (δέμας) is said to νεῦει πρὸς χόνα τὴν ζώην,
as it is made of earth. The expression ἐς χάδωνα may be found in the same sedes in e.g. 1.2.1.676(573) and 2.1.17.87(1268). See also Orph. hymn. 38.18, Nonn. Dion. 42.289 and van Liempt p. 22.

17. λυσομένῳ: See the note on λύτομαι in line 14.

Line 17b may be compared to Synes. hymn. 1.455ff.: προσώπης ἰκέτας/ δάκτεδον βλεψάρων/ δεύων νοτίσι (cf. also 1.47, 695f. and 2.241), to Clem. Rom. 1Cor. 9 (Lightfoot p. 42): ἰκέται γενόμενοι τοῦ ἐλέους καὶ τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ προσεύχομεν ... ἐπὶ τοὺς οὐκτερμούς αὐτοῦ, to Procl. hymn. 1.36 and Orph. hymn. 3.13 (cf. also 13.9, 34.27 and 9.12).

As has been shown above the supplication to God described in 14b-18 is oriental, or more precisely Biblical, and is used in Gregorian passages as well. However, when Gregory refers in his poems to supplications to men, he describes them in the Greek way, i.e. by holding the beard and knees of the person entreated (see e.g. II.8.371, 10.454f., Eur. Herc. Fur. 1208f. and Bacch. 1318). Such examples may be found e.g. in carm. 2.2.3.340f. (1504) and 2.2.4.100 (1513), where in both cases the appeal is made to Nicobulus's father, and 2.1.17.65f. (1266).

17. δάκρυα χεῖσι: Cf. carm. 1.2.9.45 (671): δάκρυα θερμα χέσσων and 2.2.3.110 (1488).

Line 18 may be compared to a passage from the Prayer of Manasses 9 (ed. Swete, OT iii, p. 825): καὶ οὖν εὐμ ἔξεσον ἀπευθείας καὶ ἔδειν τὸ υφός τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, or even to that from the Prayer of Hezekiah (LXX Is. 38.14), or Ev. Lc. 18.13. The latter passage is rendered by Gregory in carm. 2.1.1.399-402 (1000) as follows:

Αὐτὰρ ὁ δακρυξών (sc. the publican ) καὶ στήθεα χερσὶ πατάσσων,
οὐδε ἄντην μεγάλοιο θεοῦ θρόνον οὕρανον εὐρύν
εἰσορῶν, λεύσων δὲ κατ' οὐδεσ δυμασι δούλους,
τηλόθεν ἐστηκὼς δὲ λυτάστατο.

The posture of praying by facing the sky is very common nearly in
all religions, including the Greek pagan. See for instance II.16.231f.: 
/ εὐχετ' ... / οὐρανόν εἰσανελών which is said to describe Achilles's
prayer to Zeus (233-248), and 24.306f. On the various manners of pray-
ing appearing in the Homeric Epics see Beckmann pp.69-73.

19. ἄλλα: It is used to introduce the actual requests of the
Prayer (see above p. 30 ) and appears also in 1.1.36.19,33, 1.1.37.4
and 2.1.38.32,50.

19. σὺ μ' ὀλκτεύρος: Cf. Synes. hymn.3.31: Τὰν σὰν ὀλκτεύρον
κούραν. The requests to Greek gods with ὀλκτεύρειν are very rare com-
pared with those for Ἑλεός or Ἑλεός. Actually, from the various
scholars who dealt with the content of Greek hymns and prayers, only
Ausfeld (p.540f.) appears to cite three examples of requests with ὀλ-
κτεύρειν: Aesch. Choe.130, 502 and Soph. OC 109. To these one may
add also Mesom. hymn.Phys.23 (Heitsch p.27), Ῥyllus paean72(Coll.Alex.74).In
LXX and other Christian texts God is often called ὀλκτεύρων καὶ Ἑλεή-
μων (see e.g. LXX Ps.85.15, 102.8, 110.4, 144.8, and cf. Ep.Jac.5.11
and Clem.Rom. 1Cor.60 ed. Lightfoot p.176); or καθή ὀλκτεύρων (see
e.g. Ep.2Cor. 1.3, and cf. Serap. Euch.14.2, 15.1 and Deichgrüber p.91f.
and 93).

19. Ἑλεός Πάτερ: Although the request for mercy is very common
in Greek pagan and Christian hymns and prayers alike (see above the
note on 1.1.33.5), this particular expression seems to have been con-
structed according to the Biblical appellation κύριε τοῦ Ἑλεός (LXX
Sap.9.1) which is used also in Const. Apost.8.37.5. Cf. Blass-Debrun-
ner-Funk, 165.

19. Ἐλάος Ἐσσο: Cf. Hom. hymn.29.10 and Allen's-Halliday's-Si-
keas,note ad loc., and II.1.583. The same request is addressed to
Apollo-Helius in Pap.Mag.Gr.iii.213(Preis.) and Nonn. Dion.17.285. For
Ἑλάος ἔλαοι requests in Gregory see e.g. carm.2.1.1.402f.(1000): Ἑλάος
ἐπὶ, Ἑλάοι ὕπεράξοντε and those mentioned below on 1.1.29.15: Ἑλα-
20. ἐξ ἐφάπτοντος: The same expression is used in line 25 where it refers to the poet's father, and in 1.1.35.2 and 1.1.38.5 referring to the poet himself as happens in the present passage. See also 1.1.35.12. In these hexameter passages ἐφάπτοντος is used in the sense of a henchman, worshipper or servant of God (cf. LSJ s.v.) and it thus corresponds to the Biblical expression δοῦλος τοῦ Κυρίου (or Χριστοῦ, or θεοῦ) - cf. e.g. Ep.Gal.1.10, 2Tim.2.24 and 1Petr.2.16 - on which δοῦλος in 1.1.30. 46 is based. Gregory calls himself ἐφάπτοντος in a number of instances: e.g. carm.2.1.1.403(1000), in the same sedes and 2.1.96.2(1450).

20. κυνορού: The epithet is fairly common in Nonnus's Dionysiaca e.g. 12.173 where it appears in the same sedes and refers to Bacchus.

20. σάου δέ με: Cf. Od.13.230: σάου δ' ἐμέ in the same sedes. The request for a rescue or deliverance of men from various unwanted situations was common in Greek pagan and Christian hymns and prayers. For the former see Aristoph. Ranae 386 (Demeter): καὶ σφίζε τὸν σαύτης χορόν, Aristonous paean Apoll.47 (Coll.Alex. p.164) and Eur. Iph.Taur. 1399 and for the latter Synes. hymn.7.6 : / σὺ δέ μου βοήταν σάου, 1. 545,548. On the other hand, σφίζεν ἐκ θανάτου may be found not only in Greek pagan texts, e.g.Od.4.753 and 11.22.175, but also in Ep.Heb.5.7. Such a request is used in Gregory's carm.2.1.1.386(999): / ἀλλὰ μ', "Ἀναξ, ἐλέατερ καὶ ἐκ θανάτου σάωσον. Cf. also Apoll. Met.Ps.67.50. However, in the present hymn the poet uses the metaphor ἐξ θεωρίων θανάτου which I have not been able to trace any closer parallels, either in the Bible, or in Greek literature, than the Biblical κέντρον θανάτου (see below the note on 2.1.38.40) for the former and φώνα (or θανάτου) πτερόν in Paroemiographers (e.g. Apost. xvii.88, vol. ii, p.713 and Zenob. vi.31, vol.i, p.171) for the latter. Another Biblical metaphor, used in a similar context to that of the present one, is found in LXX Ps.88.49.
20. χεῖρα τανύσας: Cf. carm.2.1.1.7,176(970,983), 2.1.55.23
(1401) and 2.2.3.338f.(1504): "Αναξ Πάτερ, Υλε μέγιστε, δ' δες χειρα; also
Dioscorus Encom.6.28 (ed. Heitsch p.137): άρηγάνα χειρ' άτανύσ[σ]ης in
the same sedes and 7.21,13.14(ed.H. p.138, 143). To these one may add
Synes. hymn.5.75f.: επ' εμοίς ελαυν οδας/ τάνυσων (cf. also 2.296, 9.
123), Serap. Euch.12.3 and Procl. hymn.6.8,11. Finally, the present
expression is equivalent to the Biblical χείρα ἐκτεύνειν (cf. LXX Ex.
3.20, Ps.137.7 and Ev.Mt.14.31).

21. νοηματα πάντα καθήρας: Cf. carm.2.1.1.347(996): νολύσματα
πάντα καθηροώ in the same sedes, 1.2.1.170(535), 2.1.17.35f.(1264) and
or.32.15(M.36.192A): νούς πλησιάσῃ τῷ καθαρωτάτῳ (sc. God) κεκαθαρμέ-
νος. Requests to God for purification of the worshippers' mind and
thoughts were not absent from liturgical prayers. See e.g. Liturg.
Jac. (Brightman p.41.14f.): καθαρον ἡμῶν τον νοου και τα φρονήματα ἀπό
μιαρῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν. The purification of thoughts in the present passage
is the presupposition for the avoidance of eternal death. Similarly,
Socrates in Plat. Phaedo 67c faces his departure for the future life
with good hope having purified his intellect. See also ib.108c.

22. μὴ μ' ἀπογυμνώσως σου Πνεύματος: This is a completely
Christian request which derives from LXX Ps.50.13: το πνεῦμα τὸ
ἄγιον σου μὴ ἀντανέλης ἀτ' ἐμοῦ.

χεῖσων, Procl. hymn.7.34 and Synes. hymn.1.490. Greek gods were not only
praised for their strength and power: μένος, σθένος, κράτος (see above
p.29 ), but they were also asked to give such power to men (see Keys-
sner p.67 for requests for δύναμις, σθένος, or κράτος). The phrase μέ-
νος καὶ ἀθροος is a Homeric formula (see e.g. Il.5.2 and Od.1.321),
used purely for metrical purposes since it has no Christian parallels.
Consequently, one may see how the form of the hymn influences its con-
tent.

Line 24: A common feature in Greek pagan hymns is the petitioner's promise to praise god if the latter fulfils his requests (see above p.30). Such a promise, usually expressed in a purpose clause, is found in the present line, in 1.1.30.42,44 and 45, whereas in 1.1.33, 11 and 1.1.36.26f. it may be implied. See also carm.2.1.45.349(1378). Examples of such a promise in Greek pagan hymns may be found in Cleanth. hymn.36f.: (δύο ... σκέδασον ... δός) .../ ὃν τιμηθέντες ἀμελέως· μεσθάν σε τιμή, / ὑμνουντες τὰ ς ἔργα ὀνησικέως and Eur. Hel.173ff. See also Synes. hymn.7.48-53 and a passage from the Prayer of Manasses 14f. (Swete,iii, p.826): δι' ἀνάξιον ὑντα σώσεισ με .../ καὶ αἰνέσω σε ὑπάντος. On the other hand, the Homeric formula: αὐτάρ ἐγὼ καὶ σέ οὐκ ἄλλης μυήσου' ἀντίθες, whereby most of the Homeric hymns end, may be considered as such a promise when a request precedes it (cf.hymn. Cer. 495, 6.21, 10.6, hymn. Pan.49 and 30.19).

24. κραδύς καὶ χείλεσις: Cf. 1.1.31.11: πνεύματι καὶ φυχῇ καὶ γλώττῃ καὶ διάνοιᾳ. The Biblical sources for the combination of a praise by heart and lips may be found in LXX Is.29.13 (cf. Ev.Mt.15.8) and Ep.Col.3.16 (cf. Eph.5.19).


Line 25: One way, employed by the petitioner in order to receive a favourable response to his requests, is the reference to past kindnesses rendered by the god to him or other mortals (see above p. 30). Examples of this feature in Greek pagan hymns are: Orph. hymn.2.14, Archiloch. 27.2(PLG ii p.390 Bergk) and Aristides orat.45.14. In the present hymn the poet reminds God of the help and protection He offered to his father. The past tense παρέστην may also imply that the poet's
father was no longer alive when the poem was composed. If this is the

26. The imperatives of ὁδόντα, also used in 1.1.31.12 and

1.1.30.38, are commonly used in the Prayer part of Greek pagan and

Christian hymns alike (see above p. 31).

26. καθαρόν βότον: Cf. Gregory's or.16.2 (M.35.936B): σοφία

κράτη, βότος ... θερ' κεκαθαρμένος, ἢ καθαρομένος τῷ καθαρωτάτῳ ... καὶ

μόνην ἀπαίτοντι παρ' ἡμῶν θυσίαν τὴν κάθαρσιν, 1.1.36.27 and carm.

1.2.34.173(958) where purification (καθαρος) is defined by Gregory in

its Christian sense as ἐκκλίσεως μυλουμάτων while μολυσμὸς is τύπωσις

tῶν κακῶν. See also 2.1.23.21f.(1284): ὃς αὐτὸς σῶδα, δεδεμένος καθαρ-

σών, / δεινὸν καθαύρειν μορφότροποι μολύσματα καὶ or.32.12.(M.36.188C):

Μέγα τὸ περὶ Θεοῦ λαλεῖν; Ἀλλὰ μείζον τὸ ἐαυτοῦ καθαύρειν θερ' ἐπειδὴ

eἰς κακότεχνον ψυχὴν σοφία οὐκ εἰσελεύσεται (cf. LXX Sap.1.4). Besides,

for Gregory purification is also the means for the knowledge, vision

and contemplation of God since God Himself is pure: carm.2.1.34.104

(1314): (δεόδια, μη τι πάθομι,) / μη καθαρῶς καθαρὴς ἀπτόμενος Τριά-

δος /, 2.1.45.196(1367), καὶ καθαρὸν καθαρῆς ἀπτόμενοι σοφίς, 2.1.55.

20f.(1400f.): Βόρβορε, μη με θηλὸν, / ὃς καθαρῶς καθαροτείν συναντήσω

φαέσσον / οὕρανύος καὶ or.20.12 (Mossay, p.80 ; M.35.1080B): Διὰ πο-

λυτείας ἄνελθε' διὰ καθάρσιος κτησαὶ τὸ καθαρὸν. To these one may add

the passages cited by Gottwald which he compares with Plat. Phaedo 67b

and Plot. Enn. vi.9.11 (see Gottwald p.41 and Moreschini p.1362); and

those cited by Sykes('Arcana', on 1.1.1.8) and discussed in detail by

Plagnieux (pp.81-113). Finally, the purification of the mind by its

separation from the body is an idea discussed below on 1.1.32.45-46.

26. καθαρὸν τε τελευτῆν: The epithet καθαρὸς is found in NT

connected with καρδία or συνεδώσις, but not with βότος or τελευτή
as in the present hymn. Besides, in LXX Sap. 14.24 the meaning of καθαρός seems to be restricted to bodily instincts. On the other hand, requests for a happy or pleasant life and death were common in Greek pagan hymns: Orph. hymn. 19.21 (Zeus): ζωήν τ’ ὀλβιόθυμον (sc. δίδου) and 11.22 (Pan): ἀγαθὴν δ’ ὕπασσον βλέπον τελευτήν. For further examples see Keyssner p.136f; see also above p.31.

Line 27: Cf. 1.1.30.49 and 2.1.83.28 (1430). The requests for a good hope (ἐλπισμὸν ἀγαθήν), for mercy and grace (ἐλεος, χάρως) are in the present context Christian and may be compared to Ep. 2 Thess. 2.16, Heb. 4.16, 2 Jo. 3 and 2 Tim. 1.2. Requests for χάρως, yet in a different context, appear also in Greek pagan hymns: Hom. hymn. 24.5 (Hestia): χάρων δ’ ἀμ᾿ ὕπασσον ἀυτού and Anacreon 110 (PLG iii, p.284, Bergk). See also Keyssner p.152f. Examples of a χάρως-request in a Christian context are: AP 1.24.3 and 27.4.

Note the use in the same poem of τὸ ἔλεος - a word of koine - in line 19 and its classical equivalent ὁ ἔλεος in line 27 (cf. Bauer s.v).

28. πάντα δ’ ἀμαλάδυνης ὅσον ἡμιτον: ἀμαλάδυνης ὅσον’ is a correction first suggested by Tollius instead of ἀμαλάδυνε ὅσα of Cod. W (or ὅσα of ed. 1840) and ἀμαλάδυνεας of Cod. Bg. The reading of W is unsuitable not only for the double hiatus it produces, but also because the verb is in the third person while one would expect a second person form with which the poet would express his final request to God. On the other hand, the reading of Bg seems to be a corrupted form of ἀμαλάδυνεας and as such is metrically also inappropriate.

28. ἡμιτον: The verb is used in carm. 2.1.27.1 (1286), 1.1.2.59 (406), Orac. Sibyl. 1.74, 399, 2.304, 341, Apoll. Met. Ps. 50.7 and Procl. hymn. 7.39. A request for purification from sins is addressed to Helius in Procl. hymn. 1.35: καὶ με καθαρὸν ἀμαρτάδος.

29. ὡς ἀγαθὸς βασιλεὺς: On the title βασιλεύς see above the note on 1.1.33.1. In the present hymns the same epithet appears also in
1.1.35.5 connected with ἄλεξύκανος and in 1.1.31.10 with μέγας (see the notes ad loc.). The adjective ἄγαθος, used also in 1.1.31.10 with πατήρ, is a common Biblical attribute of God (cf. e.g. LXX Ps.72.1, 117.1.29 and Ev.Lc.18.19).

IV. Final Praise (29b-30)

In Greek hymns praise reappears at the end, usually with a χαύρε formula addressed to god (see above p.31) as happens very often with the Homeric hymns: e.g. hymn.Apoll.545, hymn.Merc.579 and hymn.Ven.292. An elaborate example of this formula from the later period of Greek literature is Proclus's hymn 6 which, not only ends, but also begins with a triple anaphora of χαύρε. On the other hand, the introduction of a final praise, usually of a doxological character, with ὁτι is common in Christian hymns and prayers and it appears also in 1.1.30.50. Such examples are: The Prayer of Manasses 15 (Swete, iii, p.826) - given below on 1.1.32.49f. - Ep.Rom.11.36, the closing of the Eucharistic prayers in Didache 9.4 and 10.4 (ed. Funk, i, p.410 and 412), and Const.Apost.8.12.50 and 15.9.

Line 29b = 30a. The repetition of the whole hemistich in the following line is made for emphasis and must be due also to the solemn style of hymns (see above the note on 1.1.34.2: σοὶ χάρως). Such repetitions comply also with the techniques used by Gregory in verse-composition and may be seen e.g. in carm.2.1.95.2f.(1449). See below Appendix III.

For σοὶ χάρως and ἡματα πάντα see the notes on 1.1.33.1 and 11 respectively.

30. καὶ εἰς αἴώνας ἄπαντας: The closing with an αἰών-formula is typical of Psalms and other Biblical prayers: LXX Pss.110, 113, 120, 130, 144, Prayer of Manasses (Swete, iii, p.826), Hymn of the Three Holy Children (LXX Dan.3.88) and The Magnificat (Lc.1.55). The same formula is used to end the doxological formulae in NT: Ep.Rom.11.36,
Eph.3.21, 1Tim.1.17, Apoc.5.13, and thereafter those in various prayers and hymns: e.g. Const.Apost.7.33.7, 45.3, 8.7.8, The Evening Hymn (ap. Const. Apost.7.48.3) and The Table Prayer (ap. ib.49.1). Such a doxological formula appears also in 1.30.50f. and 1.1.32.49f., and is used quite often by Gregory to end most of his orations.

With regard to the hymn-features used in the present poem we may now make some general remarks. The hymn is constructed throughout in the 'du-Stil', while the relative-style appears only in line 2f. The poet makes use of expressions with πᾶς (1, 12, 21, 28, 29, 30) and with ἡμεῖς ἄξιόν (10).

In the Praise part he refers to the feelings of the hymn-singers (10), and in the Prayer he employs two topoi: first he promises God another praise (24) and second he reminds God of past help given to his father (25). Some further elements in the same part are: the use of λύτομαι (14, 17), the imperative form ὅσις (26) and the conjunction ἀλλά (19) which begins the actual list of requests; also the new invocations to-God (14, 15, 19) and the employment of the universal epithets: ἀνθρωπος (15), ἁγίος (14) and βασιλεὺς (29). From the requests, particularly Greek pagan is that for μένος καὶ θάρσος (23), while those for mercy (19f.), for rescue from death (20f.) and for grace (27) - although exemplified in Greek pagan hymns also - have a Christian content. Finally, the hymn ends with a closing praise.

Divergencies from the form and content of Greek pagan hymns, apart from the use of σοὶ χάρισ, already mentioned in 1.1.33 are: 1) the transition to the Prayer by γει (14), 2) the beginning of the final praise by δέ (29) and 3) the use of an αἰών-formula (30). All these features are Biblical. Such are also the themes of the Praise: creation and scene of the throne. On the other hand, most of the requests have a Christian content, parti-
carily those in lines 22 and 28f.

As a conclusion to both hymns (1.1.33 and 34) it would seem interesting to make a brief comparison between them in terms of their content and sources and thus see the techniques employed by the poet for the composition of these poems.

Both hymns begin with the same line. However, while the introductory line in 1.1.33 is self-contained, in 1.1.34 it continues in the following line with the repetition of οἱ χάρους. After the common introductory line in both hymns, 1.1.34 follows a different development from that of 1.1.33. Therefore, although in both hymns line 1 leads to the theme of creation which is based on Ep.Col.1.16, 1.1.33 develops the first part of the Pauline passage and 1.1.34 the second. Furthermore, while in the former poem the reference to the participation of Logos in the creation (3) leads naturally to the praise of Christ (6-11), after the request to Him for mercy, in the latter poem the reference to τὰ θεονομία and τὰ ἀπαντά (spiritual and material world) reminds the poet of the ceaseless hymn of the heavenly choruses around the throne of God, which forms the second theme of Praise (4-13). In other words, the Praise in 1.1.33 concentrates on the creation of this world and the mystery of redemption; while that in 1.1.34 on the creation of the spiritual and material world and, above all, on heaven and its population.

The content of the Prayer in 1.1.34 is determined by the epithet ἀχώρατος (4,11,13), and the fulfilment of the various requests is the presupposition for the final praise (29b-30) which in turn corresponds to 1.1.33.10f., not only in the expressions used, but also in their theme: the ceaseless hymn.

From this comparison it appears that the techniques used for their composition do not differ from those employed by Gregory and
discussed in Appendix III. Therefore, the poems must, not only belong to Gregory, but also merit the recognition of being somewhat artistic compositions.

Carm.1.1.35

The next poem to be discussed is 1.1.35. It begins by calling the attention of God the Father to the poet's prayer which consists of only one request: to grant that he may compose divine poetry (1-3a). Then, as an indirect praise of God the poet makes a general statement that those who have come to know and believe in God (as the only self-generated among the living beings) and in Christ (as the king who for mortals drives away evil) lead a divine life (3b-5). The reference to Christ allows the poet to expand his praise by dwelling once more on the various aspects of the mystery of redemption (6-9): Christ became god-man following willingly the suggestion of the Father because He felt pity for the suffering human race which He ultimately set free from the bonds of Tartarus. It is not surprising that, as happens in 1.1.33, most of the Praise is devoted to Christ, although the present hymn is addressed to the Father and 1.1.33 to the Godhead. This section of the Praise part (6-9) is expressed in the narrative style and begins with ὅς τοῖς (see below).

The last four lines of the poem present a difficulty in interpretation, since it is not clear whom the poet is addressing when he uses δεῦτρ' ὕψι, ἄντεσθαι and ἀνθρώπες; nor is it self-evident in what sense he uses the word Βίβλος.

One possibility I can think of is that the poet is addressing himself and is calling on himself to nourish his soul with the god-inspired sayings of the Holy Bible; another is that he addresses
his fellow-Christians or audience (conceived as one person) and
calls them to nourish their souls with the god-inspired sayings of
the holy book (i.e. the Bible, or his book of poetry); and the
final one is that between lines 1-9 and 10-13 there is a lacuna:
either a few lines containing the connecting part of the two
sections have been lost; or it could be that there is a lacuna of
more lines in which case the two sections may have belonged original-
ly to two different poems. Whichever the case may be, the presumed
missing lines must have been dropped at an early stage of the trans-
mission of the text, since none of the two surviving MSS supports
in any way such a lacuna. Thus, the possibility of a lacuna would
be confirmed only if and when further MS evidence comes to light.

There remain the first two possibilities. In Greek pagan
hymns and above all in the Psalms it was not uncommon for the poet
to refer to himself, or to the choir, or even comment on the scene
of worship (cf. Isyllus paean Apoll.-Asclep.37 (Coll.Alex. p.133)
and paean Erythr.1f. (Ibid. p.136)). In particular, the Psalmist
often addresses his soul (cf. LXX Ps.145.1); or exhorts and urges
his compatriots to do this or that, usually expressed in the LXX
by an imperative or exhortative subjunctive with ὅτε (cf. LXX
Ps.33.12, 65.5,16).

Following the habit of Greek pagan hymnographers or that of
the Psalmist, the poet of this hymn might have been addressing him-
self, or his fellow-Christians when using ὅτε τῷ ... ἀντίγκιμα νε
(lof.). However, in either case there is a weak point: if we take
Βυβλῳς to refer to the Bible (although as will be seen below ad loc.
the plural form Βυβλοῦ and not the singular Βυβλός is commonly used
in this sense ) the content of lines 10-13 does not fit naturally
into the rest of the hymn (1-9), since there is no reference to the
Bible in any of the preceding lines.
Therefore, the only explanation remaining is that the poet exhorts his fellow-Christians to nourish their souls with the god-inspired words which appear in his book of poetry. I was inclined to accept this interpretation after having read a suggestion made by Tollius (see the annotation on 1.1.35 in ed.1696) that this poem must be intended as a preface to Gregory's hexameter poetry. If this suggestion is correct and if the present poem belongs to Gregory, then the hymn becomes a sort of a hymnodic prooemium. As such the poem may be compared to the Greek pagan hymnodic prooemia (see above p.23 n.2) and to the Homeric hymns, the majority of which served as preludes to epic recitations (see above p.14). In this case, μολὴν ... θεσπεσίαν (2f.) must refer to the entire corpus of Gregory's hexameter poetry which should follow the hymn, and the request to God to grant the poet divine song must correspond to the request: δὸς δʼ ἔμερέσσον ἀολὴν in Hom.hymn. 10.5 (cf. also Hesiod. Theog.104), or other similar ones (cf. Hom. hymn.25.6, Arat. Phaen.18). In other words, when the poet begs for a divine song what he should actually mean is that he needs God's help in order to compose his poetry which he characterizes as divine (θεσπεσίαν: 3), since it refers directly or indirectly to God. That Gregory saw his poetry as such may be attested from carm. 2.1.34. 71-91 (1312f.).

The apostrophe of the poet to his audience can thus be easily explained: at the end of his hymnodic prooemium (1-9) the poet calls his fellow-Christians to use his book of poetry which follows in order to nourish their souls with its god-inspired content. When Gregory describes his book of poetry as holy and pure this should be interpreted in the same sense as μολὴν ... θεσπεσίαν is interpreted above, and not as implying any arrogance. Besides, when he uses the phrase 'servants of the truth' (12) he should refer, I
think, to any human being he mentions in his poetry as a good example of the Christian way of life (particularly to the prophets of OT and the apostles and other saints), and not to himself as ἰσράηλιν in line 2 does. In other words, lines 10-13 form the passage of transition from the hymnodic prooemium (1-9) to the corpus of Gregory's poetry as do lines 104-15 of Hesiod's Theogony (see M.L. West's note on Theog. 104).

To conclude, lines 10-13 serve not only to join the hymnodic prooemium with the corpus of Gregory's poetry, but also to show Christians how to approach this poetry so that they may benefit from it.

Following the above interpretation it appears obvious that the title of the hymn in the Maurist edition: Ἐπάλληλος πρὸ τῆς τῶν γραμμῶν ἀναγνώσεως is without any merit. By adding it the Maurist editors seem first to take Βίβλου (10) as referring to the Bible and second to see some connection in content between the present hymn and the prayer Ἐὐχη πρὸ τοῦ Ἑυαγγελίου, said before the gospel-reading during the lections which form part of the mass of catechumens and are found both in the liturgy of St. James and that of St. Chrysostom (see Brightman p.36. 15b-28b and p.371.24ff. respectively). In this prayer God is asked to enlighten (ἐλλάδας) the congregation's hearts and minds to understand the gospels and conform their lives according to them. A similar prayer follows the reading of gospel in the liturgy of St James (see Brightman p.38. 27b- p.39.6b), while a variation of the first may be seen in Liturg. Gr. Naz. (M36.701Bf.). See also Serap. Euch.1.4.
I. Introduction (1-2a)

1. κληθε: The solemn imperative form κληθε, or its equivalent forms, first appears to introduce a number of epic prayers, collected and discussed in Beckmann, pp.25ff. Of these cases only Il.16.514, 23.770, Od.3.55, 5.445, 9.528 and Hom. Epigr.6.1 have κληθε only without being followed by μεν/μοι. The same form is sparingly used in lyric poetry and finally, makes its way into the late hexameter hymns: Orphic and Proclean, where it is used extensively (see above p.25, n.2).

1f. κληθε ... τωνδε αλτας/ ημετερων: The present phrase may be compared to κληθε (or κλοτε) μου (or μεν, μοι) ευχομενω (or -νου) used in Hom. Epigr.12.1, Theogn. 13 (addressed to Artemis), Solon fr.13 (West) (addressed to Muses) and six times in the Orphic Hymns (see e.g. 28.11, 34.10 and 59.2). On the other hand, the close position of κληθε and a particular request may be seen in Theognis 4 (Apollo).

In Biblical prayers, above all Psalms, ενωτιζεσονε, εισανοενεν or επανοεν are used instead (see e.g. LXX Ps.142.1).

1. πατερ Χριστου: Cf. Orph. hymn.8.13: χρόνου πατερ (sc. Sun), 10.18, 12.3, 13.1. The present phrase seems to have been based on Ep. 2Cor.1.3: ο θεος και πατηρ του χυρου ημων Ηισυου Χριστου, a variation of which has then been used as a stereotyped expression at the beginning of various liturgical prayers: e.g. Liturg.Jac.(Brightman, p.58. 19) and Liturg.Marc. (B. p.113.14, 114.23f., 115.6f.). See also Const. Apost.7.35.10: δι του Χριστου θεος και πατηρ and 6.10.1, 11.1, both cited below on 1.1.35.4: αυτογενεθλον.

1. κανεπισκοπε: The epithet is used of Chronus in AP 7.245.1 (Gaetulus) = Kaibel ep.27 and appears twice in the same sedes in Orac. Sibyl.1.2.177 and 1.152. In MAMA 1.171 (i.e. Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua, vol.1, p.91) it is used as a title of an official and in LXX Sap.7.23 of the spirit of Sophia. In Clem. Alex. Strom.vii.3. 15,3 (GCS 3, p.11.27f.) it refers to God, while in Idem Paed.3.12,101,3
it describes λόγος. The equivalent παντεπότης is used by Gregory in Or. 31.29 (Gallay p.336; M.36.168A) for the Holy Spirit, while in Act. Phil. 132 (LB 2.2 p.63.17) it seems to be used of the Father. However, in Christian literature more commonly used is παντεπότης, first appearing in Clem. Rom. 1Cor. 55, 64 (Lightfoot p.162), and used of the Father in Liturg. Gr. Naz. (M.36.701C). Further examples of it are cited in Deichgrüber p.101 and Lightfoot’s note on Clem. Rom. 1Cor. 55. The similar παντεπότης may be found in Orac. Sibyl. fr.1.4; while in Greek pagan literature πανότης (or παντότης) is used of Zeus and Helius (see Bruchmann, Epitheta, p.137 and 147 respectively) and πανότης of various deities in the Orphic Hymns (see e.g. 4.8). The idea that God sees everything appears in 1.1.30.33 (see below the note ad loc.). On the other hand, the similar idea that God surveys and observes everything, expressed in πανεπόσκοπος, is common for Greek gods also (see Ziegler pp.67-74 and Keyssner pp.99-101).

Apart from πανεπόσκοπος, in the present hymns there are some more epithets in παν- such as πανούτης (2.1.38.10), παμβασιλεύς, πανέφω- μος, πανάγυς (1.1.31.1,2) and πανόρμυς (1.1.29.13) which are used to show that God possesses the various qualities they describe in suppletive degree (see above p.26).

1f. (κλόθεω) ... λυτῶν/ ἡμετέρων: Cf. κλύοντες θεοί ... λυταί/ ἡμετέρας τελεσθ' in Aesch. Sept. 626f., (θεοί) .../ κλύετε παρθένων κλύετε. ../... λυτάς./ in ib.171f. and / λυτάν ὑ' ἀκούει μὲν οὕτως θεῶν,/ in Agam. 396.

2. ἡμετέρων: See the notes on 1.1.34.15: ἡμετέρης and on 1.1.33. 3 on caesura after the second longum.

II. Prayer (2b-3a)

2. μολότην δε χαρύζειν: Cf. δῶρα χαρύζη in Orph. hymn. 27.10 (Mother of gods). Other requests with χαρύζεσθαι are found in Julian. orat. 5.180A (hymn to the Mother of gods) and Archiloch. 75.2 (PLG ii
p.404 Bergk). See also Keyssner p.153. The phrase may be compared to 1.1.30.2 (see the note ad loc.). Besides, the structure whereby ἡλιθός is followed by a request introduced with ὅς is very common in the Orphic Hymns: e.g. 2.13, 8.20, 29.17, 39.9 and 30.8. Such structure may be seen also in the Homeric prayers in II.5.115ff., 10.278ff., and Hom. Epigr. 6.1ff. and 12.1(ἡλιθός ... ὅς ὅς).

2. σῷ ἑκράποντι: See the note on 1.1.34.20.

2f. μωλην ... / ἰησοφεοῦν: The poet seems to follow the Homeric pattern in Od.9.210f. where the noun (Ὀδῇ) begins the sentence and its qualifying adjective (Ἰησοφεοῦ) ends it, having been placed at the beginning of the following line. The same pattern is found in Od. 24.48f.: Ὅη ... / ἰησοφεοῦ. A strong caesura after ἰησοφεοῦ, found in the same sedes, is used also in II.20.342 (cf. 15.669).

III. Praise (3b-9)

The transition to this part of the hymn is made with γὰρ as happens also in 1.1.29.1 and 1.1.30.13 (see above p. 27 ).

Lines 3b-5: A common feature in Greek pagan hymns was the praise of a deity by reference to the happiness and welfare of those who were benefited, or those whom the deity was said to honour (τιμῶν), or love (φιλεῖν) : e.g. Hom. hymn.30.7f.; or even those who have watched the mysteries of gods : e.g. Hom. hymn.Cer.480. On these see Keyssner p.139, 67ff. and 141ff. A similar feature may be said to appear in the present hymn when he, who has come to know and believe in God and Christ is said to lead a divine life. On the didactic tone discerned behind the present passage see above the note on 1.1.33.3b.

3. ἐλαύνει: The reading ἐλαύνων of both Codd must be a corrupted form of ἐλαύνει which is necessary, since there is no main verb in the passage 3b-5. Tollius has suggested ἐλαύνοι but I do not see any place here for a wishing or imperative optative without ὁν in an independent sentence (cf. Smyth, 1814-20). ἐλαύνοι in the same sedes is used in
Orph. hymn. 8.7 and 19.1 (see van Liempt p.18).

3. ζαθένυ ἐς ἀγραπτόν: The present metaphor of man following a divine path of life reminds us of the Biblical metaphor of the two paths of life in Ev.Mt. 7.13ff., a theme taken up by Gregory in e.g. carm. 1.2.1.466-68(557), 2.2.5.123ff., 128ff. (1530) and 2.1.45.81f. (1359); or even that of the two ways of Heracles which is related by Prodicus in Xenophon Memorabilia ii.1.21-34 and is used by Gregory himself in carm.2.1.45.229-63(1369-72). On this metaphor see also B. Lorenz, 'Das Bild der zwei Wege', Liter.-wissensch.Jahrb.,N.F.20 (1979), 277-85. On the other hand, the common metaphor of the various paths of life was a beloved subject to Gregory, since it inspired two of his moral poems: carm.1.2.16(778-81): Περὶ τῶν τοῦ βίου δύο and carm. 1.2.17 (781-86): Διαφόρων βίων μακρυσμοί. See also 2.2.5.116-64 (1530-33).

The epithets ζαθένυ, used by Gregory for his father in carm.2.1.95.1 (1449), and θεσπεσίαν as stock traditional vocabulary are found in the Homeric Hymns. Examples for the latter epithet are: hymn.Merc. 422 and hymn.Apoll.360 and for the former hymn.Ven.258 and hymn.Apoll. 223,523. See also Isyllus paean Apoll.-Asclep.38 (Coll.Alex. p.133).

4. οὕτως: The pronoun is placed in an emphatic position.

4. αὐτογένεθελον: In carm.1.2.2.528 (620) the epithet is used of the bird Phoenix: γόνων αὐτογένεθελον. The same phrase, but referring to Christ, may be found in Apoll. Met.Ps.Proth.84. The epithet is fairly late and is found in Nonn. Dion.41.52 (Physis), four times in Pap.Mag.Gr. i.342, iv.1989 (Preis.) = Mag.hymn.Helius 4.24(ed. Abel), iv.943 = Mag.hymn.Helius 3.5 (ed. Preis.,iii,p.25) and Mag.hymn.Apoll. 1.27 (ed. Abel); also in Orac.Chald.fr.39.1 (ed. des Places, SC, p.77): πατρικὸς νῦς αὐτογένεθελος. On the other hand, the same epithet is used in Euseb. prep.evang.9.10.4 (M.21.697B) = Idem dem.evang.3.3 (GCS 6 p.110.9; M.22.189B) in a passage taken from an oracle to Apollo. See

Besides, in Const. Apost. 6.10.1, 11.1 gnastics are accused of calling God by this epithet among other appellations. The passages, which may be also characterized as a protest against the usage of philosophical terminology, run:

Τούτους δὲ πᾶσιν (sc. heretics) ... σκοπός ἦν ... τῶν μὲν
... θεοῦ βλασφημεῖν, ἀγνωστῶν δοξάζειν καὶ μὴ εἴναι πατέρα
tοῦ Χριστοῦ ... ἀλλ' ἄλεκτον, ἀρπητὸν, ἀκατονώματον, αὐτο-
γένεθλον

and:

'Ἡμεῖς δὲ ... ἠν μόνον θεοῦ καταγγέλλουμεν, ... τοῦ Χριστοῦ
πατέρα, οὐκ αὐταύτου καὶ αὐτογένεθλον, ὡς ἐκείνου οὖν ταῦτα,
... οὐκ ἄγνωστον ἢ ἄλεκτον...

respectively. See also Jungck's comment on De Vita Sua 1169f.

In Christian literature, the epithet is used in Didymus De Trinitate iii.2.1 (M.39.788A): (God) αὐτογένεθλος/ τύκτων αὐτὸς ἑαυτὸν -
taken from an unknown hexameter poem (see the note in Migne ad loc.);
and in Nonn. par. Jo.1:18, 5:18 and 13:20 (M.43.752C, 788B, 864B) all
in the same sedes.

The equivalent αὐτογέννητος is found e.g. in Orac. Sibyl. 8.429
and Pap. Mag. Leid. W ii.18, xiii.25 (ed. Dieterich, Abraxas, p. 176.3);
while αὐτόγενης in e.g. Orac. Sibyl. fr. 1.17 and Orph. fr. 245.8(Kern),
and αὐτόσπορος (of Αὐδό) in Nonn. Dion. 7.73.

The epithet in the present passage describes the Godhead (ἡεν:4)
and is used in order to underline that God is the only self-subsistent
or self-existent Being among the living ( ἐν τοις:4) who are all
created by God and depend on Him. Therefore, αὐτογένεθλος is used to
contrast God with the living and created world and not as a term to
describe the relationship between the three persons of the Trinity, or
the nature and qualities of the Father with regard to those of the
other two persons. To describe such qualities Gregory uses for the
Father the terms ἀναρχος and ἀγέννητος, for the Son ἀρχή and γεννητός and for the Spirit ἐκπορευόμενον. See e.g. carm.1.2.10.98ff.(751ff.): De Virtute, or.32.5 (M.36.180B), or.33.17 (236B), or.39.12 (348Bf.), or.20.7 (Mossay p.72.19f.;M.35.1073B) and ib.10(p.75; 1077A).

4. Θεόν ἔγνω: Cf. γλυκώματος τοῦ Θεοῦ e.g. in Ep.Rom.1.21 and 1Cor.1.21.

5. άλεξίκακον βασιλῆ: On the common divine epithet βασιλεύς see the notes above on 1.1.33.1 and below on 1.1.31.10. On the other hand, ἄλεξίκακος is used of various Greek deities: of Dionysus in Nonn. Dion. 7.176, 29.90, 32.198, 45.52, of Asclepius in Orph.hymn.67.5(in Abel's edition, while Quandt's edition has ἀπαλεξίκακος), of Nemesis in Nonn. Dion.48.414, of Hermes in Aristoph. Pax 422 and of Zeus in Orph. Lith. 1 (ed. Abel), Nonn. Dion.13.280 and 44.86. As a by-name of Athene it is found in Aristides orat.37.26, while, according to Aristophanes's ancient sholiast ad pac.422 (ed. Rutherford,ii,p.77), 'Αλεξίκακος was a by-name of Apollo and Heracles (cf. also schol. ad Ran.501 (ed. Fr. Dübner, p.290.26)). As a title of the latter it is used in Hellanicus fr.109 (ed. Jacoby, FGH,i,p.134) and Aristides orat.40.15. See also RE, s.v. 'Alexikakos' (Wentzel).

The same epithet could be used in hymns with various nouns associated with the celebrated deity. See e.g. Procl. hymn.5.2, 1.21, 39, 2.7 and Apoll. Met.Ps.17.109, 118.326.

Being a compound with άλεξιόν the present epithet belongs to a group of such epithets which are mainly used of the gods of healing (Apollo-Asclepius). From these particularly Asclepius, as Keyssner observes (p.109f.), appears to carry features similar to those of Christ and, therefore, the use in the present hymn of this epithet for Christ is made not without good reason.

Gregory uses the same epithet in carm.1.1.9.91 (464): σφορνής ἁλεξίκακον Θεοῦ where it appears to refer also to Christ. Finally,
the combination ἀλεξύκακος βασιλεύς is used also of Christ in the same sedes in Nonn. par. Jo. 11:3 (M. 43.840A). See besides ib. 3:2 (765B) and Apoll. Met. Ps. 19.4.

6-9: Mystery of redemption

The same subject is used for the praise of Christ in 1.1.33.6-11. See the notes ad loc.

Lines 6-7 underline that Christ became a god-man following willingly (ἐκὼν: 7) the suggestion of the Father because He felt pity (ἐποικτεύρας: 6) for the human race which had been suffering. The same reason for Christ’s incarnation may be attested also in Gregory’s carm. 1.1.2.57-59 (406): ‘Ει δ’ οτι σωμ’ υπέδεκτο (sc. Christ) τεοτι παθήσων ἄρηγών, / τοῦνα καὶ θεότητι μεγαλεί μέτρ’ ἐκλήσεως / ἤλεπτεν δε σ’ ἐλέημεν’, and or. 29.19 (Gallay p. 216; M. 36.100A): ‘Ἐν ἄρχῃ ἦν ἀνατίως’ τις γὰρ αὐτίκα θεοῦ; Ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑστερον γέγονε (sc. became god-man) οὐ’ αὐτίκα ὃ δὲ ἦν τὸ σε σωθήναι τὸν ὑβριστήν. See also carm. 2.1.86.5f. (1433).

6. ἐς ποτ’ : The phrase is appropriate to the narrative style of the section 6-9 and it has been used in Greek pagan hymns to open the narrative. See e.g. Eur. Iph. Taur. 1235, Macedonius paeon Apoll. 8 (Coll. Alex. p. 138) and Philodamus paeon Dionys. 6 (Coll. Alex. p. 166). Cf. also Call. hymn. Del. 308, Aristoph. Aves 1731 and Eur. Hel. 1301. It is followed by Gregory in carm. 2.1.1.1.10 (969, 970) which is cited below p. 179.

6. ἐποικτεύρας: Cf. 1.1.34.19: οὐκτεύρας and the note ad loc.


6. αὐτὰ παθήνων: It is found in the same sedes in II. 22.431. See also Synes. hymn. 1.504.

7. Πατρὸς ὑπ’ ἐννεσύνιον: Cf. (ἀνέρος) ... ὑπ’ ἐννεσύνιον in Apoll. Rhod. 1.7. The present phrase may be compared to Liturg. ap.
Const. Apost. 8.12.30 (Brightman p.19.15f.): εὐάγγελον αὐτὸς (sc. Christ) γνώμη σῇ ... ἄνθρωπος γενέσθαι.

8. γεύνετο: The correction was suggested by Tollius to replace the corrupted reading γεύτονα of Cod. W. Caillau used γίγνετο, while the reading of Cod. Bg is unfortunately illegible.

The contrast in the juxtaposition of the words θνητός and θεός, made to underline the double nature of the incarnate Christ, may be seen also in 1.1.36.14 and carm.1.1.9.48 (460).

8. ἄφθωνος: See the note on 1.1.34.6.

8b-9: The ultimate purpose of Christ's incarnation was to set free all those suffering from the bonds of Tartarus with His sacrifice on the cross. The same theme appears in 2.1.38.42 (see the note ad loc.) and carm.1.1.2.79 (407). The only difference in the present passage is the addition of πάντας (8) which implies that all who accepted Christ were released according to Ep.1Tim.2.4: ὁς πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθήναι. On the development of this idea in patristic literature see Kelly, Creeds, pp.378ff. See also AP 1.56.

8f. εἰς ὅ τε ... λύσατο: The poet appears to have mixed the syntax of εἰς ὅ (until) with indicative and εἰς ὅ κεν (or ἤν) with subjunctive (see Kühner-Blass-Gerth 567.1,2, Smyth 2383 and Cunliffe s.v. ὅς ii.9.(a).

9. ταρταρέων ... λύσατο δεσμῶν: Cf. 1.1.33.9 : θανάτου ... ἐ-λυσας δεσμῶν and the note ad loc. In carm.1.1.7.79 (444): / ταρτάρε- ου seems to refer to daemons, whereas in 2.2(epit.).40.5 (Μ.38.31) = AP 8.104: / ταρτάρεσσ' τε μυχο' is used of Hades. Note that the adjective ταρταρέων and the noun it describes (δεσμῶν) stand at the beginning and end of the line, following a common stylistic device in epic poetry from Homer onwards (see McLennan's note on Callim. hymn. Jov. 60) and at the same time expressing figuratively the idea of bonds by enclosing μογέοντας. The same device may be found in 2.1.38.20.
Furthermore, the juxtaposition of the two words (antithetical in sense): λύσατο - δεσμῶν (which are used in the same sedes in carm. 1.1.20.13 (489)) is also emphatic.

On the prominent place which Christ's descensus ad inferos occupied in the belief of the early Church see e.g. Ignatius Antioch. Magn. 9 (Lightfoot, ii.1, p.131): παρὼν ἡγεμόνις ἀντίος (sc. τοῦ προφήτας) ἐκ νεκρῶν and Lightfoot's note ad loc. Christ's descent into Hades attested in Ep.1Petr. 3.19, 4.6 and possibly in Eph. 4.9 is the theme of Synes. hymn. 8.16-27.

9. Ἡ̇ρ' αἰώνας: The phrase seems to have been chosen not merely to refer to Christ's death, but, above all, to underline the common Biblical notion expressed e.g. in Apoc. 1.5: λύσαντι (sc. Christ) ημᾶς ἐκ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν [ἡμῶν] ἐν τῷ αἰῶνα διά αὐτοῦ. See also Ep.Rom. 3.25, 5.9, Eph. 1.7, Heb. 9.14, 1Jo. 1.7 and Apoc. 5.9. The idea appears in Gregory's or. 29.20 (Gallay p.220; M. 36.101A): ἐξαγοράζει (sc. Christ) κόσμον, καὶ μεγάλης τιμῆς, τοῦ ἱδίου γὰρ αἰώνας.

IV. Poet's exhortation to his fellow-Christians (10-13)

As has been said in the introductory analysis of the present hymn, in Greek pagan hymns and Psalms apostrophes to the audience were not an uncommon feature. The present apostrophe serves most probably to lead over to Gregory's poetic corpus by giving instructions to Christians how to use his poetry in order to nourish their souls.

10. δεῦρο' ζηλ νῦν: The exhortative adverbs δεῦρο or δεῦτε, connected or not with cletic verbs, are commonly used in Greek pagan hymns, either at the beginning of the hymns (see above p.25 ), or to introduce various requests in the Prayer. Cf. e.g. Orph.hymn. 54. 7 and Mag.hymn. Hecat. 1,10,27 (Abel). However, in the present hymn δεῦρο' is used, following the custom of Psalmographers, as a means of addressing the poet's fellow-Christians (cf. Hesiod. Oper. 2 where
the adverb is addressed to the Muses). In Psalms ὃς ὑπερ is used nine
times: e.g. LXX Ps. 45.9. The whole phrase ὅς ὑπερ ὡς ὑπερ is used in
the present hymn, not only to mark emphatically the change of
addressee, but also to show that the poet passes onto a different
subject.

Gregory uses ὅς ὑπερ ὡς in carm. 1.2.1.352 (548) to address the
personification of Virginity and ὅς ὑπερ ὡς in the same sedes in
2.1.13.75, 89, 90 (1233, 1234) to refer to his fellow bishops. See
also 2.2.7.235, 238 (1569), and for ὅς ὑπερ ὡς 1.1.11.15 (471), 1.2.1.
215 (538), and 2.1.32.51 (1304).

10. ὃς ὑπερ: The form (not cited in LSJ or Bauer s.v.) is a
regular epic form (see Cunliffe s.v.).

10. ὃς ὑπερ ... ὑπαλλατε: Although ὑπαλλατε is described as ὃς ὑπερ
and one would have thought that it refers to the Scriptures, the
fact that it is in singular makes this interpretation improbable,
since the Scriptures are usually expressed by the plural ὑπαλλατε
(the singular form found in LXX 2Macc. 8.23 refers very likely to one
book of OT). Such instances from Gregory may be seen in or. 32.32
(M.36.209c) and epist. 11.4 (Gallay, i, p. 17; M37.41B) where the
Scriptures are called ὁς ὑπερ ὑπαλλατε, and carm. 2.1.1.438 (1002) and
De Vita Sua: 2.1.11.296, 790 (Jungck p. 68, 92; M37.1050, 1083) where
they are called ὁς ὑπερ ὑπαλλατε. See also Clem. Rom. 1Cor. 43 (Lightfoot
p. 130) and Lightfoot's note on 1Cor. 53

According to the interpretation of the hymn followed in the
introductory analysis of it, ὑπαλλατε in the present passage should
refer to the poet's book of poetry which is described with the epi-
thets ὁς ὑπερ and ὑπαλλατε as holy and pure, since its contents
directly or indirectly refer to God. Note that this phrase recalls
μολπην ... θεοκρασιν of line 2f.

10. ὑπαλλατε ἀπο ὑπαλλατε: The feminine form ὑπαλλατε, if not
a corruption, seems to be the poet's own creation, instead of the epic ἡ ἀγνάρσεύς (which is metrically also suitable) in order to have the same ending as the preceding epithet. Cf. **AP 8.1.4:**(φωνής) ... ἀγναρσεύνου, Hom.hymn.Merc.72 and Synes. hymn.1.676f. The equivalent ἀγνάρσεύς is used in 1.1.34.4, 11, 13 (see the notes on 1.1.34.4,11). Our phrase may be compared also with Procl. hymn.4.5, Nonn. par. Jo. 1:23(M.43.753B) and Procl. hymn.3.4.

11. ἀγναρσεύνους: The verb is found in the same *sedes* in Hom. hymn. Ven.115.

11. ἔ σεομνεύστους ἐνὶ μονος: The poet uses ἔ σεομνεύστος: (an epithet found once in the Bible in Ep.2Tim.3.16) in order to characterize the content of his poetry as 'god-inspired words'. Such a characterization would not, I think, be extremely inappropriate for Gregory's religious poetry which is mainly based on the Bible. Besides, since in line 2f. the poet begged God for divine inspiration to compose his poetry, it is quite legitimate to go on and describe this poetry as 'god-inspired' by using ἔ σεομνεύστος not in its restricted Christian application (see Lampe s.v. A ) but in its general (see LSJ s.v., and Bauer s.v. in which are cited all the six instances with the word among which Ps.-Phocylidea 129 (PLG ii p.99 Bergk) and Orac. Sibyl.5.308, 406). The epithet is used of the Scriptures in Gregory's *carm.1.2.1.331* (547).

Lines 12-13: In the poet's book of poetry his fellow-Christians may see the servants of truth showing the way to eternal life.

12. ἀνθράκειας: This should be a potential optative without ἕν contingent found in independent clauses as happens in Homer (see Smyth 1821 and above p. 42f.).

12. ἀληθεύς θεράσσων: The phrase can either have a general application referring to all those who serve the truth in one way or another, or be restricted to the servants of God (i.e. the prophets
The word ἱεράπων seems to have been chosen deliberately to be contrasted with the same word used in line 2 where it refers to the poet himself.

13. ζωήν: In this context the word means, I think, 'eternal life' or 'life leading to heaven' and as such it recalls ζωήν ... ἔς ἄτραξν ('the divine path of life') in line 3.

13. ὑπ' οὐρανομήκες φωνῇ: 'with a voice that reaches heaven'. Cf. Aristoph. Nub.357 : ὑπ' οὐρανομήκη μήκατε κάμοι φωνήν. Οὐρανομήκης connected with other nouns is used also in Od.5.239, Aesch. Agam.92 and Aristoph. Nub.460. On the poetic instrumental dative with ὑπ' see Smyth 1511.

Before we proceed to summarize the various hymn-features of 1.1.35 it seems necessary to add a final word about the problem of unity and the general structure of the hymn.

As we have seen from the commentary on the hymn, its similarities in various aspects with the Greek pagan hymnodic prooemia and the Psalms present, I think, sufficient evidence to explain the apparent abrupt change of addressee from line 10 onwards, and the reason which led the poet to act in this way. Further support for the unity of the poem is supplied by the cross-references between the two sections (1-9 and 10-13).

We now turn to summarize the particular features used in this hymn. The poem begins with a κλαθε verb and is written partly in 'du-Stil' (1-3a) and partly in 'er-Stil' (3b-9). The transition to the Prayer is made by ἐδ (which is commonly used in κλαθε-hymns and prayers) while the transition to the Praise by γάρ.

The addressee of the hymn is God the Father, although the Praise refers mostly to Christ. Praise is expressed not only by the three compound epithets: πανειληκονος, αὐτογένεθαλος, ἀλεξίκακος, but, and
above all, by the theme of Christ as the redeemer of mankind which is
given in a narrative style. An indirect praise of God and Christ is
the reference to the welfare of the faithful (3b-5). The theme of
the Prayer is the request for successful religious poetry.

Apart from the three compound divine epithets mentioned above,
there are two further of a universal application: βασιλεὺς (5), ἀ-
φωτος (8). The ornamentation of the hymn is enriched by some more
epithets and other stock: traditional vocabulary commonly associated
with Greek gods and thus found in pagan hymns: μολίην, ἔσεσσόν, ζαθῆν, ἱερῆς, ἀναπάσσος, ἔρῶναις; and also by the two metaphors
in lines 3 and 9. With all these elements the hymn appears to have
an elaborate style.

A final feature in our hymn is the apostrophe to the poet's
audience in the last four lines.

Counterparts of all the above features are found to a greater or
lesser degree in Greek pagan hymns. The only completely non-pagan
element in 1.1.35 is the theme of Christ's praise in lines 6-9.

A general conclusion for 1.1.33-35 with regard to their authe-
ticity may be drawn here. The passages from Gregory's works with
parallel expressions and similar ideas (cited in the commentaries on
these poems) are, I think, sufficient to show their Gregorian author-
ship. To these one may add further evidence derived from the
structure and style of these hymns: 1) The techniques used for the
composition of these poems are similar to those employed by Gregory
(see Appendix III). Some of these are: repetitions of whole or
parts of lines (e.g. 1.1.33.1 = 1.1.34.1,12 and 1.1.34.29b =1b.30a),
use of anaphora (e.g. 1.1.33.8,9) and employment of the art of
variation in the composition of two different poems based on a
common introductory line (see also below p. 188ff.).
2) The hexameter is usually not self-contained, since the sentence is extended over the following line by the regular practice of enjambement. A particular type of this is that where the sentence continues only into the first foot or second princeps of the next line with a break or pause after it. See e.g. 1.1.35.1f. and 2f. Such enjambement is a common feature of Gregory's hexameters also (see above p.45).

3) Another characteristic of the hymns under discussion, which complies with a common Gregorian practice (see above p. 46), is the use of rhetorical figures: antithesis (e.g. between the two hemistichs of 1.1.33.6), ring-form (1.1.34.1f.) and chiasmus (1.1.34.5).

4) The poet agrees with Gregory also in making cross-references within the same poem, or using keywords: e.g. in 1.1.34.30 the phrase εἰς αὐτόνας ἄξονας is a cross-reference to δυναμές (10) and ἄξονατον (11); while in the same poem ἀναφοράς is a key-word. This tendency appears also in the authentic hymns: 1.1.36 and 2.1.38 (see the introductory analysis on them).

5) In these hymns one finds also new forms constructed by analogy with existing ones: e.g. ἀναφοράς in 1.1.35.10. This is a common habit of Gregory's according to Cummings's investigations on De Vita Sua (see above p.39, n.2).

6) A final point which shows also Gregorian tendency is the preference for philosophical terms which replace the Biblical ones: e.g. τὰ νοηματα in 1.1.34.2 and νός in ib.15 which are used instead of τὰ ἀξίωμα and πνεύμα respectively. (see below the note on 2.1.38.23: νός οὐρανοὺς).

All the above similarities of hymns 1.1.33-35 with the authentic poems of Gregory, together with the external evidence, strongly support the Gregorian authorship of the hymns.
The next poem to be discussed is 1.1.36. To this a commentary on 1.1.37 and 1.1.38, and a brief analysis of the content of 2.1.22. 1-12 (1281) and 2.1.3 (1020f.) is appended, since the above poems have various features in common. It is therefore fitting to consider them as a group. Their similarities lie: 1) in the common subject-matter: a departing hymn or prayer addressed to Christ before an actual journey, or the journey of life, and 2) in the use in all the poems, apart from 1.1.37, of the Exodus theme to praise Christ, or to be used for other purposes.

Of these poems the first two, namely 1.1.37 and 1.1.38, have whole or parts of lines in common with 1.1.36. Their analysis was considered necessary in order to illustrate further the various techniques employed by Gregory in verse-composition (discussed in Appendix III).

The analysis of the last two poems (2.1.22. 1-12 and 2.1.3) not only will explain why they have been excluded from the scope of the present research, but above all will enable us to identify the sort of journey 1.1.36 refers to and consequently to assess the date of the composition of the hymn.

Greeks and Romans alike were accustomed to make departing prayers before a journey. Examples of such prayers in Greek pagan literature may be found for instance in Od.6.324-27 (to Athene), Eur. Hec.534-41 (to Achilles), Idem Iph.Aul.1570-76 (to Artemis), Apoll.Rhod. Arg.1. 411-24 (to Apollo), 4.1597-1600 (to a sea-daemon) and Mesom. hymn. Adrias (ed. Heitsch p.28) where the poet praises the Adriatic sea in order to beg for a safe journey home (see also Ausfeld p.539f. and Appel p.61). Besides, Ἑὐδόκως was a cult-title of Hermes (cf. Theocr.
Idyl. 25.4, AP 10.12.8 and 6.299.1), while its feminine form is used as a by-name of Hecate as well as of Persephone, Artemis and Selene (cf. AP 6.199). Finally, Greek and Latin literature alike offer a number of poetic compositions which have as their content: a) the farewell of a departing traveller, usually addressed to his fellow-men, b) the speech on his arrival; or c) the response to (a), and d) the welcoming address. Poems belonging to the first category often include a farewell to various divinities, or express the wish that gods may give the traveller a safe journey. See e.g. Solon fr. 19 (West) and Soph. Philoct. 1452-71. For further examples on the above four types of poems see Cairns p. 38ff., 283ff. and 18ff., and Russel-Wilson, Menander Rhetor, p. 343 and 304.

Prayers for safe journeys and other relevant requests are not absent from the Christian liturgy and other private Euchologia. Such are for instance the Eὐχὴ ἐπὶ μελλόντως πλέουσιν in J. Goar's, Euchologion sive Rituale Graecorum, reprint of the 1730 Venice edition (Graz, 1960), p. 684, and the request for a guardian angel which may be found in Liturg. Jac. and Liturg. Chrys. (Brightman p. 39.21f. and p. 381.17ff. respectively), and in Serap. Euch. 5.8. A similar request appears also in the Office of Vespers and that of Lauds (see Const. Apost. 8.36.3 and 38.2 respectively); while requests on behalf of πλέοντας and ὀδοντοφοροῦντας may be found in Const. Apost. 8.10.5, 12. 45, Liturg. Jac. and Liturg. Chrys. (Brightman p. 46.15a and p. 363.15f. respectively).

Carm. 1.1.36

To turn to the analysis of 1.1.36: the hymn is addressed to Christ who is first praised as being all good things to men and the straight way for all (1-2). The second major section of His praise
is devoted first to His works and help offered to the Israelites in their Exodus (3-11) and second to events from His life on earth as a god-man (12-18).

The particular themes of the Praise part are based on the concept of way or journey taken in a metaphorical or literal sense and expressed with ὁδὸς or other similar words. So, Christ is the way (2), while lines 3-11, not only themselves refer to the homeward journey of the Israelites, but also in them ὁδὸς is used twice to indicate the passage through the divided Red Sea (3) and the river Jordan (10) respectively. Finally, in lines 12-18 the poet refers first to Christ's incarnation, ascension and second coming, all of which may be interpreted as a sort of journey (14-16); second to His walk on the sea (17-18); and third to the pathway to heaven (ὤρα-νόμος: 12 ) and the imposition of the new path (of life) on the old (12-13). As is suggested below in the commentary, this pathway to heaven (which seems to refer to the way of life leading to heaven) arises from the combination of the new path of life (indicated in NT) with the old (exemplified in OT).

From what has been said above the Praise (1b-18) appears to have been carefully constructed, since it begins with a metaphorical sense of the concept of way (2), progresses to a literal in lines 3-11 and ends in lines 12-18 with both a metaphorical (12-13) and a literal (14-18). The reason why the poet based the Praise on the concept of way or journey is obvious: by doing so, he anticipates the content of the Prayer and thus follows the feature of Greek pagan hymns whereby the content of Praise is carefully chosen in order to secure the fulfilment of the requests (see above p.30 ).

The Prayer includes a request to Christ to be the poet's companion and grant him an auspicious journey and an angel as his escort, protector and helper. Three further reasons why the poet wants the
angel are expressed in the long final clause ὑφα ... ἀμφιεπουσιν
(21-25): the first two with the two participial phrases (πάντων ... ἔργων and τέλος ... χαριζόμενος) and the third with ἀγνώσεως which here is accompanied, not only by an acc. and a dat. (which denotes direction: see below ad loc.), but also with the two opposite adverbs ὀἰκοθεν and ὀἰκαδε. The three reasons are then: a) to keep the petitioner away from diurnal and nocturnal dangers, b) to grant him a happy end to his journey and c) to lead him safely from home and back to it and to his relatives and friends.

The first two reasons do not help us in identifying the sort of journey the poet was about to undertake. From the third reason, however, it appears that the poet does not refer only to his departing, or outgoing journey (implied from ὀἰκοθεν), but also to his return (implied from ὀἰκαδε). If we now take ὀἰκος not in its restricted sense of 'home', but in its more general of 'homeland' - better here 'hometown' - (see LSJ s.v. ὀἰκαδε), then one can, I think, easily explain why, with regard to his homeward journey, the poet mentions also his friends and relatives.

From the above we may, therefore, infer that the present hymn could have been composed before the poet's departing journey for another town, but his requests refer also to his homeward journey. In this case τέλος ἐφαλῶν (23) is more likely to refer to the completion of both journeys than to one of them only.

To come to the analysis of the rest of the hymn: in lines 26-30 the poet imagines himself already back home (ἐνθα: 26) after the end of his journey and shows his everlasting devotion to Christ expressed in his wish/decision: a) to pray to Him day and night, b) to lead a sinless life and c) to raise his winged thoughts to Him, until he passes the final way, common to everybody, and comes to the heavenly abode. This section serves as an indirect praise to Christ as
does also the invocation which follows (31-32); and to some extent is used to secure the fulfilment of the requests (see above p. 30).

Finally, after the culmination of the poet's devotion to Christ which is expressed in the 'du-Stil' in lines 31-32, the poet closes his hymn by repeating his request for a prosperous and happy end to his journey.

Of the hymns which form the subject of the present research this hymn, together with 2.1.38, is the only poem included in the Editio Princeps of the Gregorian poetic corpus, namely the Aldine edition of 1504 (see above p. 84).

In the majority of the MSS (and Edd) the poem is justifiably entitled 'Ευδοξία since both Praise and Prayer deal with the concept of journey.

The first part of the hymn (1-18) has been paraphrased by Cosmas of Jerusalem in his Λόγος ΜΖ': 'Ευδοξία (see M. 38. 452f.); while an anonymous paraphrase of it appears also in some MSS: e.g. Parisinus Coislianus gr. 56 and Vaticanus gr. 497. I have at my disposal on photostats the paraphrase of the latter MS and I refer to it a few times in the commentary.

Finally, the problem of the date of composition of 1.1.36 is discussed at the end of section III.2.
I. Introduction (la)

1. Χροστε άναξ: On the avoidance of the interjection ὅ in the present line see above p. 43f. Gregory uses this phrase many times to introduce his prayers to Christ. See e.g. 2.1.38.1, carm.2.1.92.1 (1447), 2.1.19.9 (1271) and 1.2.15.109 (774). On other occasions he addresses Christ simply by the title "Άναξ which stands for the common Biblical appellation Κύριος first applied to the Godhead and later to Christ (see Dieichgrüber p. 96f. and 179). Some of these cases are: carm.2.1.49.7 (1385), 2.1.62.1,2 (1405): "Άναξ, / "Άναξ in anadiplosis and 1.1.37.6. άναξ is a universal epithet commonly used of many Greek deities (see above p. 25), although primarily and more widely it applied to Apollo and Zeus. However, the occurrence of a title of a god, or his proper name, followed by άναξ, both in vocative and at the beginning of a hymn or a prayer - or at least of a line - as happens in the present hymn, is not very common. I could find only Theogn.5, 773, Hom. hymn.Apoll.257, Eur. Cycl.599, Orph. hymn.34.8, 65.3, Nonn. Dion.21.11, and a number of prayers beginning with Ζευς άναξ e.g. ll.3.351, Od.17.354, Apoll.Rhod. Arg.1.242 and Nonn. Dion.2.209.

II. Praise (1b-18)

On the transition to the Praise with ὅ see above the note on 1.1.34.2. The pronoun is repeated twice in line 3 according to the relative style of predications commonly found in hymns from the later period. See above p. 24.

The Praise may be divided into two parts: the first (1-2) whereby Christ is praised as being the good and the way, and the second (3-18) which may be further subdivided into two sections. In the first (3-11) Christ's power is revealed in the help He offered to Israelites during their homeward journey, and in the second (12-18) the particular themes of Christ's praise are all taken from His life on earth. All these are Biblical themes commonly used in Christian hymns and prayers.
1b-2: Christ is the good and the way

If. Πάντα πέλευς ... ἔσθελα: On expressions with πάς, commonly used in the present hymns, see the note on 1.1.33.1. Greek gods were occasionally called ἔσθλος (cf. Hesiod. Theog. 435, 439, 444: Hecate), or were asked to give men ἔσθλα (cf. Theogn. 4). See also Keyssner p.158f. Accordingly, in the present hymn Christ is said to be all good things to men. ἔσθλος is used in carm.1.1.3.42 (411) to describe the nature of the Godhead.

2. ὁδος ἔθετα: The phrase seems to be a combination of the well-known passage in Ev. Jo.14.6, where Christ calls Himself the way, with a number of other Biblical passages from Old and New Testaments where the ways of God are characterized as εὕθετω (see e.g. Ev.Mt.3.3, Act. 13.10, LXX 1Reg.12.23 and Ps.26.11). In Clem. Alex. hymn.Christ.34 ap. Paed. (ed. Heitsch p.158) Christ is called ὁδος οὐρανος (cf. line 12 of the present hymn).

2. ἔτυσσα: This verb, as well as τελεθευσυ and ἔψυ, are used for the praise of a Greek deity (see Keyssner p.119f.). Two such examples may be Hom. hymn.32.13 and hymn. Ven. 32

3-11: Christ's deeds in Jewish history

In Greek pagan hymns gods were occasionally praised for the part they played in historical battles: cf. Isyllus paean Apoll.-Asclep.62-82 (Coll.Alex. p.134f.) and Limenius paean Apoll.32f. (ib. p.150), apart from the more common way of praise by reference to their personal mythological deeds in a narrative style (see above p.28). On the other hand, the manifestation of the power and other qualities of God by reference to various events from the Jewish history was a common theme in Old Testament Psalms and prayers: cf. LXX Ps.104, 77, 134.8-12 and 135.10-24, and the Prayer of Moses in LXX Ex.15.1-19. Such a custom was followed by the early Christian Church as may be seen from
the prayers in *Const. Apost.* e.g. 7.33.4-7, 36.3-4 and 37.2-4, and from the anaphora of *Liturgy. ap. Const. Apost.* 8.12.6-27 (Brightman pp.14-18).

The innovation of our poet lies in the fact that he uses the reference to Jewish history for the praise of Christ and not of God as a Jew would normally expect. He does the same also in *De Vita Sua*:

*carm.* 2.1.11.186-92 (Jungck p.62; M.37.1042f.) and 1.1.38.1-4 (see below); while in *carm.* 1.1.9, Wyss, Lines 27-33, he presents Christ as the Divine Lawgiver (see B. Wyss, 'Zu Gregor von Nazianz', in *Phyllobolia für Peter von der Mühl* (Basel, 1946), p.162). The Exodus journey is made with the help of Christ also in Melito of Sardis, *Homilia in passione Christi* 83-85 (ed. S.G. Hall, p.46).

The same journey is recalled, among other passages, in *carm.* 1.2.2.164-71 (591f.) and *or.* 32.16 (M.36.192C), to which one may add those mentioned in Jungck on *De Vita Sua*, 188-91. In *or.* 45.21 (M.36.652C), a homily on Easter, it is used metaphorically to show that God's help will be given to Christians as it was given to the Jews. See also *ep.* 120 (Gallay, ii, p.12; M.37.216A) where the event is recalled in order to show Gregory's desire to depart for the next life. However, while in the present hymn the various events which took place during this journey are all given in a chronological order, apart from the last event (i.e. the crossing of the river Jordan:9b-11) which chronologically precedes the previous one (i.e. the battle of Israelites with the five Amorite kings:9a), such an order does not always exist in the above passages, namely in 1.2.2.164-71 (591f.) and *or.* 32.16 (M.36.192C). This fact casts a doubt in Jungck's rearrangement of lines 187-91 of the *De Vita Sua* for which there is no MS evidence (see Jungck ad loc.).

3. ἕκκ... Ἡγαγεῖς: The reference is to *LXX Ex.* 13.21f. The event is also recalled in *LXX Ps.* 77.14, 104.39, *Sap.* 18.3 and 2Esd.19.12. The same event in *carm.* 1.2.2.165f. (591) is expressed as follows: τοῦ (sc. of Israel) πρόσθεν πυρὸς στύλος ἡγεμόνευε / καὶ νεφέλης ἔλαυνος
3. στρατόν: The 'band' or 'body' of Israelites (cf. LSJ s.v.).

3f. δες & ὁδὸν ... ἐκάλυψαι: Cf. LXX Ex. 14.15-31, Ps. 135.13-15, and 77.13: διέρρηξε θάλασσαν καὶ διήγαγεν αὐτούς. The crossing of the Red Sea is rendered in De Vita Sua, 188 (Jungck p. 62; M. 37.1042) as: / πόντου βαγέντος Ἰσραήλ ὅδευκότος, in carm. 1.2.2.167 (591) as: / θ (sc. for Israel) πόντος ὑπέδειξε and in or. 45.21 (M. 36.652C) as: θάλασσάδ σου (sc. Israelite) τμηθήσεται, Φαραώ βαπτισθήσεται. See also or. 32.16 (M. 36.192C), or. 11.2 (M. 35.833B), or. 13.2 (853B) and or. 24.13 (1184C).

3. ὁδὸν: The word, meaning 'passage', has been deliberately chosen to serve the general idea carried out by the whole of the hymn as has been stated in the introductory analysis on 1.1.36.

4. φύλος: Behind the word one immediately thinks of the NT passages in Ev. Jo. 15.14, 15: ὑμεῖς φύλοι μου ἐστε and ὑμᾶς ὃς εὐρήκα φύλος. This is another innovation of the poet when he applies to OT events ideas and expressions appearing in NT.

5. ἀρτον ... ἔκασθαι: It follows chronologically the two previous ones and is related in LXX Ex. 16.1-36 in order to be recalled later in LXX Ps. 77.24 and 104.40 where the phrase ἀρτον οὗρανοῦ is used. See also Gregory's carm. 1.2.2.167 (591): καὶ οὐρανὸς ἐξόρρηκε /, or. 13.2 (M. 35.833B): οὕτως (sc. God) ἐξέρρηκεν ἐν ἑρήμῳ λαὸν φυγάδα ἔξονον ὑπέτον χαράσσεται, or. 32.16 (M. 36.192C), or. 45.21 (652C), or. 11.2 (M. 35.833B).

5. ἔκασθαι: It is used in the same sedes in 1.1.33.10. The imperative form of the verb, or its equivalent ones, are commonly used in the Prayer part of Greek pagan hymns when gods are asked to give the petitioner various benefits. See e.g. Hom. hymn. Cer. 494, Orph. hymn. 67.8 and Procl. hymn. 1.40, and Keyssner p. 125.
5f. ἐκ δ' ἀρα ... ἐρήμως: Cf. LXX Ex.17.1-7, Dt.8.15, Is.48.21, Ps.104.41, 77.15f. and 113.8; / τοῦ στρέψαντος τὴν πέταν εἰς λύμνας ὑδάτων καὶ τὴν ἀκρότομον εἰς πηγὰς ὑδάτων. The latter passage seems to have been Gregory’s source for the choice of the epithet ἀκρότομος. A variation of our passage is used in 1.1.38.4 (see the note ad loc.); while carm.1.2.2.168 (591) runs: / καὶ πέτρα βλάστησεν ὅ- δωρ. Cf. also or.32.16 (M.36.192C) and or.45.21 (652C).

6. ἐβλυσας ... ῳδον: ‘you made a stream flow’. The poet uses βλύσεων as a transitive verb (see LSJ s.v.). The present passage may be compared to Orph. Arg.599f. (ed. Abel): (γῆ) / βλύσουσι ἄργυροσείδες ὅδωρ πέτρης ἀπὸ λυσθῆς / ἄέναον.

6. μέγα θαύμ: The phrase is used to express the poet’s astonishment with the miracle. A similar parenthetic exclamatory phrase is used in carm.2.2.1.179 (1464) and 1.2.1.148 (533): ὃ θάμβος ἄφαντοτάτοις ἀπεστον /, when Gregory relates the mystery of Christ’s incarnation. The origin of the phrase seems to be found in the long Homeric Hymns and particularly in hymn.Merc.219 (the same line is used four times in the Iliad and once in a slightly different form in Od. 19.36), 270, hymn.Apoll.156, 415 and hymn.Cer.403. See also Ps.-Manetho 1.32.

Greek gods also were praised for their miracles, or for being themselves a miracle (see Keyssner p.122).

The same astonishment for the greatness of the miracle is expressed when the event is related in or.11.2 (M.35.833B): ὅδωρ ἀπεστον ἐν ἐρήμῳ. On the other hand, the juxtaposition of μέγα θαύμ (or ἀπεστον of the previous passage) and ἐν ἐρήμῳ has the effect of making the miracle even greater since it took place in the desert. ἐν ἐρήμῳ may have been taken from LXX Ps.77.15.

7-8: Defeat of Amalek by the sign of the cross formed with the raised hands of Moses.
The event is related in LXX Ex. 17.8-16. The theme is used by Gregory quite often. See e.g. carm. 1.2.2.170-71 (592): / καὶ παλάμησι τρόπαιον ἀνὴρ ἔστησε ταθέτας / σταυρὸν ὑποσκλάων, ξύτις δ’ ἐπέδοσεν ἀκωκᾶς, De Vita Sua 189 (Jungck p. 62; M. 37.1042), or. 45.21 (M. 36.652C): 'Ἀμαλὴκ καταπολεμηθήσεται' οὐχ ὅπλως μόνων, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολεμίας χερσί δυκαλίων εὐχῆν ὑμοὶ τυπούσας καὶ σταυροῦ τρόπαιον τὸ ἀντιτίθητον, or. 32.16 (192C): καταπολέμησας 'Ἀμαλὴκ εὐχῇ καὶ χειρῶν ἐκτάσει καὶ τῷ σταυρῷ προτυπουμένῳ καὶ finally carm. 2.1.1.1-3 (969) which is cited and discussed below p. 179. Cf. besides or. 11.2 (M. 35.833B), or. 13.2 (853B), Cosmas's of Jerusalem paraphrasis of the present passage (M. 38.452): τῶν ἔχρων τὴν ὁδόν τινα ἔτρεψε χερσίν σταυροτύπους Μωυσεῖς, his own schol. on 2.1.1.1ff. (347f.) and the rendering in the anonymous paraphrase in Cod. Vb: 'ὑποτυπῶν τὸν σταυρὸν ὁ Μωυσῆς'.

The same event is the subject of a Christian epigram, consisting of one elegiac couplet and found in AP 1.60, in which the phrase :/ Σταυροφανῶς τανῦς παλάμας is used. See also Orac. Sibyl. 8.251f.: / ὁν (sc. Εὐστήρα) Μωϋσῆς ἐτύπωσε προτεύνας ὠλένας ἀγνάς/ νυκῶν τὸν 'Ἀμαλὴκ πρῶτον and Geffcken’s comment ad loc.

7. θυσινένων δ’ ἀνδρῶν: From the above passages it becomes clear that by this phrase the poet refers to the Amalekites.

7. στῆσας: See the note on 1.1.34.3.

7f. δύνασθαι ... χέρας: The phrase is used in its literal sense in Plutarch. Anton. 20, while in Idem Cim. 19.3 and Polybius 4.52.1 it has a metaphorical meaning.

8. σταυρὸν ὑποσκλάων Μωυσῆς: The verb ὑποσκλάων, which in LSJ appears only with its literal meaning of 'overshadowing', is used by Gregory, apart from the passages cited above, also in carm. 2.1.45. 178 (1366): γράμματι ἀτρεκτὸν Χρυσότος ὑποσκλάων (sc. 'outlining') and 1.2.1.191 (537): (ἀνήρ ἐδώλα χαράσσων) ... / εὑδος ὑποσκλάς (sc. 'sketches') περάμενος, in two different metaphorical ways. From
the wording of the parallel passages cited above, i.e. σταυροτύπος, σταυροφανώς, χέροι ... τυπούσας σταυρού τρόπαυον and τῷ σταυρῷ προτυπωμένῳ, one has to understand the present passage as meaning that Moses stretched out his arms sideways forming with his body, or the shadow of his body, the shape of cross and foreshadowing thus Christ's cross. This description of Moses complies with the Biblical one (cf. ἐπήρευν ἡμωνὴς τὰς χείρας and 'Αρων καὶ ὁ ἐστήμον τὰς χείρας αὐτοῦ, ἐντεύθεν εἰς καὶ ἐντεύθεν οἷς in Ex. 17.11 and 12 respectively). Therefore, the poet appears to have chosen carefully διέχεεν χέρας, instead of the very common Biblical expression ἐκτείνετεν χέρας, as more accurate to express Moses's posture.

8. ἄλκαρ ἐμεῖο: The paraphrase in Cod. Vb takes the phrase in apposition to σταυρόν, but the similar passages cited below show that it is more likely to be addressed to Christ.

The phrase is found in the same sedes, but addressed to God, in carm. 2.1.1.623 (1016). See also ib. 422 (1001), 2.1.83.25 (1430) and Apoll. Met.Ps. 26.1, 61.4 (both in acc.). Cf. II.11.823: ἄλκαρ 'Αχαυ-ῶν/ in the same sedes but different context. Gregory seems to be the first to use ἄλκαρ as a divine epithet, if Apoll. Met.Ps. depends on him (cf. Golega, Der Homerische Psalter, p. 83). The epithet possibly stands for the common Biblical ones: ὑπερασπιστής, βοηθός, or σερεαστής e.g. in LXX Ps. 26.1, 32.20 and 70.6. On the other hand, on the proportion in the usage of ἐμεῖο or ἐμοίο in Gregory's poetry see above p. 39.

9. μὴν ... σχέδον: Cf. LXX Jos. 10.12-14. The event appears also in carm. 1.2.1.317 (546): μὴν ἀ' ἡλέσου τε ὁρῶν σχέδεν ἥς Ἰησοῦς (ac. Joshua, the son of Nun ), 1.2.2.169 (591): ἡλώσ ἐσχέθη δόφον and or. 24.13 (M. 35.1184C).

9ff. ὃς δὲ πέθερον/ ... κατένευσας: The list of events from OT closes with the reference to the crossing of the river Jordan, which
chronologically precedes the previous event of the battle of Israelites with the five Amorite kings and is related in LXX Jos. 3.13-16. The crossing of the river Jordan, together with that of the Red Sea is recalled in LXX Ps. 113.3: / ηθάλασσα εζεεν και ἐφυγεν, ὁ Ἰσραήλης ἐστράφη εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω (see also ib.5). Gregory refers to it in carm. 1.2.2.168f. (591): ὁ δ’ ἐξάσσατ’ ὀπίσω/ εὕρε βέων ποταμός, 2.1.22.10f. (1281) and 2.1.3.8 (1020), both cited below p.196 and 198 respectively. See also or.45.21 (M. 36.652C).

9f. ἐκεῖθεν/ εζεεν: Cf. carm. 1.2.2.167 (591): Ὅ (sc. Israel) πόντος ὑπόεις, although the phrase refers to the crossing of the Red Sea.

10. ἐπειγομένους: Cf. 1.1.38.2: ἐλαυνομένους, although it again refers to the crossing of the Red Sea.

10f. ὁδός .../ ἡμῆν: The phrase is used in Hesiod. Oper. 292 where the epithet appears in the same sedes.

10. ἐπήχθη: In the same sedes the verb appears in carm. 2.1.1.16. (971).

11. τὴν αὐτὸς ὑπέεις καὶ κατένευσας: The phrase explains γαῖαν, i.e. the promised land (cf. Ep. Heb. 11.9). For the same expression see carm. 2.2.1.17 (1453) and cf. 2.1.22.9(1281). The combination of the two verbs is a Homeric formula found e.g. in Od. 13.133, 4.6, Il. 15.374, 4.267 and 12.236. Cf. also Hom. hymn. Merc. 521 and Orac. Sibyl. 1.202.

The reversal in the order of the last two events seems to be caused by the importance of the crossing of the river Jordan: firstly because of its connection with the general idea of the hymn (cf. ὁδός in line 10); and secondly, in order to lead over to the following section of the poem (12-18), namely to Christ's deeds related in NT by the contrast: ὁδός ὁ ἐπὶ γαῖαν:10 - οὕρανυν οὐμον:12 (i.e. promised land - way to heavens); and by the repetition of αὐτὸς in lines 11 and 12.
12-18: Christ in New Testament

12-16: The way of life which leads to heaven. In this section the poet finds the opportunity first to refer once more to Christ's incarnation (14f.), as he does also in 1.1.33.6 and 1.1.35.7f., and then to pass on to His ascension (15) and second coming (16).

12. οὕτως: The pronoun, used also in lines 11 and 17, stands in emphatic position without being accompanied by a personal pronoun (see LSJ s.v. 10.b).

12. οὕρανύνη οἶμον μετόπεσεν ἢδειτάς: Cf. carm.1.2.1.171 (535): / οἶμον δ' οὕρανύνης θυτοῖς ἄγας ἐνθέου ἀφρεδές (sc. Christ). The same metaphor is used in Orac.Sibyl.6.9f.: δείκτης (sc. Christ) δ' ἀνθρώ-

ποιοῖς ὄφοις, δείκτης δὲ κελεύθουσι/ οὕρανύοις. Cf. also Procl. hymn.4. 14: ἐκείνουμένη δὲ πρὸς ὑψσφρητον ἀταρρον/.  

12. οὕρανύνη: The poet, writing in dactylic meters, naturally extends the Ionic (Homeric) ending -η (instead of the Attic -α) of feminine epithets and nouns to non-Homeric words, following the example of later epic writers, e.g. Nonnus. See, apart from οὕρανύνην, also ἀρχαῖ (13), πορείς (33), στρατη (1.1.34.6), χορεύς (2.1.38. 19) and ἐπουρανύς (2.1.38.24), all used by Nonnus, and εὐοδήν (1.1. 36.20) and ἄχηρασίς (1.1.35.10), which both seem to be the poet's own creations (see also above p.39).  

12. μετόπεσεν: The epic epithet, which is found in 1.1.35.6 (see the note ad loc.), and in the same sedes in 2.1.38.43, is used in all the cases as a substantive following the Greek practice from the tragedians onwards (see LSJ s.v.).

13. ὁστατον: Cf. carm.2.1.1.15 (971). The adverb in Homer is usually connected with πρῶτον or τοῦτον. See Il.22.203, Od.20.116 and Hom. hymn.21.4. After recalling a number of ways in literal or metaphorical sense: ὄδος ἱετα (2), ὄδον (3) and ὄδος ... ὑπεύθυν (10f.), the poet gives the final one: οὕρανύνη οἶμον: 12, which
seems to be the combination of the two ways: ἀρχαῖ and νέη άταπάδος. I take οὐρανίνο νϋμον in a metaphorical sense to refer to the way of life which leads to heaven. Such a life is based in actual fact on Christ's teaching which, according to Christ's own words in Ev. Mt. 5. 17, is a review of and supplement to the teaching of OT. Accordingly, when the poet refers to the way of life which leads to heaven as a mixture of the old way with the new, he seems, I think, to take ἀρχαί (sc. άταπάδος) as the way of life indicated by the teaching of OT and νέη άταπάδος, the life which is based on the teaching of NT. Gregory refers to the two Testaments as Παλαιά and Νέα in De Vita Sua 1169 (Jungck p. 110; M. 37. 1109).

14. ἔτε ζεδος θνητός τε: Cf. carm. 1. 2. 1. 149 (533) = carm. 1. 1. 9. 48 (460): ήλθε ζεδος θνητός τε in the same sedes.

14. κραβες: The verb is carefully chosen to describe the nature of the incarnate Christ and may be contrasted to ἐκευναξιος:13 (used to show precisely the mixture of the old way of life with the new).

14. ἐπι γαταν δευς: 'you came on earth'. Cf. carm. 2. 1. 45. 117 (1361): (sc. ψυχήν) ἐπὶ γαταν δευσελν/ 2. 1. 1. 10 (970), Orac. Sibyl. 3. 367 = 5. 466, Apoll. Met. Ps. 66. 8 and Nonn. par. Jo. 7: 3 (M. 43. 805A). The present phrase may owe its construction to the Homeric expression ἐπι νηας δευσελν in II. 11. 569.

14. δευς: The participle δευς of the majority of MSS is syntactically inappropriate, since a main verb is needed in the sentence. On the other hand, the reading δευς, an augmented form of aorist, of MSS Vb and C is metrically also unsuitable. Therefore, its correction into the unaugmented form δευς (cf. Smyth 438 and Monro 69) is necessary, although such a form is not recorded by Veitch s.v. δευς. But as has been said above p. 39 the construction of new forms by analogy to existing ones (cf. e.g. δρεδες in II. 24. 743 and Cunliffe, Lexicon, s.v. δλλωμ, δμυμ, δυνημ, δνηδζω)
is a common habit of Gregory's.

15. ἤμετέρην: Cf. 1.1.35.2 and 1.1.34.15 and the note ad loc.
On the enjambement in line 14 and the pause after the second longum
see the note on 1.1.33.2f.

15. ἐνθεον ἀπεθανός: The same phrase appears in carm.1.2.1.171
(535). Cf. also ib.180 (536), 1.2.9.83 (674), 2.2.1.75 (1457), 2.1.
45.55 (1357) and 1.1.7.56,67 (443, 444), and Od.8.375, 12.432.

16. ἔξεαυ: The form is constructed according to the Homeric
ending -σεαυ (cf. Smyth, Greek Dialects 607.2(a)). See also carm.

Christ's second coming is recalled, among other passages, in
carm.2.2.3.9f. (1480): φ (sc. man) θεός ἐξεαυ ἀπός, / ἐξεαυ ὑπα-
tάσωσιν ἐν ἡμας πάντας ἐλέγχων/ and or.38.16 (M.36.329C): καὶ ἥξουτα
(sc. Χριστόν) μετὰ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ὁδέξης.

16. ἐλεομένους: It reminds us of the credal phrase: προσόδοξεῖν
ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν (see A. Hahn, Symbole, p.135 and 165).

16. φαύνερος: An epic comparative form, the superlative of
which is found in the same sedes in carm.2.2(epit.).97.1 (M.38.59) =
AP 8.54.1. Cf. also 2.1.34.145 (1317), 2.1.87.23 (1435), 1.2.2.687
(632) and AP 9.210.12. The epithet stands for the Biblical phrase με-

16. η τὸ πάροιδεν: It is used once in Od.1.322. In the present
hymn the phrase refers to Christ's first coming on earth, namely to
His birth.

17-18: Christ walks on the water and calms the seastorm

The event is related in Ev.Mt.14.22-33, Mc.6.45-51 and Jo.6.16-
21. It may be found also in carm.2.1.1.10-13 (970f.) which is cited
below p.179, in Orac.Sibyl.8.273f.: / τοὺς ἄνεμους παῦσεω λόγῳ,
στορέσει δὲ θάλασσαν/ μαυρομένην κόσμον εὑρήνης πίστει τε παθήσας./
and 6.13.
17. ἐπεθέσα: The form has been composed according to the Ionic (Homerie) ending -αο of the second person first aorist middle. Cf. Smyth, Greek Dialects 608.1.

18. οἶδα τέσσε: 'the rough sea became calm'. The closest parallel passage I could find is Eur. Iph.Taur.1412: οἶδα νήμευν γενήσεται/. In carm.1.2.15.55 (770) = 2.1.1.21 (971) = 2.2.5.203 (1536) Gregory uses the phrase ἀγρίον οἶδα θαλάσσης/ which appears to be taken from Callim. fr.370 (Pfeif.). For references to βαθύροον οἶδα θαλάσσης/ in Apoll. Met.Ps. e.g. 105.23 see Golega p.49.


Before passing on to examine the content of the Prayer it will be worthwhile to pause for a moment to compare the Praise part of the present hymn with carm. 2.1.1.1-16 (969-71): De Rebus Suis, in order to show some of Gregory's poetic techniques which are parallel to those discussed in Appendix III. The De Rebus Suis consists of 634 hexameters and belongs to Gregory's autobiographical poetry. In composing its prooemium, lines 1-36 (969-72), as well as its epilogue, 623-34 (1016f.), in the form of a hymn, Gregory followed the example of Greek epic writers (see above p. 23).

The Praise of the hymnodic epilogue (623-31) consists of an accumulation of epithets and other appellations first to the Father, then to the Son and, finally, to the Spirit, all used to describe the nature, characteristics and relationship between the three persons. Therefore, it may be compared both in content and structure e.g. to 2.1.38. 5-12a (see below ad loc.).

On the other hand, the Praise of the hymnodic prooemium refers to Christ and may be compared, not only in structure, but also in
content with that of the present hymn. The citation of the text itself is inevitable in order to illustrate these similarities better.

This is given after the Migne edition:

χροστε ἀναξ, δς ἄγνας ποτ' ἀειρομέναις παλάμησιν
σταυροτύπους Μωσής ἐπ' οὐρεῖ σοῦ θεράποντος
ἐξελεως Ῥαμάλης, ὀλοκρόνος σθένους· δς τε ταθεύοσας
χειρεσιν ἐν βόθρῳ Δαυὶλ ὑπὸ δεινά λεβύτων
5 χάοματα καὶ φρυκτὰς ὀνύχους ἐπέδησας ἀκωκάς.
ὄν διὰ καὶ μεγάλου ἄκτο κήτεος ἐκθρο' Ἰωνάς
εὐξάμενος καὶ χειρας ἐνι σπλάχνους ταυῦσας·
ἐν φλόγῃ δ' Ἀσσυρῆ ὁροσερόν νέφος ἀμφικάλυψε
θαρσαλέους τρεῖς καθάς, ἑτεί χέρας εξεπέτασαν·

δς ποθ' ὅλην ξεύκουσαν ὑπείρ ἀλα πεζὸς ὄδευσας
κύματα καὶ ἀνέμων μένος θύραςας, ὃς καὶ μαβησάς
ἐκ πελάγους ἔρυκελας ὄρνομενος ὑπ' ἀθάνας.
παλλοῖς δ' αὖ φυκάς τε καὶ ἅμεα λύσαο νουσών,
οῦ παῦς κραυθεῖς δὲ βροτος θυντοσοῦν ἐμφύεσιν̃

15 ὅν τὸ μὲν ἡς ἄνωθε, τὸ δ' ὅστατον ἄμμω φαγάνθας,
ὡς καὶ θεὸν τελέσας, ἑτεί βροτος αὐτός ἐτύχανς.

With regard to structure, both hymns begin with the invocation χροστε ἀναξ which is followed by three relative clauses expressed in 1.1.36 by δς ..., δς ..., δς τε and in 2.1.1. by δς ..., δς τε... ὅν διὰ. In content both hymns praise Christ with reference to various Biblical events taken first from the OT and then from Christ's life on earth. Some of these events are the same in both hymns, namely the victory over king Amalek in 1.1.36. 7-8 and 2.1.1. 1-3, the cessation of the seastorm in 1.1.36. 17-18 and 2.1.1. 10-12, and Christ's incarnation in 1.1.36. 14f. and 2.1.1. 14-16. However, more important from the viewpoint of poetic techniques seems to be the deliberate choice of the particular OT events in both hymns. So, in 1.1.36. 3-11
these are all taken from the general theme of the Exodus journey in order to correspond to the main concept of the hymn: the idea of way or journey. On the other hand, in 2.1.1.1-9 all the three events related: the salvation of Israelites from the threat of Amalek, the rescue of Daniel from the lions (cf. LXX Dan. 6.1-28) and of Jonah from the cetacean (cf. LXX Jon.2.1-11) have also one thing in common: the salvation of those involved comes as a result of their prayer made with their hands extended. Furthermore, the events from Old and New Testament mentioned in the Praise part are all based on the concept of salvation, which is in harmony also with the main request:/ (έλθ') ... ὃς με σώσῃς /, following in line 18 (971). Therefore, in both hymns the content of the Praise anticipates that of the Prayer. Hence, the poet appears to follow the common practice of Greek pagan hymnographers, whereby the content of Praise is carefully chosen in order to be appropriate to the fulfilment of the petitioner's requests (see above p. 30).

In conclusion, both the Praise of the hymnodic prooemium in 2.1.1.1-16 and that of the present hymn are built in the same way and their content, apart from being similar in various parts of it, is deliberately chosen to serve a particular purpose in each case.

III. Prayer (19-33)

All the requests of the Prayer are related to the main concept of the hymn: the idea of journey.

Line 19: A variation of this line may be found in the opening line of the Prayer in the hymnodic prooemium we have dealt with just above: 2.1.1.17 (971): ἔδει, μάχαρ, καὶ ἔποι ὼδας ὡς ὀλιγὸς ἐλθέ καλεῦντι.

19f. ἀλλὰ ... σήμερον: A request to Christ to become the poet's fellow traveller

19. ἀλλὰ, μάχαρ: In the same sedes the phrase apppears in carm. 2.1.83.31 (1430) and quite often in the Orphic Hymns (e.g. 6.10, 11.
21, 19.18) where it begins the Prayer part (see also above p.30,n.3). 
μάκαρ is a universal epithet applied to many Greek gods indifferently
(see above p. 26) and stands for the Biblical μακάρος (1Tim.1.11, 6.
15 and Deichgrüber p.101). It is used by Gregory quite often: carm.
1.2.1.64, 175 (527, 536), 1.2.15.110 (774), 2.1.1.110 (978), 2.1.19.
32 (1273) and ib.103 (1279), where μακάρτατς is used instead. Among
other Christian hymnographers, the epithet is used by Synesius (e.g.
p.161) and in Method. Olymp. Parthen.285.13, 286.21, 288.56 etc. (ed.
Musurillo-Debidour, SC ).

19. ἐλθέ: Imperative forms of cletic verbs, or its equivalent,
often introduce the Prayer part of Orphic Hymns: 48.5f.: άλλα, μά-
καρ, ... ἔπαργγελος ἐπέλθος and 79.11: άλλα, μάκαρ ἐλθος κεχαρμε-
νη (see above p. 31 and Keyssner pp.87-91).

19. καλεῦντι: The participle is found in the same sedes three
times in Homer (Od.10.229, 255 and 12.249).

19. συνέμπορος: Gregory's source for the word seems to be found
in Plat. Phaedo 108c where gods are called ξυνέμποροι and ἡγεμόνες of
the human soul. Cf. also Orac.Chald. fr.217.2 (ed. des Places, SC,
p.118). A closer parallel to the Platonic passage is carm.2.2.4. 8lf.
(1511): συνέμπορον, ἡγεμονή, ἐρχόμενος Χριστῷ ξυν. See also 2.2.5.275 (1541)
where the epithet is in the same sedes and seems to refer also to
Christ; while in or.7.9 (M.35.765A) it refers to Gregory's brother
Caesarius. συνέμπορός τινι is employed by Apollinarius a number of
times in his Paraphrasis of the Psalter as the version of μετά τινος
used in the Septuagint text. See e.g. Met.Ps. 25.8 (συνέμπορον
ἐλθέεν τινι) used also in Nonn. Dion.14.192. In both cases the
fellow travellers are both men as are also in Greek tragedy when
συνέμπορος is used. Cases where one partner is a god as happens in
the present hymn may be found in Nonn. Dion. 4.101: ζομαὶ Ἁπόλ-
λωνυ συνέμπορος, 1.368 and Aristoph. Ranae 396. In Christian prayers συνοδούπάρος is used instead: Liturg. Marc. (Brightman p.127. 14f.): σύμπλους καὶ συνοδούπάρος αὐτῶν (sc. of travellers) γενέσθαι καταξώσων and Serap. Euch. 5.8 where the guardian angel is called συνοδούπάρος. Cf. also Act. Thom. 10.1 (LB 2.2, 1959, p.114.5f.).

20. σύμπλος: It may imply that Gregory refers to a real journey. The word is in emphatic position as in 2.1.38.39, 43, 47, 49 (see the note on 2.1.38.39).

20. εὐδόκης δὲ πόρος: A request for an auspicious journey. For εὐδόκης cf. carm. 2.1.1.246 (988), 1.2.29.114 (Knecht p.24; M. 37. 892) and Knecht's note ad loc., and 2.2.1.168 (1463). See also 2.1. 22.6 (1281): ήεν δὲ πόρος δόδυν and 1.2.9.101f. (675): / Χρυσότων .../ δε με ... εὐδομέοντα τύθης/. The word is in emphatic position as in 2.1.38.39, 43, 47, 49 (see the note on 2.1.38.39).

21. και ἄγγελον ἔσπελον (sc. πόρος): The poet begs also for a good angel. On ἔσπελον see below the note on line 23. The phrase appears in the same sedes in carm. 1.1.8.62 (451); while a similar request in 2.1.3.5f. (1020) is cited below p. 198. On requests for a guardian angel in liturgical or private prayers see the introductory note (above p.163); cf. also Synes. hymn. 2.264ff.

21. πομπὰ: The poet applies to the angel an epithet of Hermes as the latter was the escort of the souls of the dead to the nether world. See e.g. Aesch. Pers. 626, Soph. OC 1548, 11.24.153, 182, 461, 437 and Orph. hymn. 57.6.

21. ἀλεξητήρα: 'protector'. The epithet is used of Heracles in Kaibel ep.831.13 (= IG 14.1003) and of Dionysus in Nonn. Dion. 33.232 (gen. same sedes) and 7.96. The equivalent ἀλεξητῶρ and ἀλεξητήριος
are both used of Zeus in Soph. OC·143 and Aesch. Sept. 8 respectively.

21. Βοηθόν: Greek gods were often called to come as helpers to men: e.g. Artemis at child-births in Callim. hymn. Dion. 21f. See also Nonn. Dion. 33.345 (Sea), 30.73 (Hephaestus), 27.292 (Athene) and Bacchyl. fr. 49 (Jebb) (Zephyrus). Apart from Βοηθός, gods were called also (ἐπ-)ἀρωγός, ἐπόθουρος and ἐπιτάρροθος. See above p.27.

In Psalms God is often called Βοηθός: LXX Ps. 113.19, 117.7, 18.15 etc.

22. ἡματώμιον νυχών τε κακῶν: The phrase seems to have been based on LXX Ps. 90. 5-6: οὐ φοβηθήσῃ ἀπὸ φόβου νυκτερινοῦ, ἀπὸ βέλους πετο-μένου ἡμέρας, ἀπὸ πράγματος διαπορευμένου ἐν σκότει, ἀπὸ συμπτώματος καὶ δαιμονίου μεσημβρινοῦ. See also Orph. hymn. 3.14: φόβους ἄν ἀπό-πεμπε νυχαινεῖς.

22. Κακῶν ἀπὸ τηλόθ' ἐξέργην: Cf. the variation κακῶν (sc. men) ἀπὸ τηλόθ' μύμων/ in Carm.2.1.13.207 (1243). The syntax of ἐξέργην with acc. and τηλόθων ἀπὸ with gen. seems to be based on ἐξέργην + acc. + τήλε in Il. 23.72 in which τήλε is replaced in the present phrase by τηλόθων with gen., while ἀπὸ is an emphatic pleonasm.

23. καὶ τέλος ἐσθαλὸν ὄδος χαριζόμενος: Cf. Carm.2.1.19.77 (1277): ἐμοὶ τέλος ἐσθαλὸν ὄπαξων/(sc. God). Requests for a happy end of life may be found in Orph. hymn. 28.11: βιότου τέλος ἐσθαλὸν ὄπαξων and 73.9. In general, ἐσθαλὸς, together with ἄγαθος, is widely used in hymns to describe the various benefits or requests the petitioner asks from gods: Theocr. Idyl. 22.214f. (Dioscuroi): ἡμετέρους κλέος ὑμνοὺς/ ἐσθαλὸν ἄει πέμποιτε and Orph. hymn. 57.12, 33.9. See also Keyssner p.158ff.

On χαριζόμενοι see the note on 1.1.35.2.

24. οὐκοθέν ... καὶ οὐκαδε: The closeposition of the two
opposite adverbs corresponds to the liturgical phrase: τὰς εἰσόδους καὶ τὰς ἐξόδους (sc. προσέρχουν) used in the dismissal prayer in Liturg. ap. Const.Apost. 8.15.8 (Brightman p.27.8f.) and based on LXX Ps. 120.8.

24. (ὁφρα) ἄγνοια: The optative in the final clause is owed to an assimilation to the optative of wish in the principal clause (πόροις: 20). See Smyth 2186.c. and above p.42f.


25. πηγὸς τὸν φύλους τε: Cf. Il.11.3.163: πηγὸς τὸ φύλους τε/ and carm. 2.1.3.20 (1021), cited below p.199.


26. ἐνθα: It refers very possibly to the poet's house as does also in 1.1.37.7 (see the note ad loc.).

26. νῦκτα καὶ ἡμαρ: It is a Homeric formula (Il.5.490, Od.2.345), used also in carm.2.1.1.141 (980). The variation of it: νυκτας τε καὶ ἡματα (Il.18.340, Hesiod. Theog. 724) is used e.g. in carm.2.2.1.63 (1456) and 2.1.1.312 (993). See also Apoll. Met.Ps.1.5. However, the expression 'day and night' is not absent from Psalms either: LXX Ps. 1.2, 31.4, 41.4 and 54.11.

26f. νῦκτα καὶ ἡμαρ .../ λυσοῦμην: Cf. carm.2.2.1.31 (1454): ὠμοῖς πανυχοῦσαι καὶ ἡματίζουσι "Ἀνακτα/ μέλπουντες.

27. (ἐνθα) λυσοῦμην: This seems to be a potential optative found in an independent clause without ἄν contingent (see Monro 299 (f) and above p.42f.) as happens in 1.1.35.12 and 1.1.37.7, although the latter is found in a relative clause.

On λύσεσθαι see the note on 1.1.34.14.

27. κακοτητος ἁμιγέα σου βοῶν ἐλκυν: 'leading for you a life unmixed with badness, i.e. a sinless life'. See 1.1.34.26: καθαρὸν βοῶν and the note ad loc. For βοῶν ἐλκυν cf. carm.2.2.4.4 (1506),
2.1.32.4 (1301) and or. 43.80 (M. 36.604A); also AP 7.736.1 (Leonid.),
11.62.5 (Pallad.), both in the same sedes, 1.93.3, Nonn. Dion. 35.76
and Apoll. Met. Ps. 30.22, 20.8, 101.22 (all in the same sedes). Finally,
in Eur. Orest. 207 and Phoen. 1535 βύστος and ζωά are used instead.

28. νόσον πετρέντα: The metaphor may owe its source to the
epic formula ἔτεκα πετρέντα (Od. 1.122, 11.13.750), or even to Plat.
Phaedr. 246e: τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς πέτρωμα. Cf. also Synes. hymn. 5.87: τὸ
νόσον πέτρωμα. Gregory uses the same metaphor also in carm. 1.2.16.31f.
(780): πάντα νόσον πετρύγεσσιν ἐπέδραμον, ὀσσα παλαία, ὀσσα νέα and
2.1.45.119 (1362): πνεύματι (sc. of man) ὑπ' πετρέντα; while in
2.2.1.300 (1473) he refers to πετρέντα βίον.

28. βύστος φάσος: The phrase must be parenthetic and addressed to
Christ, the light of the poet's life as happens also in carm. 2.2.5.3
(1521): Χριστός ἀναξ ..., βύστος φάσος, (nom.), in 2.2.7.300 (1574):
Χριστός, ἐμὸν φάσος, (same sedes) and 2.1.25.7 (1285). See Ev. Jo. 8.12.
However, in 2.1.13.5 (1228) the same phrase is addressed to the bishops,
possibly after Ev. Mt. 5.14. Cf. besides Orph. hymn. 8.18 (Helius): ζωῆς
φῶς (same sedes).

28. νόσον ... αἰέν ἀείρων: Cf. carm. 2.1.1.76 (975): Χριστός ἐ-
μὸν νόσον αἰέν ἀείρων/ and ib. 265 (990): θεῷ νόσον ἀγνὸν ἀείρων/ (sc.
the poet), and 1.1.1.22 (400).

The present passage reminds us of liturgical ones when, before
the prayer of the anaphora, the priest urges the congregation to uplift
its mind or heart: see Liturg. ap. Const. Apost. (Brightman p. 14.17):
ἄνω τὸν νοῦν, Liturg. Jac. (B. p. 50.4): ἄνω σχοimen τὸν νοῦν καὶ τὰς
χαράδας and Liturg. Marc. (p. 125.11).

On expressions with αἰέν used in Greek pagan hymns see the note
on 1.1.33.11.

29. μέσῳ διε ... ἐξανύσαμεν: Here the optative, as well as that
in the following line, is used in an indefinite temporal clause
(see Kühlner-Blass-Gerth 567,7, Smyth 2404 and above p. 42f.).

Furthermore, Sophocles's Thesaurus and LSJ s.v. μέσημα cite only three cases of μέσημ' δτε, all taken from Callimachus (hymn. Dion. 195, hymn. Cer. 111 and Hec. fr. 260.4 (Pfeif.)), but followed by aor. indic. or imper. and not by opt. (which is used to refer to an uncertain time in the future) as happens in the present case. Cf. also Hesychius and Suda s.v. μέσημ' δτε.

29. πεπάτησιν ξυνήν δόδου : The last common journey for everybody is death. See carm. 2.1.3.23 (1021), cited below p. 199.

30. μονήν : The word alludes to Ev. Jo. 14.2: ἐν τῇ οὐκείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς μου μοναὶ πολλαὶ εἴσον which is mentioned by Gregory in carm. 1.2.17.24 (783): πολλαῖς γὰρ πολλῶν εἰς μοναὶ βιότων. On the other hand, the Biblical concept of μονή as the abode of the faithful may be contrasted to Procl. hymn. 6.12: δρμον ἐς εὐσεβίσης με πελάσασε κεκνη- ὕτα.

Lines 31-33: This is a new invocation to Christ in 'du-Stil' (see, above p. 31), used to underline the close relationship between Christ and the poet; and a final request for a successful end to the poet's journey.

31. σοὶ ζῶ, σοὶ λαλῶ, σοὶ ὄ' : The phrase is used in the same sedes in 2.1.38.29. The personal relationship between Christ and the poet is marked throughout the Prayer part with the use of fourteen personal pronouns and culminates in the last three lines with the anaphora of σοὶ in 31f.: σοὶ ..., σοὶ ..., σοὶ .../ σοὶ .... See above the note on anaphora on 1.1.33.8.

31. ὃ ἄνα Χριστέ : A renewed invocation (see the note on 1.1.34. 14) which is used in the same sedes in carm. 2.1.1.106 (978). The use of the interjection in ὃ ἄνα goes back to the Homeric hymn to Apollo where it can be explained by the religious epicletic nature of the formula (see above p. 44).
32. αὐρω ποδὸς ἔχονς: Cf. _carm_.2.1.1.122 (979): πρὸς αἰθέρα
tαχαίν ἄετρα (sc. Nonna), 2.1.42.8 (1344): ἐπὶ χθονὸς ἔχονς ἔρεισαν/ (cf. Nonn. _Dion_.18.15) and Synes. _hymn_.5.89: ταχαίν αὐρων/. Although ποδὸς ἔχονς is commonly used in Euripides (_Herc_. _Fur_.125, _Phoen_.104f.) it does not seem to have been used with αὐρων.

32. χειρὶ καλύτερες: The metaphor reminds us of similar Biblical ones: ὑπὸ τὴν σκέπην τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ (LXX Is.49.2, 51.16), ἐν σκέπῃ τῶν πτερύγων σου σκεπάσεις με (LXX Ps.16.8; cf. also 35.8, 60.5) and ἐξεπέτασα (sc. God) τὰς χειρὰς μου (NT _Ep_. _Rom_.10.21 = LXX Is.65.2).

Line 33: After the long series of secondary clauses (21-30), serving to explain why the poet begged for an angel (21-25) and to show the poet's great devotion to Christ (26-30), and the new invocation (31-32), the poet closes the hymn by adding his final request for a successful end to his journey.

33. ἀλλά: It is used to introduce the last request after the long break of eleven lines from the previous request in line 21.

33. καὶ νῦν: While ἀλλά (33) corresponds to ἀλλά in 19, καὶ νῦν refers us back to σήμερον in 20 and is used, together with ἀλλά, to introduce the final request (see also above p. 30).

33. ἐσθαλὸν ἐπὶ τέρμα πορεύσῃς: The phrase is a variation of τέ- λος ἐσθαλὸν ὄδοτο in line 23 and may be compared to _carm_.1.2.9.112 (676): τέρμα πορεύσῃς/; while 2.1.1.489 (1006): ἔνοιε ἔπει τέρμαθ'/ ἔκανω/ refers to the end of the poet's life as does the request in _Procl_. _hymn_.6.4: / τεύχετε ὅ' αὐγήσασαν ἐμοῦ βυότοιο πορεύην/.

We now pass on to draw our conclusions on the main features used in 1.1.36. The hymn is addressed throughout to Christ and begins with the invocation _Χριστῷ οὖς_ which is further developed in the 'Relativstil': ὅς ... ὅς ... ὅς τε ... (1-4). The poet eulogizes Christ by reference to His deeds both in Old and New Testament, following thus a common
practice in Greek pagan hymns and Biblical Psalms and prayers. The
divine epithets used throughout the hymn are either universal: ἀναστάσις
(1,31), μέμνημα (19), or of a particular application: συνεργός (19),
βέβαιος φῶς (28) and ἀλήθεια (8). The by-name Χρυσός is used, not only
to introduce the hymn by replacing the proper name of the addressee,
but also as a renewed invocation in line 31. The hymn is enriched
with some further divine epithets of restricted application: πορεύς
ἀλεξιπτήρ and βοηθός (21) which, however, refer to the guardian angel.
In the hymn the poet makes use of expressions with πᾶς (1,2),
tεραται (2) and αἷμα (28), and employs a cletic verb (ἐλθεί: 19) with
ἀλλὰ, μέμνημα to introduce the Prayer. Besides, to seek various ben-
efits from Christ he utilizes πόρος (20). Finally, before closing
the hymn with his last request the poet adds another invocation to
Christ (31f.) in 'du-Stil' by using σοῦ in anaphora: σοῦ ... σοῦ ...
... σοῦ ... σοῦ and the vocative ὁ ἁνα Χρυσότε.
The ornamentation of the hymn is rich. Apart from the epithets
mentioned above there are about fifteen more, some of which are ex-
pressed in pairs containing opposite words: ἡμαρτών νυκτῶν (22),
ἀρχαί - νέν (13). To these one may add the exclamatory phrase μέ-
γα δαμα (6), the comparison φανέρως ἡ τὸ πόροφαν (16), various
metaphors (28,32,29) and rhetorical figures: oxymoron (θεός θυτῆς: 14),
antithesis (οὐκοῦσα ... οὐκαδε:24), anaphora of σοῦ (31f.);
and finally, some vivid images, above all that of the Exodus (3-11)
and of the cessation of the seastorm (17-18).
All these features, together with the careful structure of the
hymn, provide enough elements which make the hymn an elaborate one.

We now come to discuss poems 1.1.37 and 1.1.38. The former is
written in hexameters and the latter in elegiacs. In their majority
they are similar to other Gregorian verses, mainly found in 1.1.36,
as has already been observed by Caillau (see the note on 1.1.37 in M.37.520 and J. Sajdak, 'Naziánzenica', EOS, 16(1910), p.90). These similarities and the fact that the two poems have a different MS tradition led Lefherz to include them among the disputed works of Gregory's (see Lefherz p.70). On the contrary, I think that such similarities prove the two poems to have been written by Gregory since, as will be seen, they are in accordance with Gregory's techniques in verse-composition.

Carm. 1.1.37

I. Praise (1-4a)

Line 1: It may be compared with 1.1.36.32a (see the note ad loc.). The variation lies in the fact that the affirmative sentence in 1.1.36 is replaced here by a negative one whereby the poet wants to underline that without Christ's help one cannot make even a single step. Hence, the negative sentence serves to praise Christ in a 'hyberbolic' style as does also the use of expressions with μᾶς (2,3).

(The term 'hyberbolic' style is taken from Keyssner; see Keyssner p.28ff. 'Der hyberbolische Stil'.) Such negative sentences were not uncommon in Greek pagan hymns, particularly those in 'du-Stil': Ariphron 9 (PLG iii p.597 Bergk): (sc. ὑγίεσα) σέθεν δὲ χωρίς οὖν εύδοκίμων (ἤψυ) and Orph. hymn.16.5. See also Keyssner p.29. Similar to this feature is the rhetorical question used in 1.1.29.1 (see below the note ad loc.). However, a closer parallel to the present passage may be found in carm.1.2.9.107 (676): ἔσθαι χρυσότοι δύσα βροτός ὕλος ἄξιος ἄξιος.

The reversal χωρίς σέο of the Edd, instead of σέο χωρίς of the MSS, was necessary for metrical reasons since χωρίς has the 'u' short (see Il.7.470 and Od. 9.221).

Lines 2 and 3 are exactly the same as 1 and 2 in 1.1.36 (see
the notes ad loc.). However, it is worth noticing that in this hymn
the introductory invocation Χριστὲ ἀναξ of 1.1.36.1 comes only at
the beginning of the second line.

4. οἱ πόλυνος : Cf. πόλυνος Διό in II.9.238 and θεός (or θεότης)
212 respectively. In II.24.295, 313 πόλυνος (although referring to
the bird of omen) is in the same sedes.

4. καὶ τήνδε τέμνω τριβον : Cf. cirm.1.2.17.33 (784): τάμενε
τριβον (sc. the path of life) which may be compared to τέμνων τριβον βιστόω in AP 9.359 (Posidipp.) - repeated in Schol. on Eur.
Hec.213 (ed. Dindorf) - and ib. 360 (Metrod.); cf. also De Vita Sua
102 (Jungck p.58; M.37.1036): ὀψοῦν τοῦ λόγου τέμω τριβον and
Jungck’s note ad loc.

Another variation in this hymn with regard to the way the poet
follows in praising Christ in lines 1-4a is the following: in lines
1 and 4a he praises Christ indirectly by referring to what one or
the poet does with the help of His, and only in lines 2 and 3 Christ
is praised directly with an exposition of His characteristics as
happens in 1.1.36.

II. Prayer (4b-7)

The Prayer contains three requests to Christ: first to send the
poet off unwitting, second to grant him everything he hopes for and
finally to lead him again back home.

Another feature of 1.1.37 worth mentioning is the fact that the
Prayer begins towards the end of the line and not at the beginning of
it as happens in 1.1.36 and the majority of Greek pagan hexameter
hymns. This may be possibly owed to the brevity of the poem. The
same feature appears also in 2.1.3.5 (see below p.198).

4. ἀλλά με: Cf. 1.1.36.33 and the note on 1.1.34.19.

4f. με πέμπουσι/ ἰσχυρῆ: 'may you send me off unwitting'. Cf.
Solon fr. 19.3f. (West): αὐτὰρ ἐμε ... / ἀδικηθί πέμπου Κύριες,
hymn. Phys. 12f. (Heitsch p. 27).

πέμπασσα and its compounds are among the verbs used in the
Prayer part of Greek pagan hymns when the petitioner begs gods to
send or give him various benefits, or even to avert any misfortunes.
See Keysaner p. 125f. for the former case and p. 115 for the latter.

5. καὶ πάντα πόρους: The phrase seems to summarize the requests
in 1.1.36.20f. On πόρους see the note on 1.1.36.20.

5. δο' ἐσῃτα Ἡτορ: Cf. carm. 2.1.3.18f. (cited below on p.
199). Ἡτορ is commonly used at the end of the hexameter in Homer.

6. Ἀναξ: See the note on 1.1.36.1. The new invocation varies
from the introductory one, or from its equivalent in 1.1.36.31, in
that it includes only Ἀναξ, without the addition of Χρυσιτε: in 1.1.
36 we have Χρυσιτε Ἀναξ (1) - ἰ Ἀνα Χρυσιτε (31) while in 1.1.37 Χρυ-
σιτε Ἀναξ (2) - Ἀναξ (6).

6. καὶ με ... παλύνορσον ἄγος ἐκ δώμα πενιχρόν: 'and may you
lead me back to my poor house'. Cf. 1.1.36.33 and the note ad loc.
This request obviously refers to the poet's homeward journey.

παλύνορσον: It is used in the same sedes in carm. 1.2.2.397
(609), 1.2.1.166 (535), 1.2.9.58 (672), 2.1.1.298 (992) and 2.1.45.
321 (1376). I think that this word is added in order to differenti-
ate the request in line 6 from that in 4f. Therefore, since the
former request refers to the poet's homeward journey, the latter
possibly refers to his outward journey. In this case 1.1.37 appears
to have been composed before Gregory's departing journey, although it
includes requests concerning both his outward and return journeys.

Line 7: It is nearly the same as 1.1.36.26 (see the note ad
loc.).

ἲνθα: It refers to the poet's house: ἐκ δώμα πενιχρόν (6).
έλευθερός: If Gallay is right to suggest that both 2.1.3 and 1.1.36 were composed at the same time and for the same purpose (before Gregory's departing journey for Constantinople at the beginning of A.D. 379); and if, on grounds of the similarities between 1.1.37 and 1.1.36, 1.1.37 is to be considered as written before the same journey, then έλευθερός should mean 'free from the worries and troubles Gregory had experienced in his effort to practice his episcopal duties in Constantinople'.

έλασκούμεν: Referring to Greek gods the verb may be found in e.g. Hom. hymn. Cer. 274, 292 (Demeter), 368 (Persephone) and Arat. Phaen. 14 (Zeus), in all cases in the same sedes. As a propitiatory verb it is used in the prayer part of Greek pagan hymns (see above p. 31).

From what has been said above it appears that 1.1.37 contains the basic formal characteristics of hymns: 1) Invocation (2a), 2) Praise (1-4a) and 3) Prayer (4b-7), although real distinction at least between the first two parts does not exist. Therefore, although it is short, 1.1.37 can, I think, easily be classed as a hymn; its length is however equal to, or exceeds, that of one third of the Homeric and of some of the Orphic hymns.

The hymn arose directly out of the situation in which Gregory found himself (i.e. his departure for Constantinople) and contains material from 1.1.36. However, the degree of dependence of 1.1.37 on 1.1.36 is such that, I think, it may not prevent us from characterizing it a nicely constructed poem with its own identity.

Carm. 1.1.38

The poem (written in elegiac couplets) is addressed to Christ
as may be seen from the invocation Ἱπτέ appearing only in the last line. Praise (1-4) refers to some of the events from the Exodus theme, and is expressed with very little variation from the equivalent part of 1.1.36. The same may be said for the Prayer (5-6) where two requests are made to Christ: one to be the poet's companion (as in 1.1.36.19) and the other to grant him every good fortune. The conciseness of the poem results in telescoping together Invocation, Praise and Prayer. Therefore, when in the commentary I subdivide the poem into Praise (1-4) and Prayer (5-6), I use the two terms only as headings without implying any intrinsic distinction between the two parts.

The requests are so general that they do not let us assume anything about the time and purpose of the composition of this poem. Only as a variation of 1.1.36 it may have been written for the same reason and at the same time as 1.1.36.

I. Praise (1-4): Christ's power revealed in the Exodus

Kaibel cites six epigrams beginning with ὅς (as does this hymn): 376d, 1113, 656, 970, 761 and 517c. Of these only the last one—a tomb epigram of one couplet only—is expressed with a verb in the second person as happens in our poem:

ὅς τὸν ἐμὸν παρὰ τῷ βους ἄγεως, Τῆς ἑσπερίας τιμῆσον κατὰ μὲ καὶ παρὰ τῆς ζωῆς.

1f. ὅς ... πελάγει: It is the same as 1.1.36.3f. (see the note ad loc.).

2. πῆδας κώμας ἐλαυνοῦντος: It refers to the crossing of the Red Sea (cf. LXX Ex. 14. 15-31) as does also the rest of the relative clause. Although Gregory returns in his works to the same event again and again, I could find no parallel expressions for the present one, possibly because he always presents the event in a different way. See the instances mentioned above on 1.1.36.3f., and carm.2.1.
3.8 (1020) and 2.1.22.10 (1281), which are both cited below on p. 198 and 196 respectively (although both passages seem to refer to the crossing of river Jordan and not of Red Sea).

Line 3: This is a close variation of 1.1.36.5a (see the note ad loc.). It has ὅσας instead of ὅποιας and ὀ ὁκέουσων which is added, not only to fill the hexameter, but above all to mark the greatness of the miracle and underline the surprise by which the Israelites were taken having seen the event taking place. Hence, the negative participle serves the same purpose as μεγα γάρ' in 1.1.36.6 (although this expression is used for another miraculous event: see the note ad loc.).

3. ὅσας: The verb is used transitively as happens in the Biblical exposition of the event (cf. LXX Ex.16.4). In a passive form it is used in Gregory's or.24.13 (Mossay p.68; M.35.1184C); while in or.13.2 (M.35.853B) - cited on 1.1.36.5 - the noun ὅσας is used instead. See also or.45.21 (M.36.652C) where one finds the equivalent ὠμβρέξων.

Line 4: This is a variation of 1.1.36.5b-6a (see the note ad loc.), but without ὅμοιος and with ἐγνών (used also in LXX Ps.113.8) instead of ῥόον. See or.45.21 (M.36.652C): πέτρα ἐγνώς and or. 13.2 (M.35.853B): οὗτος (sc. God) πέτραν ἐκήγαγεν.

II. Prayer (5-6): Christ is called to become the poet's fellow-traveller

5. καὶ νῦν: The phrase (commonly used to introduce the Prayer: see above p. 30 ) is here added emphatically to contrast the past time (when Christ helped the Israelites) with the present (when the poet himself is in need of Christ). See also 2.1.3.4 (1020).

5. ὅφε θεράπων: See the note on 1.1.34.20.

5. συνέμπορος ἐξεῖς καλεῦντι: The phrase appears in 1.1.36.19b (see the note ad loc.).
6. Χριστός, φίλος μερόσων: The same invocation is used to introduce carm.2.1.22.1 (1281) which is cited below on p.196. Christ is called also βροτῶν φίλος in carm.2.1.46.49 (1381); while in 1.1.36.28 He is invoked as β'ου φίλος (see the note ad loc.).

6. δεξιά κάννα φέρων: Cf. carm.2.1.3.6 (1020) where the poet begs the Logos of God to send him an angel as δεξιόν παραστάτην and ib. 18-21 (1021).

6. φέρων: The verb is used above all in Orphic hymns when gods are asked to bring men various benefits. See e.g. Orph. hymn.35.7: τέλος ἢν φέρωσα (sc. Λητά) and Keyssner p.126.

With regard to the various features of 1.1.38 there is little to be said here.

For the content and purpose of Praise we refer the reader to what has already been said in the concluding remarks on 1.1.36. In the Prayer the only elements worth mentioning here are the invocation φίλος μερόσων and the indirect request δεξιά κάννα φέρων which does not seem to have its equivalent in 1.1.36 or the Greek pagan hymns.

As a conclusion to both poems (1.1.37 and 1.1.38), apart from the remarks already made with regard to the degree of variation in each hymn separately, one may also observe that the request of 1.1.38 is the first one in 1.1.36.19 and those of 1.1.37 correspond to the requests which follow in 1.1.36.20ff. However, a reversed order appears in the case of the content of Praise, since that of 1.1.37 is taken from the first section of the Praise in 1.1.36. 1-2; while that of 1.1.38 is taken from one part of the second section (i.e. 1.1.36. 3-6).

From all these observations it looks as if these poems were written before the poet composed 1.1.36 in which he incorporated the
content of both hymns and added more material to it.

Let us now analyse the final two poems of the group: carm. 2.1.3 (1020f.) which is entitled 'Ἐνδόθα Κωνσταντινούπολεως' and carm. 2.1.22. 1-12 (1281) entitled 'Ἰκετήριον'. (The possibility that the latter poem is formed of two distinct poems is discussed above on p. 10 n. 2). In order to illustrate the relationship of these poems with 1.1.36, I think that it would be better first to cite their text and then make our remarks on them.

Carm. 2.1.22 1-12 (1281)

The text is taken from the Migne edition and runs:

Χριστέ, φάσος μερόπων, πυρδεί στύλε θηγορόου
ψυχή πλασμόμενη πικρῆς βλότου δι' ἐρήμου,
σχές θαραώ κακόμυτων, ἀναιδεὰς ἔργοσωμάτας,
καὶ πηλοῦ μ' ἀδέτου καὶ Αὐγήρου βαρεύσης
5 ἐξερήσας πληγῆσον ἀεικελύρου δαμάσσας
δυσμενέας. λείπει δὲ πόρους σῶδων. ἤν δὲ κήρουν
ἐχθρός ἐπισπέρχων, σὺ δὲ μου καὶ τάντον ἐρυθρόν
tήξειας, στερεῖν δὲ διέκκερασμι θάλασσαν
σπεύδων ἐς χθόνα ὄταν, ἐμὸν λάχος, ὑπὲρ ὑπεστησ.
10 καὶ ποταμοῦς στήσειας ἀπεύρονας, ἀλλοφύλων τε
κλάναις θούρλον ἐγχος ἀγάστονον. εἰ δ' ἐπιθαυμή
γῆς ἔρημη, μέλψω σε διηνεκέσσων ἐν ὦμοις.

A paraphrase of these lines by Cosmas of Jerusalem follows that of 1.1.36. 1-18 (both being incorporated into one section: Ἀδ-γος ΜΣ' in M. 38. 452 f.), so that Leiberz did not realize it and therefore he does not mention it in his index of Scholiasts (see Leiberz p. 295 ff.).
The poem may be characterized as a prayer or petition to Christ. Written in hexameters, it begins with the invocation Χριστε, φίλε μου which is used also in 1.1.38.6 (see the note ad loc.). Christ is metaphorically called 'fiery column' (πυρός σετόλος), obviously after LXX Ex. 13.21 and Apoc. 10.1. Note the use of the unusual form of vocative: πυρός instead of πυρόν (also seen in βροτός in 2.1.38.27: see the note ad loc.).

The whole poem is built with various Biblical events and images mainly taken from the Exodus theme, and used metaphorically in order to describe the journey of the poet's life, or more precisely the journey of his soul which appears in line 2 to wander in the solitude of life. In favour of a completely metaphorical approach to the poem is Cosmas's paraphrase, according to which Pharaoh (2) is compared to the devil, ἐργοδιωκταῖς to the daemons, πηλὸς to sin and δυσμενεῖς to Gregory's own enemies (although one could also take Pharaoh, ἐργοδιωκταῖς and δυσμενεῖς to refer to the same people).

The poet begs Christ to protect and deliver him from all these dangers. He also begs for an 'easy way' (λείαν ... ὀδόν:5), namely a smooth and trouble-free journey of life, until he reaches the divine and holy land (ἐσ χῶνα ὡταν:9, γῆς ἀερῆς:12), namely the kingdom of heaven where he promises to offer a ceaseless hymn to Christ.

After the brief analysis of the content of the poem we may now compare it to 1.1.36 making the following remarks:

a) Both poems are written in hexameters and are addressed to Christ, 2.1.22 in the form of a petition and 1.1.36 of a hymn.

b) The concept of journey lies behind both poems, but while in 2.1.22 it refers to the journey of the poet's life, in 1.1.36 this refers to a real journey.

c) The Exodus theme serves a completely different purpose in
each poem: while in 1.1.36 it is the means whereby Christ is praised, in 2.1.22 it forms the basis of the poem's imagery and is used in a completely metaphorical way. This shows how skilfully the poet could use the same material in order to produce two poems different in content and style.

From the above observations it becomes, I think, obvious why 2.1.22. 1-12 was excluded from the present research: not only the lack of any praise of Christ (apart from the introductory invocation), but also the metaphorical interpretation of its content dissociates it from the straightforward style of the group of hymns which form the subject of the present research.

Carm.2.1.3

We now turn to *carm.2.1.3* (1020ff.). The text runs as follows:

```
Ἐν σοὶ μὲν ἢρμονεῖς, ὁ θεὸς Λόγε,
μένοντες οἴκου· σοὶ δὲ ἀνάκτοιν σχολὴν.
σή μὲν καθέδρα, σή δὲ ἐγερσις καὶ στάσις,
σή δ' αὖ πορεία, σοῖς δὲ καὶ νῦν νεόμασιν
5 εὐθυκοροθμεῖν. ἄλλα μοι τῶν ἀγγέλων
πέμποις ὀδηγόν, δεξιὸν παραστάτην,
δὲ με στήλω πυρός τε καὶ νέφους ἁγιόν,
τέμνων δὲ πόντον, ἐκθέμισα δ' ἱστάμη λόγῳ,
τρέφων δ' ἀνωθέν καὶ κάτωθεν πλουσίως.
10 σταυρὸς δὲ χειροῖν ἐκτυποῦμενος ὥρασος
ἐχθροῦ κατεύργου· μηδ' ἐν ἡμέρα μέση
καύσων φλέγων με, μηδὲ νυὲ φόβον φέρων.
τὴν δὲ τραχείαν καὶ προσάντης μοι τρόπον
λεύκων τυθείς, εὐπορόν τε σῷ λάτρῃ,
15 ὡς κολλάκως με καὶ τὸ πρὶν χειρὶ σχέπων
γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης ἐξέγοιας κυνόνων,
```
The poem may be divided into three sections:

1) 1-5a: Invocation to the Logos of God whereby the poet expresses that his whole life and events during it are under Christ's supervision, or take place for the sake of His.

2) 5b-22: Prayer to Christ amounting to two main requests: one (5b-9) to send him an angel, and the other (13-14) to make his way easy. The first request may be compared with the third in 1.1. 36. 20b-25 and the second with 2.1.22. 6 and 1.1.36.20a. Between these two requests there are three minor ones (10-12), all used metaphorically and based on events from the Exodus.

As is common in Greek pagan hymns and prayers (see above p.30) the poet goes on to remind Christ of His help in the past and His protection offered many times (πολλάξις:15) in lines 15-17. In particular Christ saved the poet from dangers at sea and on earth, from serious illnesses and from various hardships. The whole section may allude to real events, since it is well known that: 1) in his trip to Athens Gregory nearly underwent a shipwreck, 2) he usually had poor health and 3) he suffered several hardships, for instance the seizure of the fortune of his brother Caesarius (see Gallay, La Vie, passim and De Vita Sua: carm.2.1.11. 368ff. (Jungck p.72; M.37. 1054f.)).
Lines 18-22 contain the reason for the poet's second major request (i.e. that in 13-14) and they may correspond to lines 7-9 which form the reason for the first request (i.e. that in 5b-6).

3) 23-24: In the final section, the content of which is Christ's veneration (σὲ προσκυνοῦμεν), the poet returns to the invocatory style of section 1-5a by introducing it with σὲ. The reason for this veneration is the poet's desire that his last journey (namely his death) be propitious and very easy (cf. 1.1.36. 29).

From the brief analysis of its content 2.1.3 may be described as a prayer, since it is mainly concerned with various requests (5b-22). However, in it one finds a few topoi and other hymn-features: a) anaphora of second person pronouns (1-4), b) the use of purpose clauses (18ff.), c) the feature whereby Logos is reminded of the help He offered to the poet and how He protected His petitioner (15ff.), and d) the topos whereby a hymn or prayer closes with a final praise (23f.).

Another reason for describing 2.1.3 as a prayer rather than as a hymn is its iambic metre which is closer to prose than any other type of metre and consequently more appropriate for prayers (which are to be recited) than for hymns (which are usually sung).

Furthermore, the poet, obeying the law of form, avoids in his iambic poem any epic forms and other stock traditional vocabulary: archaisms, compound epithets and rare expressions which all mark the solemnity of hymns (particularly those in hexameters and elegiacs). On the contrary, the use of common expressions (e.g. of ἀνέργῳ in line 14 instead of ἑυρήκων which is used in 1.1.38.5 and 1.1.34.20) and language close to ordinary speech add to the simplicity of the style of the poem also appropriate to that of prayers.

For all these reasons the poem has been excluded from the scope
of the present research.

To come to the particular occasion which led to the composition of 2.1.3: I take the phrase ὑπὸ ... προσελέβοντος (18f.) to refer to what the poet is going to do at the place which he is about to visit and αὖθις (20) in the same sense as ἐπανέμησεν in 1.1.37.6 (see the note ad loc.), namely to refer to the poet's return to his homeland after fulfilling the purpose of his outward journey.

If my interpretation is correct and if the title of 2.1.3: Ἐνδώσα Κωνσταντινουπόλεως (given by the Maurist editors) has some justification, then it is probable that 2.1.3 was composed before Gregory's departure for Constantinople in A.D.379. The same date is provided by the Maurist editors (see the annotation in M.37.1019-20) and Gallay (La Vie, p.135f.), while Muratori prefers the date when Gregory left the capital to return home (see M.37.1019-20).

Both Gallay and Muratori saw a similarity between 2.1.3 and 1.1.36, which to some extent has been illustrated above in the analysis of 2.1.3. The connection between the two poems may be attested also from the fact that in Cod. Am 1.1.36 (but only lines 1-30) is followed immediately afterwards by 2.1.3 which is entitled ἄλλα (sc. Ἐνδώσα).

From what has been said above I believe with Gallay that both poems were written at the same time and for the same reason: before Gregory left home to become bishop of Constantinople (at the beginning of A.D.379).

To conclude: the comparison of 1.1.36 with all the poems associated with it reveals with what variety Gregory used the imagery of the Exodus theme in poems dealing with an actual journey or life's journey, so that in the end he managed to compose poems which seem to be the same, but are quite different from each other.
III.3. Carmina 2.1.38 and 1.1.31

As has been said above the two hymns (2.1.38 and 1.1.31) are examined together on grounds of their similarity in metre: both are written in elegiac couplets.

In the history of Greek hymnography elegiac hymns or hymnal prayers are very rare. Some of these are found in longer pieces of literature (see Meyer, pp.40-47: 'Gebetsformen in der elegischen Dichtung'), or in the form of votive epigrams. In the category of elegiac hymns and prayers fall: 1) The prooemium of the Theognidea (1-18) which includes two hymns to Apollo (1-4, 5-10), one to Artemis (11-14) and one to the Muses and Graces (15-18). The construction of this prooemium in a hymn-form follows the common tradition of epic prooemia e.g. of Hesiod. Theog. 1-115 or Arat. Phaen. 1-18 (see above p.23 ). 2) Theogn.341-50 and 373-80 (a prayer and a hymn to Zeus respectively), 757-68 (a prayer to Zeus and Apollo), 773-82 (a prayer to Apollo), 1087-90 (a prayer to Dioscuri ) and 1386-89 (a short hymn to Aphrodite). 3) Solon fr. 13 (West) which begins with an invocation to the Muses followed by a request. The whole poem could be a sort of hymn with morality replacing narrative. 4) Ion fr. 1 (PLG ii p.251f. Bergk): an elegy which seems to celebrate Dionysus and ends with a farewell to the god followed by a request (13-16). Callinus's fr. 2 (PLG ii p.5 Bergk) is too short to be of any use for our purpose. 5) Callim. hymn.5 to The Baths of Pallas and epigr.33, 53. 6) Kaibel ep.797 (Apollo and Asclepius) 803 (Artemis), 812, 815, 974 (Hermes) and 831 (Heracles). 7) A hymn to Pan on IG 14.1014. 8) Anacreon 110, 112 (Apollo, Hermes: PLG iii p.284f. Bergk) and 9) Bacchyl. epigr. 1 (= fr.33 ed. Jebb) to Nike.
Before passing on to examine in detail the content of 2.1.38 it will be worthwhile to pause for a moment to consider whether the silence Gregory imposed on himself (see lines 1f. and 31) refers to a particular event of his life or not and, consequently, to determine the possible date of composition of this hymn.

In a number of Gregory's epistles (107-114 and 116-19) there are some passages where he refers to the vow of silence he took. In epist. 119 (Gallay ii p.11; M.37.213Bf.), which is addressed to Palladius, Gregory gives the precise period during which his vow lasted, namely the period of Lent. The actual text reads:

Χρυστῷ συνενέχρωσα τὴν γλῶσσαν ἰνύκα ἐνύστευν καὶ ἀναστάντω συνήγεωρα. Τούτῳ μοι τῆς σωφτῆς ἓο μυστήρων, ζυ' ὠπείρ δέωσα νοῦν ἀνεκλάλητον, οὗτος ὡς καὶ λόγον κεκαθαρμένον.

The date given to the above epistles by their editor, following H. Lietzmann (see H. Lietzmann, Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule, TU 1 (Tübingen, 1904), p.72f.), is A.D. 382 (see Gallay Lettres, vol.ii, p.5 n.1). However, Gallay in his earlier work on Gregory's life suggested a year between A.D. 384-90 (see Gallay, La Vie, p.233 n.2). The date provided by Lietzmann is accepted also by Marie Madeleine Hauser-Meury in her Prosopographie zu den Schriften Gregors von Nazianz, Theophaneia 13 (Bonn: P.Hanstein, 1960), e.g. p.52 n.71. Cf. Pellegrino p.28, Egan p.60 and Plagnieux p.329 n.184.

Gallay (in his La Vie, p.234 n.4) and the Maurist annotator (see the Argumentum on 2.1.34 in M.37.1307) have noted that the four poems which precede 2.1.38 in the Migne edition, namely 2.1.34-37 (1307-25), refer to the same vow of silence. See particularly 2.1.34. 1-5, 11 (1307, 1308).

In both the epistles and poems (mentioned above) Gregory gives
the two main reasons which led him to take his vow. The first reason (to help himself talk sparingly by keeping complete silence) may be seen in 2.1.34. 11f. (1308): τὸ δ' αὐτοῦ, ὡς κε μυθουμι/ μυθων μέτρα φέρειν παντος ἐκληρατέων and epist. 107 (Gallay ii p. 5; M.37.208A); Ἑρωτᾶς τῷ βουλεταί ἡμῶν ἡ συγῆ; Βουλεταί λόγου μέτρα καὶ σωφής. The second reason may be inferred from 2.1.34. 177f. (1320): γλώσσαν ἔχων ἀδάμαστον, ἐμφαλον, ἡ με τόσον/ πήματι τοῦ φθονεροῦ ὑπεκεν δὲ παλάμας/, 187-89 (1320): λόγος ... πάσιν μ' ἐ- θηκε φθονον ἐκφθονον and 201f. (1321): μύθω γὰρ ἐμφ θόνως ἁγρι- ον δὲ/ ὁμοια φέρειν συγῆς βένθος ἐπεσπασάμην/: Gregory became the target of envy on account of his ἀδάμαστος and ἐμφαλον γλώσσα ('inflexible' and 'sweet-speaking tongue'); and, consequently, his decision to keep silence may have been taken in order to avoid inflaming the envy against himself. This may be attested also from epist. 110 (Gallay ii p. 6; M.37.208B): ἐπελθῇ γὰρ λαλών οὐκ ἐπεξειχον τὰς γλώσσας (i.e. of Gregory's fellow Christians), τῇ σωφῇ τὸ σωφαν ἐδὸδα, τῇ ὁμοιῳ τὸ δυνον ἐκπαιδεύων.

Besides, Gregory's silence was much criticized, as one may see from epist. 113 (Gallay ii p. 7; M.37. 209B): Μὴ κρύνε με συγώντα and 114.1 (p. 8; 209B): Ἐπελθῇ μοι τὴν σωφὴν ἐγκαλεῖς ... and ib. 6 (p. 9; 212B): πάντων καταφλυαρῶν ἡμῶν τῆς σωφῆς. See also the Argumentum on 2.1.34. in M.37.1307)

In conclusion, the evidence from both the epistles and poems 2.1.34-37 indicates as a probable time for the composition of 2.1.38 the Easter Day of A.D. 382 (which the Maurist annotator dates on the seventeenth of April: see M.37. 1307 and 207f.).

Turning now from the date of composition to the content and structure of the hymn we are faced with the problem whether the hymn in its present form consists of two distinct hymns (1-38 and 39-52);
or whether the second section itself forms a hymn within a hymn.

Of the oldest three MSS (Codd C, L, Am) Codd C and Am do not cite the two sections as different hymns, but Cod L seems to do (see the description of these MSS above p.69ff.). According to the Maurist annotator the two sections appear as separate poems also in a Cod. Coislin. (56 ?)(see M.37.1328). Finally, the copy of Cod. Paris. Coislin. 56, namely Paris. Suppl. gr. 1090, cites the two parts as distinct poems (see above p.72). However, on account of there being no evidence available to us from the rest of the MSS, it seems at present impossible to draw any definite conclusion from the external evidence on this matter. I shall therefore rely only on the internal.

A brief analysis of the content of the hymn will help us to illustrate the possible relationship between the two sections.

In the introductory four lines the poet informs Christ of his decision to praise him after breaking his vow of silence. Expressions in this section carrying particular weight with regard to the unity of the hymn are: κράτος (1), φθέγγωμ’ (2), εἰ θέμας εὕρεται (3) and τὸνδε λόγον (4). As will be seen below, the poet appears later in the hymn to make cross-references to them.

The section which follows (5-12a) is formed of a stream of epithets and other appellations which are addressed to Christ and describe His nature and characteristics, mostly in relation to the other two persons of the Trinity. This part is very similar in structure to the Orphic hymns (see above p.19 ) and those of Synesius.

The last appellation of Christ in the section, namely that He is the Creator of all that exists and that will come, leads over to the content of lines 12b-14: the creation (ἀπαντα:12) exists for Christ who, after laying the foundations of the world and creating
all that exists by His will, encompasses all with His unerring commands. This section is introduced by γύρο to show the connection with δὴμυστρίζ (11). Important from the stylistic and structural point of view is the use of the second person pronoun which opens the section and is repeated to introduce nearly every couplet of the following section (15-25).

In the new section the poet presents the representative parts of creation: sun, moon, fixed stars and planets, 'heavenly minds' (νόες οὐρανώνες) and man taking part in the praise of Christ. Therefore, the main idea of section 12b-15, found in σοὶ ἡμῖν αὐτῷ λευ, is illustrated by the following one (15-26). In praising Christ by reference to the various parts of creation, Gregory follows a practice common in Biblical Psalms and prayers.

The last to appear in the list of created beings and things is man who reminds the poet of Christ's incarnation, since this took place for the sake of mankind. Hence, in the following couplet (27-28) the poet praises Christ with reference to His incarnation to which he adds in the succeeding two couplets (29-32) his personal devotion with expressions recalling 1.1.36.31. Both couplets too are introduced with a second person pronoun and thus follow the style of section 15-26. However, one may discern a slight difference in the use of such pronouns in sections 15-26 and 29-32. While these pronouns simply emphasize the general invocatory style in the former section, in the latter the confessional (or even devotional) character of 'du-Stil' is obvious.

Line 31 refers to the poet's vow of silence and recalls line 1f.; and the request in the next line (32) to his desire to speak or keep silence only when it is appropriate to do so. This request in turn leads over to lines 33-36: the poet's determination to speak only what is lawful. Thus, corresponding expressions are: εὐαγγέλιον
and even θέμις (sc. εἶναι) in 33. The idea that the poet will speak only what is appropriate and permitted is illustrated with four metaphors: of the pearl, gold, rose and wheat. Besides, ἡθέγησον and θέμις (sc. εἶναι) recall similar expressions in lines 2 and 3.

The following couplet (37-38) appears to join the preceding part of the hymn (1-36) with that which follows it (39-52) and, together with lines 33-36, may form a new introduction which corresponds in content to the first one (1-4). Apart from what has been said above for line 33, θαλάσσα and πρῶτον ἔσος in lines 37-38 recall also phrases from the introduction: ἀγνὸν θύσις and τόνος λόγον respectively.

The Easter section (39-46) opens with σήμερον and is expressed in a narrative style. In it the poet relates Christ's resurrection and the events connected with it: the victory over death and the releasing of the souls of the dead. All these themes are used for Christ's praise also in 1.1.33.8b-12 and 1.1.35.8f.

Lines 47-48 refer to the victorious angelic hymn, while 49-50 to the poet's present hymn, bringing back again the theme of his vow of silence, and to his request to Christ to let him be His hymn-singing lyre. It is worthy to note that σήμερον introduces symmetrically on the one hand the two four-line parts of the Easter narrative and on the other the two couplets: one with the angelic and the other with the poet's hymn.

Finally, lines 51-52 serve to close the hymn bringing back the first subject of Praise: the relationship of Mind and Logos (5), and expressing the poet's wish to praise the Spirit in another hymn if the latter so wishes.

From this analysis it appears clearly that every particular section of the hymn follows logically and naturally the preceding
one so that the hymn cannot but form a unity which is further supported by the various cross-references within the poem.

The apparent lack of unity in the hymn is due, I think, to the fact that the hymn consists of two sets, each including a three-fold hymn-division, so that Introduction A (1-4), Praise A (5-31) and Prayer A (32) is followed by Introduction B (33-38) - which may be better called a 'link passage' - Praise B (39-50a) and Prayer B (50b). The hymn closes with a couplet (51-52) which somehow serves to join the two sets together. It appears therefore that Gregory's rhetorical training helps him to break schemata (i.e. the traditional three-fold division) and handle his hymns with freedom.

This poem may be characterized as a hymn of praise, since Prayer A and B are restricted only to one line, or less, each (32, 50b) and contain only one request each. These requests derive naturally from the content of Praise A and B respectively and are thus subordinate to them. Besides, the closing lines (51-52) may be taken as an indirect promise of the poet to praise the Spirit in a future hymn. Having these two features, the poem resembles in structure the Homeric hymns which, after the usually extended Praise close with a farewell expression, a request and a promise for another hymn.

A paraphrase of this hymn appears in Codd Ma, D and Vb (see above p.72f.). Of these that of Cod Vb is available to us and has been used occasionally in the commentary to illustrate, or support, the interpretation of various difficult points. The paraphrase omits a number of lines (41-46), possibly because of the scribe's carelessness, or because there was insufficient space left for this purpose in the MS; yet it treats the poem as a single unit.
I. Introduction A (1-4)

1. Χρυστὲ ἀναξ: The same invocation introduces 1.1.36. See the note ad loc.

1. σὲ πρῶτον (φησιγμοῦ): πρῶτον may refer to Gregory's breaking of silence, or, in a way, correspond to αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα / (ῥέξω) in line 51f., although the latter expression may also refer to the previous ἔρεξα (51). In the latter case πρῶτον is used following the custom of Greek hymnographers usually to accompany the name of the addressee by a πρῶτος-expression when more than one deity is invoked: Hom. hymn. Apoll.158f.: αὔτε τ' ἐπεί ἄρ πρῶτον μὲν 'Απόλλων ὡμνήσωσιν, αὐτοὶ δ' αὖ Λητώ τε καὶ Ἀρτέμιν ζοχέαραν. Such, or a similar, expression is used also when the poet plans to proceed from the hymn of a particular deity to another one: Hom. hymn.9.8f. On these and other types of expressions with πρῶτος see Keyssner p.11f., 15, 17f. and 19.

1. λόγον ἡρώ δῶκα: Cf. carm.2.1.43.1 (1346):/ ποὺ δὲ λόγου περιμένετε; ἐς ἡρώ, Eur. Suppl.1154f.: λόγων δὲ παρακλείεισσα σῶν/ ἄ- ἐρω φερόμενον οὐχεταὶ and Procl. hymn.7.6:/ μηδ' αὐτῶς ἀνέμοιησιν ἐμὸν ποτὲ μύθον ἔσοψ, which are, however, only pure verbal parallel expressions. The rendering of ἐπεὶ λόγων ἡρώ δῶκα/ δηναιοῦν κατέχων in the paraphrase of Cod. Vb is: ἐπεὶ τὸν λόγον ἐς μακρὸν κατασχών ἐ- λυσα νῦν καὶ ἄνετον εἰς ἄερα διαφῆκα φέρεσαί.

2. (σέ) ... / φησίγμον' ἀπὸ στομάτων: Cf. (σέ) ... / μέλψομ' ἀ- πὸ στομάτων in carm.2.1.34.208 (1322). The syntax of φησίγμασθαι with an acc. of a person and ἀπὸ with gen. seems to combine those found in Pind. Olymp.1.36 (ed. Snell-Maehler, 1971): ύες Ταυτάλου, σέ ... φῆ- σιμα ουν and 6.12ff.: αἴνον ... ὠν ἐνόπλικα/ ἀπὸ γλώσσας "Ἀδραστος ... ἐς 'Αμφιλήρῃο/ φησίγκατ'. Both Pindaric passages and that of Gregory, mentioned above, show that the verb is used in the sense of 'celebrating'. The same verb is repeated in line 33 but in its more common sense: 'to speak'.
3. ἀγνωστότω λερήθος ἁγνὸν θύσις: According to the rendering of the paraphrase in Cod. Vb, ἀγνωστότω λερήθος refers to Gregory himself, while ἁγνὸν θύσις (in apposition to τὸν θεὸν λόγον) refers to the present hymn. The actual text runs: σῇ πρῶτον ἀπὸ στόματος φθέγξομαι καθαροῦ λευθέρου καθαράν θυσίαν εἰ θέμως τούτῳ εἴπετε τὸν θεόν προβαλλόμενος ὧν μοι νοῦς ἐγεννήσατο. This is also Pellegrino's view when he says (p.29f.): 'dove la sua poesia diviene veramente, com' egli vuole, "di santissimo sacerdote santo sacrificio" (2.1.38. v.3)'. In this way ἁγνὸν θύσις corresponds to θεμώς (37). As Gregory's present hymn is ἁγνὸν θύσις so are his νοήματα (i.e. 'thoughts') during the same, or another, vow of silence related in carm.2.1.83. 1-4(1428):

... γλῶσσαν ἑοσα λάλου καὶ χειλεά στηῆ
τοῦ νοου ἀποτείχων εἰς θεοῦ κοινωνίαν,
διάρα κεν ἀγνωστότου νοήμασιν ἁγνὸν ἰἈνακτά
tόσω (καλὸν γὰρ τὸ φρενὸς μόνης θύσις).

3. θέμως (sc. εἴναι): Cf. line 33. The phrase, very common in Greek literature (see LSJ s.v.), is used by Gregory, especially any time he discusses dogmatic subjects concerning God's nature and attributes. See for instance carm.1.1.2.13 (402), 2.2.7.51 (1555), 2.2.3.83 (1486), and 1.2.1.673 (573),1.2.2.449 (613), 2.2.1.355 (1476) where he uses the phrase οὐ θέμως, οὔτ' ἐπέκειν (cf. line 33). To these one may add Synes. hymn.1.223,225: οὐ θέμως εἴπεταν, (cf. Terzaghi's note ad loc.) and Clem. Alex. Strom.iii.2 10.1 (CGS 2 p.200.14).

3f. εἰ θέμως εἴπεταν, τὸν θεὸν λόγον: The same phrase, but forming a syntactical unity, is used parenthetically and in the same sedes in carm.1.2.1.674f. (573).

4. ἡμετέρου νόσου: The choice of νοῦς (referring to the human mind), together with that of the preceding λόγος, seems to have been deliberate in order to pave the way to the content of Praise and, above all, to be contrasted to μεγάλου Νόου Λόγε (5). On ἡμετέρος see above the note on 1.1.34.15.

II. Praise A (5-31)

a) Invocation I (5-12a): Christ's attributes and nature, mainly in relation to the other two persons of the Trinity

Lines 5-7: Christ's relation to the Father

5. πατροφάες: 'you derive your light from the Father'. The paraphrase in Cod. Vb has: ὦ ... πατροφές ἐκλάμψας. The present hymn is the only citation of the epithet in Lexica. Gregory is fond of using epithets in -φας: πλησιφάς in line 18 and carm.1.1.4.80 (422), πατροφάς in 2.1.45.290 (1374), ἀρτυφάς in 1.1.5.61 (429), λυσφάς in 2.1.87.16 (1434), τρυσσοφάς in 1.1.4.65 (421) and 2.1.99.2 (1452), ὠξυφας in 1.2.9.50 (671) and συμφας in line 8. See also Pellegrino p.87 on Gregory's coinages in -φας and above p.40f.

The idea of the epithet may lie also behind Clem. Alex. Strom.vii. 2. 5.6 (GCS 3 p.6.1f.): ὄλος (sc. Christ) νοος, ὄλος φως πατροφον.

5. μεγάλου Νόου Λόγε: On the relationship between the Father and Son as Νοος and Λόγος respectively see above the note on 1.1.33.3.

The Godhead is called νοος μέγας (great intellect) in carm.1.1.5.2 (424), whereas in 1.1.1.29 (400), De Virtute: 1.2.10.90 (687), 2.2.1.68 (1456) God is simply called νοος. However, in the Arcana poems and in the same sedes as μεγάλου νόσου one finds μεγάλου θεοῦ instead: 1.1.4.1 (415), 1.1.7.57 (443), 1.1.8.4,126 (447,456), 1.1.9.25 (458); while in 1.1.2.7 (400), 2.1.1.100 (977) and 2.2.7.47,75,303 (1554, 1556, 1574): μεγάλου θεοῦ Λόγος (or -ψ). See also Orac.Sibyl. 1.53,324 and 8.284, and Synes. hymn. 1.177ff.

5. φέρτερε μύσοι: Cf. carm.2.2.5.265f. (1540): / Χριστοῦ ἐχοὺς
These two passages, also connected with 1.1.29.2,4, help us to understand that by φέρτερε μύθου in the present hymn the poet wants to show that Christ is beyond any expression made with human words. See also the metaphor in carm.2.2.7.47-9 (1554) cited below p.222 and the rendering in the paraphrase of Cod. Β: λόγου παντὸς ὑπέρτερε. Behind the close position of Λόγε and μύθου one may discern a word play: Christ the Word cannot be expressed in human words.

6. φωτὸς τ' ἀκροτάτου φῶς ἄχρον: God is called ἀκροτάτος φῶς in carm.1.1.7.6f.,50 (439,442), 1.1.4.25 (417), or.40.5 (M.36.364B) and or.32.15 (189D); and η ἀκροτάτη οὐρανίων φαέων in 2.2.1.186 (1465). See also 1.1.32.3 and the note ad loc. The metaphor φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, used to describe the relationship between the Father and the Son, was established in the theological terminology having been introduced in the Creed (see Sympol.Nic. (325)p.44.13; M.20.1540B and A. Hahn, Sympo-, p.132, 135, 136, 138, 147 stc.), and has been widely used ever since in the patristic literature (see Lampé s.v. and Theodorou p.261 n.201). The relationship of all the three persons of the Trinity expressed in terms of light is discussed in Gregory's or.31.3 (Gallay p.280; M.36.136C): κηρύσσομεν, ἐκ φωτὸς τοῦ Πατρὸς φῶς καταλαμβάνοντες τὸν ὙΔων ἐν φωτὶ τῷ Πνεύματι, σύντομοι καὶ ἀκροτίττοι τῆς Τριάδος Θεολογιῶν.

When Gregory calls Christ ἄχρον φῶς and the Father ἀκροτάτος φῶς he does not suggest any qualitative or quantitative difference between the two persons of the Trinity, because both expressions are superlatives in sense, if not grammatically. The choice of ἄχρος and ἀκροτάτος may have been made only for reasons of variation and metri gratia.

On the light images used by Gregory to define the nature of God and the relationship between the persons of the Trinity see above p.47.
6. οὐδόγονε: 'only-begotten'. It is Gregory's own coinage invented possibly to replace the more common μονογενής which is used in carm.1.1.1.24 (400) after Ev.Jo.1.18, 3.16, 18 etc. In or.30.20 (Gallay p.266; M.36. 128D-129A) Gregory explains why Christ is called μονογενής as follows: "Μονογενής" δέ, οὐχ διὶ μόνος ἐκ μόνου καὶ μόνον, ἀλλ' διὶ καὶ μονοτράπως, οὐχ ὡς τὰ σώματα. Besides, οἶος instead of μόνος is preferred for the construction also of οἰκχώτων in carm. 2.2.5.147 (1532) and οἴδεως in 1.2.1.46 (525) and 1.2.5.11 (643).

7. εἰκὼν ἀθανάτου Πατρός: Christ is the image of the Father according to Ep.2Cor.4.4 and Col.1.15 (see Deichgräber p.182). The same idea may be found in 2.1.45.32 (1356), 1.1.2.8 (402) = 2.1.1.628 (1016) = 2.1.2.3 (1017) and 1.2.1.145f. (533).

Ἀθανάτος is a universal epithet of Greek gods e.g. of Aphrodite in Sappho fr. 1.1 (Page, S&A) and may be found in carm.1.2.15.2 (766), 2.1.1.132 (980) and Synes. hymn.2.114 : / πατρὸς ἀθανάτου. See also above p. 26.

7. σφραγις ἀνάρχου: Cf. carm.1.1.1.31 (400) : (Christ is) σφραγις κυσμουμένη πατρώς καὶ 2.1.14.41 (1248) : / σφράγισμ' ἀνάρχου.

Both ideas of line 7, namely that Christ is the image and seed of the Father appear together in or.29.17 (Gallay p.212; M.36.96C), where Ev.Jo.6.27 is quoted as warrant for the σφραγις-appellation, in or.38.13 (325B) = or.45.9 (633C) and or.30.20 (Gallay p.268; M.36.129B), where the appellation εἰκών is explained as follows: "Εἰκὼν" δέ, ὡς ὀμολογοῦν, καὶ διὶ τοῦτο ἐκεῖθεν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκ τοῦτο Πατήρ. Ἀὕτη γὰρ εἰκόνος φύσις, μυθισμα εἰναὶ τοῦ ἀρχετύπου.... The same theme appears in the anaphora of Liturg.Bas. (Brightman p.322. 28-30): ὁς (sc. Christ) ἐστὶν εἰκών τῆς σῆς ἀγαθότητος, σφραγὶς εὐστυμος ἐν ἐαυτῷ δεικνυός σὲ τὸν Πατέρα which seems to have been influenced by Athanasius hom.5 in Mt. 11:27 (M.25.217B). See also Synes. hymn.3.61 : ὁ πατρὸς σφραγὸς σφραγίσ/. ἀνάρχος is found also in 1.1.30.27 and 1.1.32.3, and is commonly
used of God, especially in the Arcana poems: 1.1.1.25, 31 (400), 1.1.2.19 (403), 1.1.3.76 (414), 1.1.4.55 (420). See also 1.2.1.20 (523).

In the passages cited on 1.1.35.4: αὐτογένεθελον, the epithet is used of the Father in the sense that He is not generated as is the Son who is thus called ἄρχη. As a negative epithet ἄνωρχος originated in Greek Philosophy before it became a common characteristic of God. (See Gottwald p.19, and above p.48).

Line 8a: Christ's relation to the Holy Spirit

8. Πνεύματι τῷ Μεγάλῳ: Cf. carm.1.2.1.28 (524): Πνεύματι σὺν μεγάλῳ (same sedes). μέγας is a universal divine epithet (see above p.26 ) used in the present hymns also in lines 5, 39, 52 of this hymn and in 1.1.31.10.

8. συμφωνεῖς: This is the only citation of the epithet in Lexica and is formed to show that Christ and the Holy Spirit have the same light, or that Christ is συνεκλάμπων τῷ μεγάλῳ Πνεύματι according to the paraphrase of Cod. Vb.

Epithets in συν- to refer to common characteristics, or activities of two deities were used occasionally in Greek pagan hymns: see Orph. hymn.11.9 and Keyssner p.129f.

Lines 8b-12a: Christ's relation to the Creation

8. εὐρωμέσων: The epithet is used of Poseidon in Pind. Olymp. 8.31 (ed. Snell-Maehler, 1971), Oppian. Ἁλ.1.74, 2.35 and Orph. hymn. 17 (2).6 (= Cod. Thyrr. ed. Abel p.68); of Chiron in Pind. Πυθ.3.4; and of αὐθήριον in Empedocles 135.1 (ed. H. Diels, PPF p.161). Gregory uses also the more common ψυσμέσων e.g. in carm.1.2.1.6, 176, 367, 653 (522,536,550,572) and 2.1.34.77 (1313).

Divine epithets in -μέσων are used in Greek pagan hymns, mainly to describe the region of power or action of various Greek gods (see Keyssner p.76).

9. αἰώνος πεύρημα: πεύρημα is a new coinage used instead of
the Attic πέρας or the epic πετροφ. I think that αἰών refers to the world (cf. Ev.Jo.9.32 and Bauer s.v. la) as the Biblical: ὁ αἰών οἰκ-
toς or ὁ νῦν αἰὼν refers to the present world or age (cf. Ep.1Cor. 2.6, 1Tim.6.17). If this is the case, then the present passage may be compared with or.30.15 (Gallay p.258; M.36.124A) where Christ is called: τὸ πέρας τῶν γενομένων; or even with the Biblical expression συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος (e.g. Ev.Mt.24.3, 28.20) since Christ's second coming will mark the end of the world.

Besides, in carm.2.1.45.31 (1355) Christ is αἰώνος ὑπερέχει:, while in 1.1.1.27 (400) the Father appears αἰὼν' ἀμφὶ ἔχειν. A possible Biblical source for the present idea, namely that Christ is the end of the world, seems to be Apoc.21.6: ἐγὼ τὸ Ἀλφα καὶ τὸ θεό, Ἡ ἀρχή καὶ τὸ τέλος (cf. ib.22.13, 1.8). The paraphrase of Cod. Vb runs: ὁ τῶν αἰῶνα περεύχων (cf. 1.1.30.22 and the note ad loc.).

9. μεγαλείες: This is another epithet used very frequently of Christ: see carm.1.2.17.31 (784), 2.1.17.17 (1263) and 2.1.34.109 (1315), in the same sedes in all instances. In Greek literature the epithet seems to have been used only in Oppian. Cyneget.2.4, but not as a divine one. In his epitaphs Gregory uses the same epithet with men: carm.2(epit.).2.85.1 (M.38.54) = AP 8.43.3 and 2(epit.).2.52.1 (36) = ib.116.1

9. ὡβιόδωρε: Cf. carm.1.1.4.82 (422): φῶς ὡβιόδωρον/ which refers to the Word of God and ib.83: ὡβιον ὡπάξειν said also of Logos. As Sykes informs us, the epithet is also the reading of Cod. Vaticanus Graecus 482 instead of αὐλολόθρων of carm.1.1.3.5 (408) and is found in L (Vari p.769) (see Sykes p.211). Finally, cf. AP 1.22. 3: ὡπάξε (sc. Christ) ... ὡβιόδωρον ἄρωγήν /.

In Greek pagan hymns and prayers one finds the similar divine epithets: ὡβιόδωτης (ἡ -δω-
tος), ὡβιοδότης (ἡ -δοτος) and the feminine ὡβιοδότειρα. See e.g. hymn. Jov.6 ap. Pap.Cicag. (Coll. Alex. p.84), Carmina Popularia ap. Stob.
Ecl. Phys. i.2.31 (PLG iii p.681 Bergh) and the examples cited in Keyssner p.125 and 141. See above p. 26.

10. θεότης : Cf. carm.2.1.1.200 (985): (Τριάδος) ... / ψυχι- 
θράμβου and 2.1.45.288 (1373). However, in 1.2.2.452 (614), 2.1.68.59 
(1413) and ep.154 (Gallay ii p.45; M.37.260C) the epithet applies to 
human beings (see Gallay, Langue et Style, p.76), whereas in 2.1.32. 
34 (1303) to δόξην. See also Nonn. par. Jo.12:26 (M.43.853C) where it 
is used of the Father. The same epithet is used of Κλωθώ in Pind. 
Isth.6.16 (ed. Snell-Maehler, 1971) and of the Nereids in Idem Nem. 
4.65.

Gregory's coinage ψυχιθράμβος, in the same sense as the present 
epithet, is used in 1.1.3.6 (408) of the Holy Spirit.

10. θύματος : Cf. carm.2.1.1.129, 175 (979, 983) where the 
epithet is used of God. The same epithet is addressed to Zeus e.g. 
in Callim. hymn.Jov.55 (see McLennan's note ad loc.), Idem epigr.52.3 
(= AP 12.230), AP 293.3 and Nonn. Dion.24.279; while in Pap.Mag.Gr. 
passim it describes δαίμον, βασιλευς or Θεός.

10. ταυτοτικός : Cf. carm.1.1.3.5 (408) where it describes the 
Holy Spirit and AP 1.101.4 and 27.1 where in both cases it is addressed 
to Christ. On epithets in παν- or παντο- used to describe what Greek 
gods possess or do in a great degree see above p. 26. Such epithets 
are commonly used to describe various characteristics of God also 
(see the note on 1.1.35.1 : πανεπίστολος).

Greek gods are nowhere described with παντοτεις - an epithet of 
the Christian era - but only with μεγαλοσθενής or πολυσθενής: Pind. 
Olymp.1.25 (ed. Snell-Maehler, 1971) (Poseidon), Procl. hymn.6.2 
(Hecate) and Aesch. Eum.61 (Apollo). See also Keyssner p.52f.

10. ἄγμα μέτο : Although ἄγμα is used a few times in Gregory's 
poetry : carm.2.1.17. 62 (1266), 2.1.27.6 (1286), 2.2.6.27 (1544), it 
ever applies to Christ as does in the present hymn; and therefore,
the difficulty in understanding what Gregory means by calling Christ the 'breath of mind' remains. Neither does the paraphrase of Cod. Vb, πνεύμα νοου help us at all in interpreting the passage. However, compared with Act. 17.25: αὐτός (sc. God) δύος πᾶσι ζωήν καὶ πνεύμα καὶ τὰ πάντα, and LXX Gen. 2.7: καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνεύμα ζωῆς the phrase may mean that Christ gives life to the human mind.

11. νομητὰ κόσμου: νομητῆς, as well as νομεύς - used of Christ in carm. 1.1.1.34 (401) and 2.2.3.4 (1480) are both coinages of Gregory's. The classical νομητωρ is used twice in Nonn. Dion. 12. 20 and 9.1 for Helius and Dionysus respectively. The same idea, namely that Christ directs or governs the world, may be found in carm. 1.1.5. 34ff. (426): θεὸς τόδε πάντα κυβερνᾷ, νομιμὸς ενθα καὶ ενθα θεοῦ λόγος δοξα θεῷ ὑπέρθεν, δοξα τ' ἐνερθεν εὐθυκε νομίμως, 1.2.25. 535ff. (850) and 2.1.1.573 (1013). Cf. also trag. anon. fr. 472 (TGF, Nauck) and Cleanth. hymn. 2.35.

11. φερέσατο: 'ζωοπόρος' in the paraphrase of Cod. Vb. Cf. carm. 2.1.93.7 (1448) and 1.1.3.6 (408) where the epithet is used of God and Holy Spirit respectively. It is found also in ο. 4.115 (Bernardi p. 274f.; M. 35.653B): 'Ορφεὺς παρότω ... ὡ ... δείχθη τῷ ζωογόνῳ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ φερέσατον (cf. Orph. fr. 289 ed. Abel). As a universal epithet it was used first for the life-giving powers of earth (cf. Hesiod. Theog. 693, Hom. hymn. Cer. 450, hymn. Apoll. 341) and then applied to various deities: Παῦλο in Kaibel ep. 1026.1, Eros in Nonn. Dion. 41.130, Helius in Orph. hymn. 8.12 and Physis in ib. 10.12. See also Keyssner p. 136f.

The Christian equivalent seems to be ζωοκοῦντος which is used twice in Const. Apost. 7.34.8, 8.12.33 of God and Christ respectively and was established as an attribute of the Holy Spirit in the various Creeds (see the note on 1.1.33.4 above p. 113).
11f. ὁμοοργή / ὄντων, ἔσσομένων: Cf. AP 1.24 :/ Σύνθερον
(sc. Christ) ... / ὀιχομένων ὄντων τε καὶ ἔσσομένων βασιλεύων/. On the
enjambement at line 11 see above p. 45f.

ὁμοοργή is used of Logos in or. 45.7 (M. 36.632A) = or. 38.11(321C)
and or. 34.8 (249A). The Platonic ὁμοοργός (e.g. Tim. 28a, 29a and
Rep. 530a), which is used in the present passage instead of the common
Biblical κτέσις, is found once in NT (Ep. Heb. 11.10) and once in LXX
(2Macc. 4.1), but is not used of the Creator. It was applied to God
the Creator first in Clem. Rom. 1Cor. 20.11 (Lightfoot p. 74): ὁ μέγας ὁμο-
μοοργός καὶ δεσπότης τῶν ἄκαντων (see Lightfoot's note ad loc.) and
then in various prayers in Const. Apost. 7.27.2, 8.21.3, in Serap. Euch.
1.1, 9.1 and Liturg. Jac. (Brightman p. 32.16, 50.15). Apart from the
Platonic ὁμοοργός, the epithet applies to Physis in Kaibel ep. 1002.
5 and is connected with Zeus in Orph. fr. 121.122 and 130 ap. Procl. in.
Tim. ii. 95E and 137B respectively (ed. Abel).

The section we have just discussed (5-12a) recalls, as has been
noted in the introductory analysis of the hymn (above p. 205), the
style of the majority of Orphic hymns. Such a style is exemplified
also in the hymns of Synesius and that of Clement of Alexandria (see
above p. 32f. and p. 32 respectively). Furthermore, it may be compared
both in content and style with the Praise part of the hymnodic epilogue
in carm. 2.1.1.623-34 (1016f.). See also above the note on 1.1.36.19

b) Lines 12b-26: All the Creation taking part in the praise of
of Christ

12b-14: All exists for Christ

12. σοὶ γὰρ ἄκαντα πέλευ: Cf. Pap. Mag. Gr. xii 250 (Preis.): σῇ
δυνάμει στοιχεῖα πέλευ καὶ φύσται κάντα καὶ Orph. hymn. 37.6 (Titan)/
ἐξ ὑμέων γὰρ πάσα πέλευ γενεὰ κατὰ κόσμον.

13f. ὃς κόσμῳ θέμεθα ... / ὁς ἄναπτόμενοι / ὃς πάντα φέρεις ἀναπτόμενον τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνά-
The metaphor whereby Christ appears to have laid the foundations of the world reminds us of the Biblical one where God is said to στήσας τήν γῆν: LXX Ps. 101.26 (cf. Ep. Heb. 1.10), Is. 51.13, 48.13, Job 38.4 etc. Gregory uses the middle form δησμεύειν as happens in Homer (see Cunliffe s.v.), although he makes use of the active δεῖν (or ἐνέδειξεν with τιμήσει) in carm.1.2.1.73f. (527): ἐν δε άθλασαν/ γαύσας ἀγκαλύδεσσαν ἔδησας. Cf. also carm.1.2.34.2 (946). On the other hand, κόσμον θέμεθα is used in the same sedes in 2.1.13.5 (1228), but refers to bishops.

13. ὅπωσ' ἐστὶ θελοντος: 'everything that exists (sc. in the world) by your will', or in the paraphrase of Cod. Ἡβ: δοσά ἐστι βουλομένου σου. Behind θελοντος one may discern the patristic teaching on creation as the result of God's free will (see Basil. hex.1.7 in Giet, SC, p.114f.; M.29.17C) in opposition to the Platonic view that Cosmos comes into existence through necessity in the will of God (see Plat. Tim. 47e-48a and Plot. Enn.iii 2.2. 34-36, and Theodorou p.250f. ). This idea may be attested also in Gregory's carm.1.1.4. 77 (422): / ἡθέλε (sc. God) μὲν νοερὰν στήναι φύσιν and or.38.9 (M.36. 320C) = or.45.5 (629A), and seems to have been based on LXX Ps.134.6: / πάντα δοσά θέλησεν ἐποίησεν ὁ Κύριος ἐν τῇ ούρανῷ καὶ ἐν τῇ γῆ (cf. also 113.11).

14. φορέειν νεόμασιν ἀπλανέως: The phrase is reminiscent of the Biblical metaphor whereby God appears to hold the world in His hand: LXX Ps.94.4: ἐν τῇ χερεί αὐτοῦ τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς. Gregory uses the frequentative φορέειν instead of φέρειν in order to underline the continuation of Christ's action.

14. νεόμασιν: Cf. 2.1.3.4f. cited above p.198 and 2.1.43.26 (1348).

14. ἀπλανέως: The adverb, in the place of its cognitive adjectival (cf. Smyth 1097), is used to describe νεόμασιν. By it the poet
seems to emphasize the infallibility of Christ's commands.

Lines 15-26: The celestial bodies, 'heavenly minds' and man, following the purpose for which they were created, participate in Christ's praise

The praise of God by reference to various parts of creation, particularly to the celestial bodies, is a common feature of Biblical Psalms and prayers. See e.g. LXX Ps. 135: 5-9, 148. 2-4,7-12, the hymn of the Three Holy Children (LXX Dan.3. 52-88).

The feature appears also in 1.1.30. 5-12 (see below).

Lines 15-16: The sun surpasses the stars in brightness as Christ the minds

The paraphrase in Cod. Vb runs: διὰ σοῦ καὶ ἡλιοφώς ἐλπισιν καὶ ὕψόδρομος ἀστέρας ἀποκρύπτει τῷ κύκλῳ τῷ ὑπερλάμποντι δυ τρόπον καὶ σὺ τῶν νόσω ὑπεραστάτες τῷ ἀκροσύτῳ τῆς θεότητος φωτί.

15. σοῦ: The pronoun is used in anaphora in lines 15, 17, 19, 23 and 25 as happens with σήμερον in 2.1.38.39,43,47,49. On the use of anaphora in the present hymns see the note on 1.1.33.8.

15. Ἀναξ: On this divine epithet see the note on 1.1.36.1.

15. Φανοῦν ὕψόδρομος: The epithet ὕψόδρομος, also used in carm. 2.2.7.49 (1554), is absent from Lampe's Lexicon and is mentioned only in the Supplement to LSJ where it appears in Orph. hymn.19.1 and in three passages from Nonnus's Dionysiaca, although Peek, Lexicon zu den Dionysiaka der Nonnos s.v. cites four instances with this epithet. Of these cases only Nonn. Dion.38.310 has ὕψόδρομος referring to Phaetho as happens in the present hymn. On the other hand, Bruchmann in his Epitheta Deorum, cites only our passage under Helius's epithet ὑψόδρομος. The similar ὑψικλέπειθος is addressed to Apollo-Helius in Mag. hymn.ii.2.14 (Abel). Other compound epithets in -δρομος in Gregory's poetry are: ἀείδρομος: 1.1.5.66 (429), ἀλλίδρομος: 1.2.9.106 (676) and 1.2.12.11 (754), and περίδρομος: 1.1.5.69 (429). See also van Liemp
16. (Phaetho) κύκλον ύπερτέλλων εξηγοῦν: (Phaetho) 'causing the fervid disk to rise up'. Gregory appears to use ύπερτέλλων transitively and in the same syntactical way and meaning as ἀνατέλλειν is used, possibly influenced by Ἐυ. Mt. 5.45: τὸν Ἑλλον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει (sc. God). See besides Hesychius s.v. ύπερτέλλοντες and LSJ s.v. ύπερτέλλειν. The verb, yet in transitively used, may be found in Gregory's Ec. 4.11 (Gallay i p.5; M.37.28A): τὸν κορυφῆς (sc. St. Basil's head) ύπερτέλλοντα (see Gallay, Langue et Style, p.78f.); also in Eur. Phaetho 6 (= fr.777.1, TGF, Nauck2) and Herodotus 3.104. However, the choice of this verb instead of ἀνατέλλειν is made not only metri gratia, but, above all, in order to show the superiority of the sun over the stars given with ἕπερ-, as happens with ἐπεράμπελεν which is used for the same purpose in Or. 28.29 (Gallay p.166; M.36.68C) -cited in the following note - and is the rendering of our verb in the paraphrase of Cod. Vb. Worth noticing is finally the rendering of ύπερτέλλον in Hesychius: ύπερθαλάξελλον; ύπερφαινόμενος τῶν ἄλλων ἄστρων.

16. νόες: A feature of the present hymn is the extensive use of terms originated in Greek Philosophy: apart from the relationship between the Father and Son expressed in the pair Νόος-Λόγος (5), and the use of δημιουργὸς (11) and epithets with a-privative (ἀναρχός, ἀθάνατος (7), ἀμβροτος and ὕψος ἄσαρχον (27)), in the present couplet Gregory compares Christ with νόες, which in line 23 are characterized as οὐρανῶνες. The particular meaning of νόες is discussed in detail on line 23. Finally, the comparison of the sun with god in 15f. is a common Platonic image: cf. Rep. 508c which is quoted by Gregory in the passage from the second theological oration cited below.

Christ's superiority over νόες reminds me of His supremacy over angels stated in Ep.Heb. 1. 4-14, particularly 4: τοσοῦτω κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων διὰ διαφοράτερον πα_rho_aὐτούς κεκληρονομηκεν ὡνομα.
On the other hand, the same metaphor is used also when Christ, the Word, is compared with the false words of the human mind in *carm.* 2.2.7. 47-49 (1554): Ἀγώ, ὡς ὁ καλύτερος πάντα φρενὸς βροτής τρεπτὸν πολυεὐδέα μῦθον, τόσον, ὃσον φαέθων ὑψόρομος ἀστέρας ἄλλους. These lines may also clarify the phrase φέρτερε μῦθον in line 5.

A similar sun-metaphor is used by Gregory to show that the Godhead exceeds τὰ νοοῦμενα and may be found in his second theological oration: or.28.29f. (Gallay p.166f.; M.36. 68C-69A):

Πάθεν ἡλιος φροντωρεῖ πάση τῇ οὐκουμένῃ καὶ πάσας ὑ- φεσιν ὃπερ χοροῦ τῶν κορυφαῖος, πλεόν τῶν ἄλλων ἀστέρας ἀποκρύπτων φαινόμενη ἃ των ἐκείνων ἐτέρους; Ἀπόδειξις θεός, οὐ μὲν ἀντιλάμπουσιν, ὃ δὲ ύπερλάμπει.

and further below:


See also or.40.5 (M.36.364B).

Gregory was fond of using sun-images in order to emphasize or express more vividly his argumentation. Another such instance may be found in or.45.2 (M.36.624Bf.) where the sun is compared to Easter and the stars to the other feasts in order to show the greater importance of the former feast.

In Greek poetry such a comparison of the sun with stars is used in Pind. Olymp.1. 7-12 (ed. Snell-Maehler, 1971) to show that the Olympian games are the best of all. Finally, in an epideictic epigram (AP 9.24) Leonidas uses the same metaphor to illustrate Homer's supremacy over the other poets:

"Αστρα μὲν ἡμαύρωσε καὶ ἑρὰ κύκλα σελήνης
ἀξονα δυνήσας ἐμπυρον ἡλιος,\"
The moon changes its shape for Christ

17. φθυνύσει : This epic verb, found in the same sedes e.g. in II.2.346, is nowhere in Homer used of the moon. However, see Ps.-Manetho 6.566: μήνης ὁ ἐν φθυνυσσάται φεγγός.

17. ἀμουβαδὸς : It is used in the same sedes in carm.2.1.51.5 (1394), while in 1.2.15.125 (775) and in the same metrical position ἀμουβαδὸς is used instead.


18. πλησιωθαίς : Cf. carm.1.1.4.80 (422) where the epithet refers to νοερὰν φύσιν (sc. angels). As a term to describe the full moon it is commonly found in Philo Alex. e.g. iii, p.93.20f., iv, p.252.12 and v, p.43.17,22 (ed. Cohn). See also Ps.-Manetho 1.208,245, 5.113,115, Nonn. Dion.28.232, 41.258, 48.323 and carm. xlvi.13 (ed. Heitsch p.165).

Lines 19-20: The ζωφόρος κύκλος causes the change of seasons.

The paraphrase of the couplet in Cod. Vb runs : σὺ καὶ τὸν ζωφόρον περιάγεις κύκλον μέτρα ταῖς ὀρασὶς φέροντα κυριαμέναις ἥπιῳ κεράσματι.

Line 19: A variation of it may be seen in carm.1.1.5.46 (427): μούρας ςωφόρος τε κύκλος καὶ μέτρα κορεύης

See Sykes's note ad loc.

The present couplet speaks about the changing of seasons caused by the ζωφόρος κύκλος and the μέτρα of its κορεύη. The obvious meaning of ζωφόρος κύκλος is that of the zodiac.
A doctrine common to the philosophical schools but clearly stated by Aristotle was that by its annual movement in the ecliptic (or zodiac circle) the sun: 1) generates light and heat (see De Caelo ii 7 289a 31ff. and Meteorol. i 3 341a 19ff.), 2) is the cause of generation (γένεσις) and destruction (φθορά) (see De Gene-rat. et Corr. ii 10, particularly 336a 31ff., Joachim's notes ad loc. (p.253ff.) and Meteorol.ii 2 354b 28ff.), and 3) causes evaporation in summer and rainfall in winter (see Meteorol. i 9 346b 35- 347a 8). In other words the sun causes the annual cycle of seasons. This doctrine is clearly stated in De Mundo 6 399a: πορεύεται δε διήλθος πορεύεται ο παράφας ἡλιος, τι μὲν ἡμέραν καὶ νύκτα δυνατέων ἀνατολή καὶ δύσει, τι δε τὰς τέσσαρας ὁρας ἑγὼν τοῦ ξένου.

In two passages Gregory too appears to accept that the sun causes the change of seasons. One is found in the second theological oration, namely in or.28.30 (Gallay p.168f.; M.36.69B), and the other in carm.1.2.1. 69-71 (527). The former passage runs:

Πῶς δε (sc. ἐστὶν ὁ ἡλιος) ὑὼν ποιητῆς τε καὶ μεριστῆς, εὐτάκτως ἐγνωσμένων τε καὶ ἀπογνωσμένων, καὶ ὅπερ ἐν χορῷ συμπλεκομένων ἀλλήλως καὶ διασταμένων, το μὲν ψυ-λίας νύμφη, το δε εὐταξίασ, καὶ κατὰ μυκην καρναμένων (cf. Πηλα καρναμένως:20), καὶ ταῖς ἐγγύτησι κλεπτομένων ταυ-τῶν ἡμέρας τε καὶ νυκτός, ζνα μη τῇ ἀπαιστὴ λυπησωμεν; 'Ἀλλ' ετω μὲν ἠμέν ἡλιος.'

See also Mason's notes ad loc. The other text is: τὸλιν (sc. ἰελὐ-ψ μὴν τε) ξειλας, τι μὲν ἂρ' ἐνγένεσιν ἐξ ἀναρήπονσε φαινεν/φωτὸς ἀπεξερείτο σοι βατς, καὶ ἁραν ἐλώσειν'. See also or.20.11 (Mossay p.80; M.35.1077C) and or.33.9 (M.36.225B) where Gregory speaks of ὑὼν περιτροπας καὶ ὑὼν ἄλλας respectively.

Furthermore the paraphrast in Cod Vb renders ζωοφόρος (sc. κύκλος) as ζωοφόρος: ζωή + φέρω (sc. κύκλος).
From the above I tend to believe that Gregory chose ζωοφόρος κύκλος to mean the sun (i.e. the life-bearing disk) and at the same time the zodiac (i.e. the animal-bearing circle). That the sun is a life-bringing disk may be seen for instance in Gregory's second theological oration in a passage (which is found only a few lines before that already mentioned above) where he characterizes the sun by the epithets ψεφόβος and ψυζως (i.e. in Mason's own rendering 'bringing the means of life' and 'life-begetting' respectively; see his note ad loc.). This interpretation in also in accordance with Aristot.: De Generat. et Corr. ii 10 336a 18 where the sun (as the efficient cause of generation and destruction) is called τὸ γεννητικόν ('the generator'; see Joachim's note ad loc.).

Let us now come to the meaning of μέτρα χορεύσις (sc. of ζωοφόρος κύκλος). According for instance to Philo Alex. i.23.16f. (ed. Cohn): πλανήτων τε καὶ ἀκλανόν χορεύσις ('the orbits/circling motions of planets and fixed stars') and ΑΡ 7.334.2: ἔτεων μέτρα ή ib.9. 481.4: ὑμνὸν μέτρον ('the measure/duration of years or seasons' respectively) the present phrase seems to mean the measure/duration of the orbit/circling motion shared by the sun and the zodiac together. The same interpretation is followed in a scholion mentioned in M.37. 1327: μέτρα κυνήςδως. Gregory's expression seems to have been chosen to reflect μέτρα in line 20.

Finally, with a poem like this (where the poet's primary purpose is to praise Christ and not write an astronomical treatise) one need not be surprised if the poet handles astronomical terms with some flexibility. Besides, such handling is in accordance with Gregory's general habit of deliberately using accepted technical terms in a different sense whenever by the resulting ambiguity he wants to place particular emphasis on the subject he raises. An
example of this, taken also from the world of astronomy, may be
found in carm.1.1.5.44 (427) where Gregory uses ἀνάστερος (techni-
cally meaning 'starless' or 'carrying no planet'; see LSJ s.v.) to
characterize his λόγος ('teaching') as 'free from any astrological
views' (see the note in Sykes ad loc.), since further below he goes
on to refute such views. Gregory's habit of changing the meaning of
words has already been seen in 1.1.36.8: ὑποσκλάδευν and 2.1.38.16:
ὑπερτύλλευν (see the notes ad loc. and cf. also 1.1.29.10: σύνεσμα
and ib. 14: ἀκλήξυτος).

Lines 21-22: Fixed stars and planets reveal the wisdom of Christ
21f. ἀκλανόες ... ἀστέρες: This is another stylistic device
whereby the adjective and the noun it describes occupy each the first
sedes of the two lines in an elegiac couplet. See also above the
note on 1.1.35.9.

Line 21: A variation of it appears in carm.1.1.5.67 (429):
ἀκλανόες τε πλάνω τε καλύμποροι, ὡς ἐνέξουσιν
which refers also to the planets and fixed stars.

21. τε ... τε: On this correspondence (used mainly in poetry)
see Smyth 2973 and above p. 42.

21. ἀκλανόες τε πλάνω τε: The same phrase is found in Ps.-
Manetho 1.4.

21. πλάνω (sc. ἀστέρες): 'the planets'. The epithet in this
sense is used instead of the more common πλανηταί or πλάντες (sc.
ἀστέρες), both of which are used from Aristotle onwards (see LSJ s.
v. πλάνος).

21. καλύμπορον ἀύσουνες: Sykes on 1.1.5.67 (429) - cited
above - interprets καλύμπορον as 'a technical term in astronomy to
describe the actual or apparent motion of heavenly bodies "backward"
in the zodiac, i.e. from east to west' without providing any evi-
dence for this and by possibly regarding καλύμπορον to refer only
to planets. However, the word is more likely to have been used by Gregory to refer to both fixed stars and planets in the sense that the former move from east to west and the latter from west to east (see e.g. B.F.C. Costelloe-J.H. Muirhead, Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics, A translation from Zeller's Philosophy of the Greeks, vol.1 (London: Longmans, 1897), pp.490ff.).

This late adverbial epithet is used by Gregory also in carm. 2.1.19.61 (1276) but in a different context. In the same metrical position it appears in Oppian. Hal.4.529 and Nonn. Dion.2.247, 692, 5.487.

21. ἀκούοντες: The 'w' is long as happens in Homer: Od.10.99, 495 (both in the same sedes).

Line 21 is a spondiazon hexamerer, namely it has a spondee at the fifth foot. In the present hymns there are four further such instances (see below Appendix I, Table 3).

22. ἡγαθέσις εἰς τὸ λόγος σοφύς: With this phrase the poet should mean that by their movements the stars reveal the wisdom of Christ. He appears therefore to use the periphrasis εἰς τὸ λόγος instead of λέγουσι, possibly used in the same sense as δηνεξίωσα in the Biblical passage: / Ον οὐρανοί δηνεξίωσα ὀξύν θεοῦ ('the heaven with its stars relates the glory of God') in LXX Ps.18.2 (see also the note on 1.1.33.2f.).

Lines 23-24: All the 'heavenly minds' who praise the glory of the Trinity are Christ's own light.

23. νόες οὐρανών: 'νόες οὐρανοῦ' is the paraphrase of it in God Vb. See also the schol. on line 16: οὐρανώς δυνάμες (M.37. 1326). For οὐρανών Lampe s.v. cites only Orac.Sibyl.5.76 and Gregory's carm.1.2.2.680( 631), where it refers to God, and renders it as 'heavenly being'. See also 1.2.17.66 (786) where it is opposed to θυμίας. Therefore, οὐρανών as well as οὐρανώδους in 1.1.29.15
are alternative forms of οὐράνιος (used in line 10 for Christ: see the note ad loc.) and in 1.1.31.4 to denote anything pertaining to the sky) and have the same meaning. On the interchangeability between οὐράνιος, οὐρανίων and οὐρανιών, see also above p. 41.

As has been already observed (see above the note on 1.1.36.19: νόον περίενεν and 2.1.38.16) the present hymns show the poet's preference for philosophical terms instead of the more accepted Christian or Biblical ones. Consequently, I think that νόες οὐρανιών in this hymn refer to the angels as ἡ νοῦν in 1.1.34.2 do (see the note ad loc.). Νοὺς is used of the angelic intelligences in a number of passages from Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite: cf. for instance those cited in Lampe s.v. νοῦς I.E., and Max. Conf. schol. ad Cel.Hier. 1.2 (M.4.32Af.): νόες καλοῦσι καὶ οἱ παρ' Ἀλλήλους φιλόσοφοι τὰς νοεράς, ἢτοι ἀγγειων δυνάμεις .... Besides, angels had been already identified by Philo Alexandrinus and St Gregory of Nyssa with the intelligible world (see I.P.Sheldon-Williams, 'He-nads and Angels: Proclus and the ps.-Dionysius', Studia Patristica xi (=TU 108, Berlin, 1972), p.71 and Gottwald p.29). There are a number of passages in Gregory's own works where angels are called νόες: Carm.1.1.4.94 (423), 1.1.7.14 (439) = 1.2.1.32 (524), 1.1.8.62f. (451) = 1.2.1.84f. (528): οὐρανον εὐρων ἔχουσιν, ἄγνοι νόες, ἄγγελον ἐσθολον; οἱ νοεροί μέλλοντες εἰμι (sc. of God) κλέος οὐκοτε λήγουν, ib. 695 (575) and or.28.31 (Gallay p.172; M.36.72B): εἰς ἔναν ἀγγέλους ... νοεράς δυνάμεις ἢ νόες. Cf. also Carm.1.2.3.5 (633) and De Virtute: 1.2.10. 100 (687). In or.45.2 (M.36.625A) and ib. 5 (629A) = or.38.9 (320C) angels are called νοεροῦ and νοερὰ πνεύματα respectively. See finally Synes. Hymn.1.270-74 and Terzaghi's note ad loc.

23. οὐν φάσοι εἰσίν ἄναντες (sc. νόες οὐρανιών): The 'heavenly minds' are Christ's light. Angels are called φάν ἄετων in Carm.
2.1.34.207 (1322), or even δεύτερα φῶτα (see the passages quoted on 1.1.34.6: πυρήνες), *carm.* 1.2.1.45f. (525): ἥδε φανερῆς/ ἔλκειν (sc. τοὺς ἄγγελους) ἐκ Τριάδος σέλες ἀκλητον, 1.2.3.9f. (533): οὐ πρῶτοι (sc. angels) φέρουσι' ἀκτένα τῆς καθαράς Τριάδος,/ πνεύματα καὶ πῦρ, λειτουργοὶ τῶν θεοῦ προσταγμάτων/, *or.* 41.11 (M.36.444A): Οὐ γὰρ ἐλλοθεὶν αὐτᾶς (sc. ἄγγελονκαὶ δυνάμεις) ἡ τελείωσις καὶ ἡ ἐλλαμψις ... ἡ παρὰ τοῦ ἄγγος Πνεύματος and *or.* 6.12 (M.35.737B): (sc. οἱ ἄγγελοι καὶ δυνάμεις καὶ οὐράνιοι) φῶς εἰσὶ καὶ αὐταὶ τελειῶσιν φωτὸς ἀπαναγάμματα.

24. μέλπουσι Τριάδος δόξαν: Cf. lines 47f., *carm.* 1.1.8.63 (451) = 1.2.1.85 (528), and *or.* 45.2 (M.36.625A) where the angels are called τῆς ἀνω δόξης (sc. of God) ἑτοπταὶ καὶ μάρτυρες. On μέλπουσι see below the note on 1.1.29.1.

24. ἐπουρανύς: It is used also of the Trinity and in the same *sedes* in *carm.* 2.1.87.16 (1434); while in 2.1.17.36 (1264) and at the same metrical position οὐρανύς is used instead. This shows that the preposition ἐπὶ does not add any particular significance to the sense of this epithet (see also above the note on νόες οὐρανύων:23). The epic form οὐρανύς-η is not used in Homer but appears in Nonnus's Dionysiaca (see also above the notes on 1.1.34.3: στήσας and 1.1.35.10: ἡσθῆς and ἀκηροσθῆς ἀπὸ βυσσου. The epithet is used once in NT of κατη (Ev.Mt.18.35: a *varia lectio*); while ἐπουρανύως θεὸς appears in Od.17.484 and in the plural three times in the Iliad (see Bauer s.v.). The same epithet may be also the reading of 1.1.34.13 instead of ἐπὶ οὐρανύου (which both MSS preserve: see the note *ad loc.*).

Lines 25-26: Man is Christ's glory

25. σὸν θρόνος ... κλέος: Cf. *carm.* 2.1.19.47 (1275) where σὸν κλέος refers to Gregory himself.

25. ὁ δὲ ἄγγελον ἐνθάδε ἐδήμας: Man is called an angel on earth
in **carm.** 1.1.8.68f. (452) = 1.2.1.90f. (529): ἀγγελον ἄλλον/ ἐὰν χρησιν ὑμνητῆρα τ' ἐμῖν (sc. of God) μενέων τε νῦν τε./ and **or.** 38.11 (M.36.321C-324A) = **or.** 45.7 (632A): (sc. Logos) ... δημιουργεῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ... ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔστησαν ἄγγελον ἄλλον.

26. ὑμνοσάλον: In line 50 and **carm.** 2.1.21.10 (1280) the epithet refers to Gregory himself and in 2.1.16.83 (1260) to other people; while in 1.2.1.85 (528) = 1.1.8.63 (451) and 1.2.1.351 (548) it refers to angels. See also Synes. **hymn.** 4.25, Simonides fr. 184.2 (PLG iii p.512 Bergk) and AP 4.1.13 (Meleag.) 7.18.6, 9.24.3 (Leon.).

The idea that man is placed on earth in order to praise God may be seen also in Cleanth. **hymn.** 37-39: / ὑμνοσάντες τὰ οδ' ἔργα δινεῖς, ὡς ἐπεξεργασθής ἄνθρωπος οὕτως ἄλλο τι μετέχων/ οὐτε θεοί οὐ κοιλοῦν ἀπ' υψίου ἐν ὃς ὑμνεῖτιν. (cf. ib.6) and Epi- ctcetus 1.16 (Schenkl p.55. 27-56. 4): τὸ γὰρ ἄλλο δύναμιν γέρας κυ- λός εἰ μη ὑμνεῖτιν τὸν θεόν; εἰ γοῦν ἄνδρας ἡμῖν, ἐποίουν τὰ τῆς ἁπ- αθός, εἰ κύκνος, τὰ τοῦ κύκνου. νῦν δὲ λογικὸς εἶμι· ὑμνεῖτιν με δεῖ τὸν θεόν. See J. Adam, The Vitality of Platonism and other Essays, edited by A.M. Adam: (Cambr.: Univ. Press, 1911), p.176 and below the note on 1.1.31.9.

26. ἦ φῶς: The phrase is addressed to Christ after Ev. Jo.8. 12. Christ is invoked as βοῦ φῶς and φῶς μερόν in 1.1.36.28 and 1.1.38.6 respectively (see the notes ad loc. ). Note that this invocation is enclosed within the phrase σῆς ... ἄγιανθι which refers also to Christ and is deliberately chosen to correspond in sense to this invocation.

The use of the interjection ὅ in this invocation complies with the practice followed by the Greek tragedians (see above p.43ff.).

c) Lines 27-28: Incarnation

On Christ's incarnation as a subject of the Praise in 1.1.33.6 and 1.1.35. 6-8 see above the notes ad loc.
The nature of the incarnate Christ is expressed in terms of a paradox since He is at the same time \(\text{μμ\(\omega\)ροτος} \) and \(\text{βροτεύς} \) (immortal and mortal), \(\text{ἀσωμός} \) and \(\text{σαρκοφόρος} \) (with and without flesh).

27. \(\text{Δυμβροτές μου βροτεύς} \) : The strong antithesis created by the juxtaposition of the two contrary words is used to denote and emphasize the dual nature of Christ as a god-man. The same effect is produced in \(\text{car} \).1.1.9.42 (460): \(\text{Δυμβροτος ήλθε βροτεύς} \) and 1.1.18. 37 (483): / \(\text{μι\(\tau\)ερος έκ βροτεύς θεός Δυμβροτος} \). See also Synes. \(\text{hymn.} \) 8.15: [\(\text{Βροτεύων πέρων δέμας}\)] (sc. Christ).

On the universal divine epithet \(\text{Δυμβροτος}\) see the note on 1.1. 33:11: Besides, \(\text{βροτεύς} \) is a rare form of vocative instead of \(\text{βροτεύς} \) (see Kühner-Blass-Gerth 118,5b and above p. 39 and 197). However, the meaning of \(\text{βροτεύς} \) should be the same as that of \(\text{βρό-τευς} \) or \(\text{βρότες} \) following Gregory's general attitude of using words with different meaning (see above p. 40 ). The same word appears to be also the reading of Cod L in Nonn. Dion.47.431 (ed. Keydell): see LSJ s.v. The word \(\text{βρότες} \) (used of Christ) is found in \(\text{car} \).1.1.20.2 (488) and 1.2.14.92 (762).

27. \(\text{Παληγγενεύς} \) : The epithet is used in line 45 where it refers to man's rebirth in Christ as it derives from \(\text{παληγγενεύς} \) which is commonly used in this technical sense (see Lamp s.v.). However, in the present passage the epithet is addressed to Christ and is found in a context where the poet speaks of Christ's incarnation. Therefore, it is very likely that by calling Christ \(\text{παληγγενεύς} \) (with a second birth ) the poet refers to Christ's generation as a god-man which took place in time (cf. \(\text{ύστα\(\tau\)ον} : 28) and followed His generation as Son of God before the beginning of time (see also above the note on 1.1.35.4: \(\text{αὐτογένεθλος}\)). Cod Vb gives the paraphrase \(\text{παληγενεύω} \), while the \(\text{schol.} \) in M.37.1328 has \(\text{δις} \) \(\text{ε\(\mu\)νε} \) \(\text{δε\(\upsilon\)ερον γεννηθεύς} \).
In Greek literature παλιγγενής is used once in Nonn. Dion. 2.650 and in Pap. Mag. Gr. vii. 510 (Preis.).

27. ὕψος ἄσαρκος: The phrase is deliberately formed to be contrasted to σαρκοφόρος (both found at the end of two successive lines), and is used to the same effect as the antithesis in line 27a. Besides, it may be compared with carm. 1.1.2.62f. (406): ἢν (sc. Christ) βροτός, ἀλλὰ θεός. Δαβὶδ γένος, ἀλλ’ Ἀδὰμολ/ πλάστης. σαρκοφόρος μὲν, ὁτάρ καὶ σώματος ἐκτός./ and with or. 38.2 (M. 36.313B): ὁ ἄσαρκος σαρκοῦταί. See also or. 28.9 (Gallay p. 116; M. 36.36C) where God is called ἀσώματος, and Const. Apost. 8.12.31: καὶ ἐσαρκίζ-θη ὁ ἄσαρκος. On σαρκοφόρος see Orac. Sibyl. 1.325 and Nonn. par. Jo. 1:15 (M. 43.752B).

28. ὑστάτων: It is used in the same sedes e.g. in carm. 1.2.1. 137 (533) and Callim. hymn. Apoll. 79 (see William's note ad loc.).

28. θυτήρων πίματι: It gives the reason which led to Christ's incarnation: to release mortals from their sins. See also 1.1.35.6, the note ad loc. and Synes. hymn. 8.24.

d) Lines 29-31: The poet's personal devotion to Christ

29. σοι ζῶ, σοι λαλῶ: The phrase appears in 1.1.36.31 while in carm. 2.1.12.804 (1225) we have: / φ (sc. for God) ζῶ, πνεύω τε καὶ πρὸς ὅν βλέπω μόνον.

29. σοι ο’ ἐμπνοῶς εἴμι θυηλῇ: Gregory is in the paraphrase of Cod. Vb a 'living sacrifice' (θυσία ζῶσα) offered to Christ after Ep. Rom. 12.1 (cf. LXX Ps. 50.19). The same idea is expressed in carm. 2 (epit.). 2.119.44 (M. 38.74): ἐμπνοῶν ἐρόν ἔνσ./ (said of Basil), or. 16.2 (M. 35. 936B): Σοφία πρῶτη, βίος ἑκαυνετός καὶ θεφ κεκαθαρμένος, ἦ καθαράμενος, τῷ καθαρωτάτῳ καὶ λαμπροτάτῳ καὶ ἰδιότητι παρ’ ἤμων θυσίαν, τῆν καθαροῦν, ἢν δὲ καρδίαν συντετριμμένην (LXX Ps. 50.19) καὶ θυσίαν αἰνέσεως (Ps. 49.23), καὶ καίνην ἐν Χριστῷ κτίσιν (Ep. 2 Cor. 5.17), καὶ νέον ἀνερμοῦν, καὶ τὰ τολμάτα τῇ Γραφῇ κα-
In his poems Gregory appears an enthusiastic advocate of the ideal of poverty: see carm.1.2.17.5f. (782) and 2.2.1.32 (1454), which he himself seems to have followed: carm.1.2.15.113f. (774) and 2.1.1.65-76 (975).

Line 31: It refers to the poet's vow of silence and it thus brings back the main subject of Invocation A.

31. γλῶσσαν ἔσομαι: It is used in carm.2.1.83.1 (1428), 2.2.1.67 (1456) and 2.1.37.5 (1324). In 2.1.36.5 (1323) ἔσομαι λόγον is used instead, while in or.2.71 (Bernardi p.184; M.35.480B) the poet prefers the expression τῷ γλῶσσῃ δεσμόν ἐπιτεθέναι and in or.12.1 (M.35.844B) τυφλὰν φυλακὴν τοῖς χείλεσιν (cf. LXX Ps.140.3).

Besides, in or.6.7 (M.35.729B) he uses the opposite expressions γλῶσσαν ἔσομαι and γλῶσσαν λύεσιν (i.e. 'to keep silence' and 'to speak' respectively). The latter passage helps us to understand μῦθον λύεσιν of our hymn in the same sense as γλῶσσαν λύεσιν (i.e. 'to speak'). That γλῶσσαν ἔσομαι and μῦθον ἔλεγα should express opposite meanings may be further attested from ἀμφότερα in the following line.

Since γλῶσσα and μῦθος are obviously associated with Gregory one would expect οὖσας (as another part of the body) to be his too. Consequently, the second hemistich would mean: 'I released speech for my own ears'. However, such meaning has, I think, no sense. Therefore, οὖσας should refer to others (possibly Gregory's fellow
Christians), however harsh this may sound to us. The metrical restrictions may be one reason why the thought was forced in such a way into the structure, although the obscurity of the whole phrase may equally well have been deliberate. The meaning then becomes: 'I released speech for the others to hear'. Such interpretation may be supported also by the fact that, since (as has been already mentioned in the introduction to this hymn) Gregory's silence was met with much criticism by his fellow men, one would expect him, after breaking his vow, to answer their accusations. An intention to do so is pronounced by him in one of the epistles he wrote during his silence, namely epist.118.2 (Callay ii p.11; M.37.213B):

'Εσωάνησα μὲν ἐμαυτῷ λαλήσει δὲ τοὺς ἄλλους (cf. epist.108 (p.5;208A) ep. 113 (p.7;209B) and ep.116.1 (p.10;213A)). Following this interpretation the past form ἔλυσα in the hymn should have been used instead of the future λύσω to express an action which the poet was fairly certain he would do and therefore regarded as already done (see Smyth 1934 and Kühner-Blass-Gerth 386.11).

However, there is a slight possibility that the whole phrase is an early corruption (which took place in a non-surviving MS) instead of οὐκα ταύτα μὴ ἔλυσα (i.e. during my silence 'I released my ears to the speech' sc.of others ). In support of this interpretation is one of the epistles (believed to have been written during the period of Gregory's silence), namely epist.109 (Callay ii p.5; M.37.208B). The epistle is addressed to Cledonius and it reads: Οὐ καλῶ τὴν συντυχίαν εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἡ γλῶττα σουγέ, τὰ γε ζητά τοὺς σοῦς λόγους ἡδέως παρέξομεν, ἐπειδὴ τὸν λαλεῖν ἀ χρῆ τὸ ἄμαχεν οὐκ ἄτεμπτον.

III. Prayer A (32)

32. λύσομαι: See the note on 1.1.34.14: λύσομαι.

32. ἀλλά: This conjunction is commonly used to introduce the
Prayer (see above p. 30). The postposition of it is a rare phenomenon and seems to have been done metri gratia. For postponed ἀλλὰ in Callim. hymn. Jov. see McLennan's note on l. 18.

32. πόρος: See the note on 1.1.36.20.

IV. Introduction B (33-38)

Lines 33-36: The poet's resolve to speak only what is lawful

33. φθέγξομαι, ἐκεῖ ἐκέλευεν: The phrase appears in the same sedes in carm. 2.2.7.21 (1552). For ἐκέλευεν see Cleanth. hymn. 37.

In line 33 the two hemistichs express the same idea in a positive and negative way respectively. The clarification of this idea, namely that the poet will speak only what is permitted to him, is given with the four metaphors: of the pearl, gold, rose and wheat which follow in lines 34-36. The first and fourth metaphors occupy each a pentameter and the second and third share the two hemistichs of the hexameter, giving thus to the section (34-36) a polarized form.

Line 34: The two hemiepe are opposite in sense while the four words they consist of form a syntactical chiasmus: a-b-b-a.

34. ἰδὼν: The verb is accurately chosen to refer metaphorically to the poet's flow of words which are compared to a pearl. In doing so the poet follows the usage of ἰδὼν with the only difference that he uses it transitively (see LSJ s.v. 1.2). However, the paraphrase of this verb in Cod Vb is ἐκλέξομαι.

34. μαργάρεον: This is the only citation in Lexica and is used instead of μαργαρίτης.

34. βορβορον: Cf. carm. 2.1.61.6 (1405): εἰ δ' οὖν σὺ γλῶσσα, μὴ δέχον βορβορον.

The metaphor in line 34 whereby the poet decides to let flow a 'pearl' (i.e. precious or useful words) and leave aside 'mud' (i.e. useless or even bad words) in a way reminds us of the Biblical ones: a) in Ev. Mt. 7.6 and b) in Ep. Eph. 4.29. Pearl-metaphors,
although used in a different context, may be found in AP 8.21.1f. = \text{carm.2(epit.)}.2.63.1f. (M.38.42), \text{or.}33.1 (M.36.216A), \text{or.}37.18 (M.36.304A) and \text{epist.12.2} (Gallay i p.19; M.37.44C).

Line 35a: The gold-metaphor together with the wheat-metaphor in line 36 may be compared with \text{carm.1.2.1.696f.}(575)/ καὶ στάχυς εἰς ὀλύγου μέν, ἀτὰρ στάχυς ἐβλάστησε/ σπέρματος, ἐκ ψαμάθου δὲ μεγ' ἐξοχος ἔκλετο χρυσὸς./.

Line 35b: The rose-metaphor is very beloved to Gregory, since it appears a number of times in his works: \text{carm.1.2.3.71}(638)/ ὡς ῥόδον ἐν ἀκάνθαις, οὕτως ἐν πολλοῖς στρέφῃ (sc. you the virgin), De Vita Sua:2.1.11. 472 (Jungck p.76; M.37.1062): τρυγῶν ἀκάνθαις, οὐκ ἄκανθίζων ῥόδα, De Virtute:1.2.10. 214-17 (695f.):

\begin{quote}
μεμνησομαι δὲ δεύγματος χάριν τινών,
ὡς ἄν μάθης κανθάνοι τὴν ἀρετήν, δοσ
ῥόδι' ἐξ ἄκανθῶν, ὡς λέγουσι, συλλέγονων,
ἐκ τῶν ἀπέστων μανθάνοι τὰ κρείσσονα.
\end{quote}

also 1.2.2.208f.(594), AP 8.98.6 = \text{carm.2(epit.)}.2.19.6 (M.38.20) and \text{epist.183.2} (Gallay ii p.72;M.37.297B): ῥόδα ἐξ ἄκανθῶν, ὡς ἡ παρουμία, συλλέγομεν.

The phrases ὡς λέγουσι and ὡς ἡ παρουμία (used in the above passages) are suggestive of the proverbial origin of the rose-metaphor. However, I have not been able to trace in the Paroemigraphers such or a similar idea. The metaphor may have been taken from stock material used in the rhetorical schools as it is used also in Nicephorus Progynasmata ap. Rhet.Graec. i.511.24f. (ed. Walz): ῥόδα μέλλων τρυγῶν ἐξ ἀκάνθων οὐκ ἐγύνωσκον. Cf. Stephanus, Thesaurus s.v. ῥόδον. The same metaphor appears in other Christian writers as well: Basil. leg. lib. gent. 3(M.31.569Cf.) (see Ruether p.165 n.2 ), Clem. Alex. Strom.ii.1. 3,3 (GCS 2 p.114.14f.) and Amphilochius Seleuc. 61 (Oberg p.30 ; or ap. Gr.Naz. \text{carm.2.2.8.61}
in M.37.1581).

35. ἡραναῖς: The epithet is used by Gregory also in carm. 2.1.1.354 (996) to describe Babylon. Cf. Synes. hymn.1.16.

36. λεξίου': The verb is used in the sense 'to pick for oneself' as happens in e.g. II.24.793 and Apoll. Rhod. Arg.3.807, and is rendered in the paraphrase of Cod Vb as λῆψομαι. Wheat-metaphors were a beloved theme in Greek pagan literature and a number of proverbs resulted from this as one may see in LSJ s.v. καλάμιν. See also AP 4.1.34 (Meleag.)

Lines 37-38: This hymn is the poet's first-offering to Christ after he completed his vow of silence.

The same subject appears in one of the epistles which make reference to the poet's vow of silence: epist.117 (Gallay ii p.10f.; M.37.213A): Καλὸν γὰρ ὢσπερ ἄλλου παντὸς, οὗτο δὲ καὶ λόγων ἀπαρχὴς ἀνατέθηκα τῷ Λόγῳ πρῶτον, εἶτα τοὺς φοβουμένους τὸν Κύριον. It is therefore very likely that the present hymn is the poet's actual first words offered to Christ after his silence.

38. ἀπερευγυμένη: The verb (not cited in Lampe) has the non-classical meaning 'to utter' following that of the Biblical (ἐξ-) ἐ-ρεύγυςοθαυ which is used in a similar context e.g. in LXX Ps.44.2 and 118.171 (see Bauer s.v. ἐρεύγυςοθαυ). The verb in this sense is presumably a Hebraism as one may see from Ev.Mt.13.35 which is a version of Ps.77(78).2 and uses ἐρεύγυςοθαυ, while the Septuagint (LXX Ps.77.2) has θεγγυςοθαυ. Gregory uses in the same sense also ἐξευέλων in carm.2.1.34.50 (1311).

V. Praise B (39-50a)

a) Lines 39-46: Narrative on Christ's resurrection

The same subject is used for the praise of Christ in 1.1.33.8f. (see the note ad loc.).

39. σήμερον: It is repeated for emphasis at the beginning of
lines 43, 47 and 49 to introduce, first the two sections of the Easter narrative and then the angelic hymn and that of the poet. The same word may show also the possible composition of the hymn on Easter Day. See Gregory's oration On Easter: or.45.2 (M.36.625A) where one reads: Σήμερον δὲ τὴν ἀνάστασιν αὐτήν ἔστησαμεν ὦ θεός ἐν ἐλαυνομένην, ἀλλ' ἦν γεγεννημένην. A triple repetition of this word may be seen also in Callim. hymn.Lavacr.Pallad. 45 (twice),47.

Christ's resurrection is the theme of the homily mentioned above in the prooemium of which one reads: Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν, συνεγείρεσθαι. Χριστὸς εἰς ἐαυτόν, ἐκανέρχεσθαι. Χριστὸς ἐκ τῶν, ἐλευθερώθη τῶν δεσμῶν τῆς ἀμαρτίας. Παλαι ἄνθρωπος ἀνοιγότας και θάνατος καταλύεται (or.45.1 in M.36.624B). Synesius's eighth hymn has a similar subject matter and the similarities with this section will be shown below. On Christ's descent into Hades see the note on 1.1.35.9, or.29.20 (Gallay p.222; M.36101Bf.) and Orac.Sibyl.8.310ff. and 1.377ff.

39f. οἶς ὁμώχην, ἔγρατο: Cf. carm.1.1.2.78f.(407): νεκῶσαι ὁμώχην, ἔγρατο ὅ ἐκ νεκῶν and the note of Sykes ad loc.; 2.2.7.174 (1564): / καὶ θάνατος καὶ νεκῶσαι μοῦ and Apollinarius Protheoria 88 .

40. θανάτον κέντρον ἀφεσιμένεσθαι : The metaphor is taken from Ep.1Cor.15.54-56 which in turn is influenced by LXX Os.13.14. The phrase θανάτον κέντρον is used in carm.2.1.45.160 (1364) and κέντρα μόρφοι in 2.1.1.52 (974); while in or.45.22 (M.36.653C) Gregory quotes part of the Pauline passage. On death images in Gregory see J. Mossay, La Mort et l' Au-delà dans Saint Grégoire de Nazianze, Un. de Louvain. Recueil de Travaux d' Hist. et de Philol. 4, 34 (Louvain, 1966), pp.12-16.

41f. καὶ ... ἤθετο: Cf. 1.1.33.8 and the note ad loc., Orph.

ἀμελείτου θέριον: Cf. AP 7.439.4 (Theodorid.): ἀμελείτην ... 'Αζω, and for the same epithet hymn. Asclepi. 8 (Heitsch p.171) and Nonn. Dlon.43.420.

42. φυκάς δείκνυε ἐλευθερίνην: Cf. carm. 2.2.7. 196-98 (1566): ὡς κεν ἀναστάς/ ἐκ νεκρῶν καλύνοροις ἀναστήσεις θανόντας,/ ἐλκὼν οὖα μάγνισα λύθος τονόντα σῶμαρν./, Synes. hymn. 8.17f., 24f., and AP 1.56.

Note the polysyndeton in lines 40-42.

Lines 43-44: Cf. carm. 1.1.20.37f. (491), 1.1.22.20 (494), 1.1.23.10f. (494).

43. ἐκ τύμμολο θεροῦν: Cf. carm. 2.2.1.251 (1469), 2.1.45.185 (1366) and 1.2.15.133 (775).

43. μερόπεσσι φανωθὲ: The phrase appears in the same sedes in Apoll. Met. Ps. 117.52. On μέροπες see above the note on 1.1.36.12

Line 44: The triple anaphora of ὡς underlines the reason for Christ's incarnation, crucifixion and resurrection: the redemption of mankind.

45. παλιγγενές: As a technical term the epithet (or its cognate noun) usually refers to the effect of baptism on men. In this sense it is found in carm. 2.(epit.) 2.24.6 (M.38.22) = AP 8.103.6 and Nonn. par. Jo. 1:33, 3:6 (M.43.756B, 768A). See also above the note in line 27.

However, compared to or.40.2 (M.36.360C): τρισθήν γέννησαν ἡ-μοῦν οὖαν ὁ Λόγος· τὴν ἐκ σωμάτων, τὴν ἐκ παντίσματος καὶ τὴν ἐς ἀναστάσεσις (possibly of the dead), the epithet in this hymn seems more likely to refer to the third type of birth than to the second.

On the use of παλιγγενές (1) of baptism as a restoration or rebirth, 2) of second penance as a restoration and 3) of eschatological

45. ἐν θανάτῳ ζωήντες: Cf. II.20.350.

46. οὐκ: The addition of this pronoun (if it is not a corruption instead of a third person form) should have been made in order to prepare for the change of the narrative style into the second person style of the following section.

46. συναειδωμένες: Cf. or.45.1 (M.36.624B) and ib.25 (657B).

The use of compounds in συν- to describe what Christians do together with Christ is owed to St Paul: see Ep.2Tim.2.11, Eph.2.6. Such compound verbs may be found in Gregory's carm.1.2.2.566 (623), or. 40.45 (M.36.424Bf.) and or.1.4 (Bernardi p.76; M.35.397B). On the syntax of such compound verbs with dative (exemplified also in Gregory's epistles) see Gallay, *Langue et Style*, p.28.

46. ἑοσὶν ἀνερχομένων: Gregory refers to Christ's ascension in carm.1.1.3.31 (410).

b) Lines 47-48: The hymn of angels

Gregory refers to the hymn of angels at the event of Christ's resurrection in or.45.1 (M.36.624B), where he tells us also that the content of this hymn was that of the Gloria (in Ev.Lc.2.14).

47. αὐγλήνες: The epithet is used to describe the angels in carm.2.1.45.21 (1355), 1.2.1.31 (524), 2.1.99.1 (1451) and AP 8.54.

1 = carm.2 (epit.).2.97.1 (M.38.59). See also Apoll. Met.Ps.102.38 and AP 1.94.3. In carm.1.1.3.28 (410), however, it describes the Spirit. As a stock epithet it was used in Greek pagan hymns: Hom. hymn.32.9 and Apoll.40.

47f. χορός .../ ἀγγελικός: Cf. 1.1.34.6 and the note ad loc., and Synes. hymn.4.18.

47. ἄμψιγχηθεν: The verb appears in the same sedes in Hom. hymn.Apoll.273 and is used again by Gregory in carm.1.2.9.39 (670).
In the paraphrase of Cod Vb it is rendered as ηερωχαλοι. Angels appear to participate in the victorious hymn on the occasion of Christ's resurrection also in Synes. hym. 8.26f.

48. ήμυνον επιστεφουν: 'a hymn of victory, or a victorious hymn', and according to the scholion in M.37.1329: 'δυνον ηευκυκλοι'. The present passage is the only instance, according to Lampe s.v., of this epithet which seems to have been constructed by Gregory in the place of έπιστεφις following his habit of changing the declension of various words (see above p. 41). Cf. Synes. hym. 8.40: / έπυκυκλον ές μελος which supports the interpretation of our passage and proves wrong the paraphrast in Cod Vb who renders έπιστεφους as έπισταφος.

c) Lines 49-50a: The poet's hymn

49. ηχον ελευσα: This is rendered in the paraphrase of Cod Vb as λόγον διήξοςα and, together with χεύλεα ... λύσας (which corresponds to μύθον έλυσα: 31), brings back once more the subject of Introduction A: the poet's vow of silence.

49. μεμυκάτα χεύλεα συγγ: It appears in the same sedes in AP 8.4.3 = carm.2.(epit.)2.119.15 (M.38.73) and AP 15.40.6 (an epitaph of the grammarian Cometason on the resurrection of Lazarus).

VI. Prayer B (50b)

50. ἀλλα: See the note on 1.1.34.19.

50. ὑμνοσκόλον κλάδον: Gregory regards himself as a musical instrument destined to glorify God also in carm.2.1.34.69f. (1312): δραγανόν εύμθ θεότο καὶ εὐκράιτος μελέτουν/ ήμον θατερι φέρω, ib. 91 (1313): τόσον γλώσσαν εχω κλάδον and or.43.67 (M.36.5850): γενομαι ... δραγανον κερουμενον τενεματι καὶ θεός άμνοσον άδεις καὶ δυνάμεως. Cf. also carm.2.1.45.156 (1364). The present request may be compared to that in 1.1.31.12 (see the note ad loc.)

VII. Epilogue (51-52)
Line 51: The poet offered his mind to the Mind (sc. the Father) and his word to the Word (sc. Christ). The word-play in the two different meanings of νοῦς and λόγος is so obvious as not to need any further comment.

51. ἔριξα: The poet avoided the doubling of 'ρ' metri gratia (see above p. 39). The choice of this verb which is rendered in the paraphrase of Cod Vb as έσθωσα καὶ ιεροθρησκοσα (cf. also the schol. in M.37.1329) seems to have been made deliberately in order to refer back to θυσία (29); while line 51 refers to the first subject of Christ's praise (in line 5). See also epist.119 (cited above p. 203).

Line 51f.: The poet expresses his determination to make an offering to the Holy Spirit as well by composing another hymn dedicated to Him.

51. αὐτῷ ἔπεμψα: See above the note on κρυπτον in line 1.

52. ἰν ἐθέλη: The addition of this phrase may be contrasted to the practice of Greek pagan hymns when such or similar expressions with ἐθέλειν are used in order to express the free will of gods to act, or fulfil a request: Hom. hymn. Ven. 38 (Aphrodite): εὖτε ἐθέλησεν and Procl. hymn. 1.45f. (Helius) ἐὰν δέσθων ... εὖ κε ἐθέλουσ, δόσ, ἄναξ. See also Keyssner p. 84 and ἐθέλοντος in line 13.

Such feature appears also in Christian prayers: see e.g. Liturg. Jac. (Brightman p. 57.25f.): διὸ ἐθέλεις καὶ ὡς ἐθέλεις. Cf. LXX Ps. 50.18.

At the end of the commentary on 2.1.38 let us see some of the features and particular characteristics of this hymn, leaving aside those concerning its structure and the themes used in it, since we have dealt with them in the introductory analysis of the hymn.

Of particular importance in this hymn is the extensive use of
divine epithets: Some of these are the poet's own coinages, particularly constructed to describe minutely and in an accurate and concise way various doctrines concerning Christ's characteristics (mainly in relation to the other two persons of the Trinity): πατροφαίες (5), οἶδονε (6), συμφαίες (8), αἰώνος πέλαμα (9). Some are particularly Biblical, or exemplify in early patristic texts: εἰκών (7), Ἀγίος (5), πνεομένης (10), φῶς (26), ὑφὸς δασάρχου (27), σαρκοφόρος (28), καλλιγενής (27). Other epithets are stock divine epithets of the Greek pantheon and are either restricted to particular gods (εἴρυμεδών (8) used mainly of Poseidon, ὑψηλονος (10) of Κλαυδίο and Nereids, ὕπάνοια (10) mainly of Ζεύς); or used universally (μεγας:5, ἀθανατος:7, φιλέσβοιος:11, Ἀναξ:15, ἀμβροτος:27). Finally, there are epithets first originated in Greek philosophy, particularly the negative ones, as ἀναρχος (7), or even διαπουργος (11). Other epithets and stock vocabulary used in Greek pagan hymns, but describing other nouns are: ἄγνοια (3), ἡγαθειος (22), μέλησιν (24, 48), ὑμνοπόλοι (26, 50), ἀγλαυς (26), εὐχαρις (32), αἰγαλής (47), ὠμον (48).

The ornamentation of the hymn is rich. Apart from the epithets already mentioned there are a dozen more. Of considerable importance with regard to ornamentation are the four metaphors in lines 34-36, the simile in lines 15-16, the image of the harmonious movement of the celestial spheres (17-21), the periphrasis ὅμα τὸ νυκτὸς (17) the personification of the sun: Phaetho (15) and the vivid description of Christ's resurrection and the events related to it (39-46).

To the above one may add various stylistic remarks (referring particularly to the usage of rhetorical figures), which have been already made on individual lines.

All these features and characteristics, together with the appearance in the hymn of new or rare forms, heavy compounds and
traditional vocabulary, give the hymn a solemn and elevated style.

A final word on the problem of the unity of the hymn: As we have seen both in the introductory analysis and the commentary on it, the poem is unified by the various themes and cross-references which appear in both sections: 1-38 and 39-52. Therefore, the apparent lack of unity seems to be no longer valid.

Carm. 1.1.31

The next poem to be discussed is 1.1.31, a short hymn of only six elegiac couplets.

The MS tradition of the poem follows that of 1.1.33-35 with the exception that it is found also in Cod Np (see above p. 68f). Hence, the authenticity of the present poem is also in doubt. However, the remarks already made for 1.1.33-35 to support their authenticity apply also to 1.1.31, and so it seems unnecessary to repeat them here.

The hymn begins with the Biblical expression ἐξα (sc. εἴρηται) which is repeated in line 2 for solemnity and stylistic purposes. This expression, together with the closing request for a pure doxology, determines the characterization of the hymn as a doxology.

In the introductory couplet the poet refers to all the three persons of the Trinity and, while the hexameter is shared between the Father and the Son (who is King of all), the pentameter is left to the Spirit who is described with the rare and late epithet πανευ-

υνος ('wholly blessed' in Lampe s.v.) and the liturgical one πανδυ-

γιος ('all-holy').

Praise (3-10) begins with a confession-like formula on the dogma
of the tri-une God. (3a). The major part of Praise is spent on the theme of the creation and preservation of the world, (often celebrated in the Psalms), whereby God's power is manifested and extolled. Although such a theme appears in most of the hymns under discussion, this is the only poem where the creation is wrought by the Trinity (conceived as a unity) and not by the three persons, each taken separately (as in 1.1.30), or by one or more of them (as in 2.1.38 and 1.1.33), or even by the Godhead (as in 1.1.34). As will be seen in the commentary, the expressions used (at least for lines 3-5) echo passages in liturgical prayers. Furthermore, it seems worthwhile to notice that the first two couplets of Praise (3-6) refer to God's works of creation; while the last two (7-10) to the response of Creation to His works which is expressed in two hymns. In the first hymn all Creation (παντός κτισμός: 7) celebrates God as the only Cause of its coming into existence and of its preservation; and in the second the rational natures celebrate God as a great King and kind Father.

Compared to the fact that glorification of God is also the subject of both Introduction and Prayer, the theme of creation in the first part of Praise (3-6) becomes less important and is thus subordinate to the notion of glorifying God in lines 7-10.

The hymn of the rational natures makes the poet want to glorify God, since he himself is a rational being. His desire is implicit in the closing request to God the Father that he may glorify Him in purity.

With the return in the closing couplet to the theme of Introduction: the glorification of God, the hymn acquires a ring form seen also in hymns 1.1.34 and 1.1.29. Besides, the emphasis on the notion of praising God (seen in the use of such verbs as: δοξα (sc. ελνα), δοξολογεῖν, ώμεῖν, ἀξίζειν), leads us to characterize this poem, not so much as being itself a hymn glorifying God, but as a
hymn about the act of glorifying God.

This hymn may be compared in content with a short prayer entitled Εὐχὴ τῆς παραστάσεως and found in the Liturgy of St James (see Brightman p.31. 15-23). The various similarities can be illustrated only if we cite the text of this prayer which runs:

Δέξα τῷ Πατρί καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ καὶ τῷ ἀγόρι Πνεύματι, τῷ τριάδικῷ καὶ ἐνιαύξῳ φωτὶ τῆς θεότητος τῆς ἐν τριδίῳ μοναδικῷ ὑπαρχούσῃ καὶ διαμορφωμένης ἀδιαλείπτως' τριὰς γὰρ εἰς θεὸς καινοκράτωρ οὗ τῶν ὄζειν οἱ οὐράνιοι διηγοῦνται, ἢ δὲ γῆ τὴν αὐτοῦ δεσποτεὶς καὶ ἡ πᾶλαια τὸ ἀυτοῦ κράτος καὶ πασα αἰωνιότητα καὶ ουσία κτέως τὴν αὐτοῦ μεγαλευστη γνωριστεὶ πάντοτε ὅτι αὐτῷ πρέπει πάσα ὤξει των κράτος μεγαλευσθῇ τε καὶ μεγαλεπέση νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

As we see both texts begin with the triadological doxology and after the confession to the tri-une God, they proceed to the praise of the Trinity by reference to the creation. But, while in 1.1.31 this consists of two parts: a) God creating the world and b) the world glorifying God, the liturgical prayer refers only to the second part, namely how the heavens, earth, sea and all the visible and intelligible creation always reveal God’s glory, dominion, power and majesty. Finally, both texts close with another doxology.

Another point to make here is the fact that eleven out of twelve verses are paroxytone. This feature is common in the hymns under discussion and, not only shows that they belong to a late period of Greek literature, but also marks the gradual change from the heathen metres (which are based on the quantity of the syllables) to the rhythmic verse of Byzantine period (which is based on the position of the grammatical accents in the line). See also above p. 61f.
I. Introduction (1-2): Glory to the tri-une God

1. δόξα (sc. εὐτυχι or εὐσίω): The phrase is repeated at the beginning of line 2 as happens with σοὶ χάρις (sc. εἰναί) in 1.1.34; see note ad loc. The Biblical origin of the phrase may be attested, not only from its occurrence in the Gloria (ap. Ἐκ. Lc. 2.14), but also from the phrases δόξων or ἐναγκαζών δόξαν which are used quite often in the Septuagint version of the Psalter: see Ps. 65.2, 113.9 and 95.7, 8. Other doxological verbs used by Gregory are: δοξάζεται in carm. 1.2.3.1 (632), 1.1.30.42, and δοξολογεῖται in line 12 of this hymn. The common doxological formula whereby most of the Christian prayers and homilies end is discussed below in the note on 1.1.32. 49f. Finally, the use of both δόξα (sc. εἰναί) and δοξολογεῖται in the present hymn justify its characterization as a doxology or glorification as does also Cod. W (see the tit. in appar. critic.).

1. Πατρός: On this common title of God see the note on 1.1.34. 14 and 1.1.35.1.

1. παυμασώλης: The epithet (found once in LXX Ecclus. 50.15) refers to Christ also in carm. 1.2.1. 455, 708 (556, 576) and in Liturg. Marc. (Brightman p. 132.15); while, as a theological term for both God and Christ, it has been widely used in patristic literature (see Lampe s.v.).

In pagan Greek hymns this epithet or the feminine παυμασώλεω is addressed as a divine epithet to various gods: Zeus in Orph. hymn. 73.3 and Alcaeus fr. 308 2(b) (ed. Lobel-Page, PLF), and Artemis in Orph. hymn. 36.11 (see also Keyssner p. 45f.).

In Christian poetry it is used (as Golega informs us: Golega p. 63) about twenty five times in Apoll. Met. Ps. e.g. 74.2, 112.6 (both in the same sedes); cf. also Nonn. par. Jo. 1:23 (M. 43.753B) and AP 1.97.3 (where, however, it seems to refer to the emperor Justinian).

On the epithets in παυ- (which are used in the hymns under
The same idea, namely that Christ is the King of all may be seen also in 1.1.30.21; while the same is said of the Godhead in 1.1.33.1=1.1.34.1 (see the note ad loc.).

2. πανευφημις: This is a rare epithet and the various Lexica cite it in texts later than Gregory's age. See e.g. Ps.-Dionysius Areop. Coel.hier.7.4 (M.3.2120): πανευφημιων θεαρχηαν and paraphras. Pachymer. (236B).

2. παναγίω: As a term used of the Holy Spirit the epithet appears frequently in the formulaic triadological doxology whereby a number of prayers in the Liturgy of St James and that of St Mark end: Liturg.Jac. (Brightman p.31.13): τῷ παναγίῳ ἀγαθῷ ζωοποιῷ καὶ όμοουςῳ σου πνεύματι (cf. pp.32.13, 22, 41.21, 43.17 etc.) and Liturg.Marc. (Br. p.122.5, 123.30). However, the first instance in patristic writings of this epithet (yet referring to God) seems to be Clem. Rom. 1Cor.35 (Lightfoot p.108): see Lightfoot's note ad loc. and ib.58 (L. p.169). See also Const.Apost. 8.12.29 and Deichgräber p.99.

II. Praise (3-10)

3. ἡ Τριάς εἰς θεός ἐστιν: This phrase is a concise declaration of the triadological dogma and is expressed with some degree of didacticism, a characteristic of Byzantine hymnography (see above the note on 1.1.33.3b).

The subject of the tri-une God is largely discussed by Gregory, not only in his orations (above all the five theological treatises), but also in his poems (see Trisoglio, Forma Futuri, p.737 n.153). Some of these passages are cited below to show verbal similarities with our hymn. These are: De Virtute: carm.1.2.10.992 (752): / Εἰς ἐκ τριάν θεός τε καὶ κοινὸν σέβας, 1.1.3.60 (413): / ἐκ μονάδος Τριάς ἐστι, καὶ ἐκ Τριάδος μονάς αὐθεν, or. 39.12 (M.36.3480): Εἰς οὖν θεός
The expression εἰς τεός (which is very common in Gregory's Arcana poems: 1.1.1.25 (400), 1.1.3.75, 76 (414), 1.1.4.3, 39 (416, 418)) may be traced on the one hand in Greek philosophy back to Xenophanes fr. 23 (ed., H. Diels, PPF p. 42), and on the other in the Bible: Ep. Jac. 2.19 (see Deichgräber p. 115f.). See also Ps.-Phocylidea 54 (PLG ii p. 89 Bergk), and Orac. Sibyl. 2.126, 3.11 and fr. 1.7. Furthermore, the same expression (followed by a relative clause which refers to the creation as happens in our hymn) is used in Soph. fr. 1126 (Pearson): εἰς ἑστὶ θεός, δὲ οὐρανὸν τ' ἔτευξε καὶ γάτων μακρὰν/ πόντου τε χαροπὸν οἶδομα κάνειμιν βῶς./ and Orac. Sibyl. fr. 3.3: / ἀλλὰ θεὸς μόνος εἰς καυσαρτατος, δὲ πεποίηκαν/ οὐρανὸν (see also ib. 1.8, 3.35, 543, 786 and 8.375).

3b-6: Creation and preservation of the world

On this subject see the notes on 1.1.33.3f., 1.1.34.2f. and 2.1.38. 12b-14.

3. εἰς ἑστὶς ... πάντα: Cf. 1.1.33.3b, 1.1.30.13 and 1.1.32.

9. In line 7 God is called κτύσης as happens in Synes. hymn. 3.16 (see Terzaghi's note ad loc. where references to other passages are cited).

Lines 4-5: Their content, standing in apposition to ἔξωσε τε

---

1. A.C. Pearson, (The Fragments of Sophocles, vol. iii (Camb., 1917), p. 174) seems to be right to cast doubts on the authenticity of this fragment by suggesting that it 'reads like a Hellenized paraphrase from a Hebrew prophet of the Old Testament.'
πάντα (3), reminds us of a passage in the anaphora of the Liturgy of St Mark (Brightman p.125.25ff.): σοι τῷ ποιήσαντι τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὰ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, γῆν καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ, ἀλάσσας πηγὰς κοσμούσις λύμας καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς, and a similar one in Epist.Diognet. 7.2 (Marrou, SC, p.68): ὃ (sc. Ἀδαμ) πάντα διατέτακταν καὶ οὐκέτας τα καὶ οὕτως, ὡς καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ, ἀλάσας καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ ἁλάσσῃ. The two passages seem to be based on LXX Ps. 145.6, 2Esd. 19.6 and Apoc.14.7. Finally, note the word-pattern in line 4: a-b-a-b (where we have two pairs of words with parallel construction) and the polysyndeton in line 5.

5. πάντον καὶ ποταμοῦ: The phrase is in the same sedes in Ps.-Manetho 1.206.

6. πάντα ὄσοι: Cf. 1.1.33.4 and the note ad loc. Besides, ὃ ὄσοι (referring to God) may be found in Pap.Mag.Gr. iv.1162; in 1282 and vii.530 it is used of the sun. See also Orph. hymn.38.3, where Κοσμητέρες are called ὄσοις ξοιοί, and van Liempt p.47.

Lines 7-10: The Creation and particularly the rational natures praise God

A similar subject appears in Gregory’s or.44.11 (M.36. 620B):

Πάντα τεθε急于 καὶ δοξάζει φωνάς ἀλάλητος· ἐκ πάσι γὰρ εὐχαριστεῖται δι’ ἐμοὶ τεθεῖς· καὶ οὕτως ὁ ἐκείνων ὤμος ἡμέτερος γύνεται, καὶ δὲν ἐγὼ (sc. Gregory) τὸ ὄνειρόν λαμβάνω. See also 2.1.38.23-26 and the notes ad loc.

Line 7: The image of the Creation praising its Creator goes back to the Old Testament: LXX Tob.8.5: εὐλογοῦσας σε (sc. God) ... πάσαι αἱ κτίσεις σου (cf. ib. 15) and Job 38.7: ὦτε ἐγεννήθησαν ἄστρα, ἤλεσάν με (sc. God) φωνῇ μεγάλῃ κάντες ἀγγελοὶ μου. An elaborate example of this image may be the whole of Psalm 148 where in line 5 we read: αἰνειειδοῦσαν (sc. all the parts of Creation) τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου· ὥτε αὐτὸς εἶπε καὶ ἐγεννήθησαν, αὐτὸς ἐνετεύλητο καὶ
However, this is not the only poem to follow the Biblical practice, since this may be seen also in Synes. hymn.1. 343f.: 'Ελθών το άνθρωπον τον θεόν ανήρων' which is followed by an enumeration in thirteen lines of the various elements of Creation, all in apposition to άνθρωπον.

7. σοφόν: The addition of this epithet, made to describe the Creator, is in accordance with e.g. LXX Sap.9.2, or Ps.103.24: άνθρωπον άνθρωπον άνθρωπον (which is used in Liturg.Marc. (Brightman p. 126.2)). Cf. 1.1.33.3: άνθρωπος and the note ad loc.

7. κρίς: ὑμνήσεως: Cf. 1.1.4.1 (415). On ὑμνήσεως as a common verb for introducing Greek pagan hymns see above p.23. The same verb is used in 1.1.29.2 and in other Christian hymns: Clem. Alex. hymn. Christ. 8 ap. Paed. (Heitsch p.158), Synes. hymn.1.210f., 2.80, 82, 87, 3.1, 8.3 etc.

Line 8: All comes into existence and is preserved because of God who is the first cause (ἵπτώτης αὐτῶν), since He is also Ἥπτωτης οὐσία or φύσεως (cf. or.28.7 (Gallay p.114; M.36.33C) and ib. 31 (p.172;72A)). The present passage may be compared to De Virtute: carm.1.2.10. 942-45 (748):

Θεόν το μὴ σέβεσθε μὲν ἐστ' ὀλοκληρωμένον,
μηδ' αὐτῶν τιν' εἰδέναι πρώτην δύνα.
ἐς ἄς το άνθρωπα καὶ προσήκει καὶ μένει
τάξει τ' ἀφρότητα καὶ λόγῳ προσδόμενα.

On the theme of God as the first cause see also or.28.13 (Gallay p.128; M.36.44A), or.31.14 (Gallay p.302; M.36.149A), ib.30(p.336f.; 168C) and Moreschini p.1385)

8. μόνον: The addition of the word is made in order to emphasize God's power, and by doing so the poet follows a common practice of Greek pagan hymns in which expressions with μόνον are regularly used (see above p.29 ). Such expressions are found
also in NT and are used of God or Christ: Ep.1Tim.1.17, Judae 4.25 (see Deichgräber p.101). They are found in 1.1.30.26 and 1.1.29.4, 5 too.

9. λογική ... φύσει ... άεύθυ : Cf. Const.Apost.7.35.10 : σοε (sc. God). ή ἐπάξεις προσκύνησις ὀφείλεται παρὰ πάσης λογικῆς καὶ άγγελικῆς φύσεως, 8.37.6 and or.28.13 (Gallay p.128; M.36.44A): ἐφύσεται μὲν πάσα λογικὴ φύσις θεοῦ καὶ τῆς πρώτης αἰτίας. Besides, in 1.1.30.12 man is called λογικὸν ζῴον (see the note ad loc.). Here λογική φύσει may apply to mankind and angels alike.

It is worthwhile to mention that the poet chooses appropriately the content of both hymns (one in lines 7-8 and the other in 9-10) to match with the relationship with God of those who offer them. Thus, in the former hymn all creation (possibly the irrational) cannot but unconsciously celebrate its Creator as the only Cause of its existence and preservation. On the other hand, the content of the latter hymn (i.e. that God is great King and kind Father) is in accordance with the more personal relationship of rational beings with God who is Himself rational and may consequently be known only by them.

In distinguishing the two hymns in this way the poet appears to follow similar ideas in Greek philosophy e.g. the Stoics (see below the notes on 1.1.30. 10-12).

9. διὰ κανόνος άευση : The expression with διὰ κανόνος is equivalent to those with ἀεί or ἀνανεικαί which are found in 1.1.33. 11 and 1.1.34.10 respectively (see the notes ad loc.), and serves the same purpose: it underlines the devotee's ceaseless hymn. Such an expression appears in 1.1.30.37 too and is occasionally used in Greek pagan hymns: Cleanth. hymn.14 and Soph. Až.705 (see Keyssner p.34 ). Examples of the same expression may be found in the Psalms too: LXX Ps.33.2, 39.12, 17, 69.5, 70.6, 14, 71.15, and Orac.Sibyl.
fr. 1.17 (see Smolak p. 446 n. 64).

On ἀειδεῖν (as a verb used to introduce hymns) see above p. 23.

As in 2.1.38.25f. (see the note ad loc.) so here the only reason for man's existence is to praise God. This is also the primary duty of man according to Xenophanes fr. 1.13f. (ed. H. Diels, PPF, p. 35): κρή δὲ πρῶτον μὲν θεὸν ύμνεῖν εὐφρονας ἄνδρας/ εὐφήμους μυθοὺς καὶ καθαροῖς λόγοις*.  

10. Βασιλέα μέγα: This is a LXX expression and is used primarily in the Psalms which celebrate the kingship of God: LXX Ps. 46.3, 47.3 and 94.3. Cf. besides Orph. hymn. Prooem. 37 (Asclepius), Pap. Mag. Gr. iv. 243, and Orac. Sibyll. 3.499, 616. The same phrase appears in Gregory's or. 7. 17 (M. 35. 776C); while Βασιλεύς τῶν δῶν is used in or. 2. 61 (Bernardi p. 172; M. 35. 472Af.), and the invocation ζάντων Βασιλεύς in 1. 33. 1 (= 1. 34. 1): see the note ad loc. and Gottwald p. 24.

10. ἄγαθον πατέρα: Cf. Clem. Rom. 1 Cor. 56 (Lightfoot p. 165. 19f.) and 1. 34. 29a.

Note the verbal and structural correspondence between the two couplets: 7-8 and 9-10.

III. Prayer (11-12): A request to the Father to grant the poet the ability to glorify Him appropriately

Line 11: With the polysyndeton in this line the poet wants to underline his wish to glorify God with the entire of himself, however, the four words used in the line were not chosen at random, since they may be grouped into two pairs: one with parallel ideas (καὶ ἔλεγον - ἐεὐχὴ), and the other with opposite ones (γλῶττα - διάνοια). Cf. 1. 34. 24: κραδύλα καὶ χείλεσι, and the note ad loc.

12. δὸς: On requests with this verb see the note on 1. 34. 26, and Smolak p. 435 n. 36.

12. καὶ ἐμοὶ: The function of this phrase is the same as that of καὶ γὰρ in 1. 34. 14: as in the latter hymn the poet wants to join
with the heavenly choir in their hymn to God, so in this hymn he, as a rational being, wants to imitate the example of the rational natures in glorifying God.

12. (οῦς) καθαρὸς δοξολογεῖν σε : Cf. carm. 1.2.1.2 (521):/ ἐκ καθαρῆς κρατίης καθαροὶς μέληντες (sc. παρθενίην) ἐν ὄμως/. A similar request closes the hymnodic epilogue in carm. 2.1.1.634 (1017): (καὶ μοι ἡμᾶς) ... ὄμως σε δυνακέσσοι γεραίρενν/. See also Synes. hymn. 1.60-71: ἦν σοι φύσι/ καθαρὰ παθῶν, .../(68) κα-θαρᾶ γλώσσα/ γνώμα θ' ὀσύρ/ τὸν ὀμιλϊμουν/ ὄμων ἀποίη/. An elaborate example which shows with the repetition of καθαρὸς (οὐ-ρ复试) seven times the importance of purity (since it is the presupposition for praising God properly) is Serap. Euch. 10. 1-2:

Κύριε ... ἐνε τῶν λογικῶν πνευμάτων, ἐνε ψυχῶν καθαρῶν καὶ πάντων τῶν ... καθαρῶς ἐπικαλουμένων, ὡστε γνώσιμον τοῖς καθαροῖς πνεύμασιν, ... ὄμως τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ταύτην ... καθαρὰν ἐκκλησίαν εἶναι, ... ἦν δυ-νατὴ καθαρῶς ὄμως σε.

Cf. LXX Job 16.18 which is used in Liturg. Marc. (Brightman p. 135.13).

On the subject of purification see the notes on 1.1.34.21 and 26, and 1.1.32. 45-46.

The patristic verb δοξολογεῖν appears in Serap. Euch. 13.1, Liturg. Jac. (Brightman p. 50.13) and the Morning hymn ap. Const. Apost. 7.47.2.

12. Μάτηρ : The invocation calls back to πατέρα (10) and Μάτηρ (1). See also above the note on this invocation in 1.1.34.14.

The short elegiac hymn we have just discussed is the only hymn from the present group which is not written entirely on the 'du-Stil', but on the contrary the Introduction and Praise are built on the 'er-Stil' and only the two-line Prayer is in 'du-Stil'. Thus, the
hymn appears to comply with the practice commonly followed in the Homeric hymns.

As has been said in the introductory analysis the hymn may be characterized as a doxology. Besides, the similarity in the subject of the first and last couplets gives the poem a ring form.

The addressee of the hymn in the Introduction is all the three persons of the Trinity; while Praise is devoted to the Trinitarian God and the request is made to God the Father. The themes used in the Praise are both commonly found in Christian hymns and prayers, and are based mainly on the Bible.

The transition from Introduction to Praise and from there to Prayer is made asynetically.

In 1.1.31 there are various features common in hymns as: anaphora (δόξα:1,2), expressions with πᾶς(3,6,7),μόνος(8), διὰ ταύτας (9), epithets in πᾶν- (1,2), verbs of singing (7,9), an imperative of δοξολογεῖν (12) and the patristic verb δοξολογεῖν(12).

Finally, one may observe that the elegiac couplet with its symmetrical form, added to the balanced subject division of the hymn (Introduction: 1 couplet, Praise: 2 x 2 and Prayer: 1), helps the poet to build a well-constructed hymn in which the rhetorical figures are plentiful: isocolon, homoioteleuton (4a, 4b), polysyndeton (5,11), anaphora (10a-10b), alliteration of 'κ' (used six times in 5f.), chiasmus (10) and repetition within one line of words from the same root (7: κύριος, κύριος).
III.4. Carmina 1.1.30 and 1.1.32

The next poems to be discussed are 1.1.30 and 1.1.32. Both may form a group, not only because, as we have seen above, they follow a similar MS tradition, but also because they are written in short verses: the former in anacreontic and ionic dimeters with two exceptions and the latter in a non-quantitative metre (see above p.55ff.).

Their metrical form appears to affect their style. While in the hexameter and elegiac hymns (already discussed) the epic forms, archaisms, heavy compounds and rare words are abundant and determine their solemn and elevated style, 1.1.30 and 1.1.32 do not contain such forms, but rather expressions from koine and the imperial period. Such expressions give them a style which is closer to the ordinary speech and is thus similar to that of the various prose liturgical hymns and prayers. Besides, as is discussed in the commentary on these hymns, their similarity to other early Christian hymns and prayers in terms of themes and expressions used in them is greater than that of the hexameter and elegiac hymns. Therefore, Krumbacher's observation about the dualism in style of Byzantine hymnography may equally well apply to that of the two categories of hymns in the present research: the solemnity and elevation of style in the hexameter and elegiac hymns is replaced by simplicity and 'vulgarism' in those written in short lines (see K. Krumbacher, Geschichte der Byzantinische Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des Oströmischen Reiches : Handbuch des kl. Altertums-Wissenschaft ix.1 (München, 1891), p.340).

Carm. 1.1.30

Let us now come to 1.1.30. This hymn is the only one of the present group to have been analysed and commented (see K. Smolak,

In my analysis of the content of 1.1.30 I follow Smolak in general lines without going into as much detail as he does since such a treatment of subdividing the major sections of 1.1.30 is, I think, mechanical and superfluous, and involves the risk of overschematization and at the same time of splitting into parts what is in actual fact a unity.

The poet begins the hymn with an address to the sole-ruler, king and lord in order to grant him the ability to praise Him properly (1-3). As Smolak observes (p.427f.), the structure of line 4 with ὅτι ὅν leads over to the following section (5-12), with which it forms a structural unity; while at the same time its content with ὁμοιός and ἀνθρώπος connects it to the introductory section: cf. ἄνθρωπον, ἄνθρωπον (2).

In lines 5-12 ὅτι ὅν is used six times in anaphora, introducing each time a different object (animate or inanimate) in the chronological order of its creation: ἀγγελοί, ἄνθρωπος, ἡλίας, σελήνη, ἀστρα, ἀνθρώπος. Behind this arrangement Smolak (p.427) discerns the Neoplatonic order of: 1) κόσμος νοητός (5-6), 2) κόσμος αἰσθητός (7-9) and 3) man (10-12) by regarding ἄνθρωπος as hypostatized beings (p.438f.). The refutation of such an interpretation is made below in the note on ἄνθρωπος. The ultimate purpose of this section is to praise God by reference to the task each part of the created order is destined to fulfill. As has been said in the case of 2.1.38. 12b-26 (which is built on the same principles) the praise of God by reference to the various parts of Creation is particularly Biblical and is exemplified in the Psalms and other hymns and prayers of OT.
The following section (13-15) introduced by γάρ explains why the various parts of creation praise God: God created everything giving it order and preserving it with His providence.

Line 16, as Smolak also observes (428), serves the same double purpose as line 4: a) it completes the act of creation according to the Biblical exposition of it by adding that it took place only by the word of God and b) it leads over to the content of the following subsection (17-21): the characteristics and participation of the second person of the Trinity (significantly here called Logos) in the creation of the world.

In lines 22-24 the poet refers to the work of the Holy Spirit (to protect and preserve everything). So, while the first major part of Praise (4-12) refers to the Godhead, the second (13-24) is shared among the three persons of the Trinity: a) the Father (13-16), b) the Son (17-21) and c) the Spirit (22-24). Extending his observations further Smolak (p.429) sees a thematical correspondence between: 1) lines 13-14 and 20, and 2) 15 and 22-24.

The reference separately to the three persons of the trinitarian God leads over to the third part of Praise (25-35) which is devoted to an exposition of the nature and characteristics of the Trinity expressed in a series of epithets and participial phrases in the mode of the Orphic hymns on the one hand and of the Synesian on the other.

The three-fold Praise is followed by the Prayer (36-49) which is addressed to the Father as does that in 1.1.34 and 1.1.31. It begins and ends with the common request for mercy, while the rest of the petitions (for forgiveness of sins and cleansing of the poet's conscience) are interrelated since they all aim at making the poet able to praise God and Christ properly.

Finally, the hymn ends with a formulaic doxology (50-51) which derives from its Biblical counterparts.
As has been seen from the analysis of the hymn, there is fluent transition from one section to another without sometimes clear demarcations (cf. lines 4 and 16). Nevertheless, subdivisions are made below in the commentary but are intended only to facilitate the exposition of the material.

It has been noticed by Wilamowitz (Sitz. Berl. Akad., 1 (1907), p. 279) that the structure of this hymn with the anaphora of ὅτι ὅν (seven times) and the parallel cola (κόμωτα) is similar to that of Synesius's hymns. These similarities explain why this hymn (together with 1.1.32) has been appended to various early editions of Synesius's hymns (see above p. 86f.). Besides, a number of expressions used in the present hymn may be found in Biblical prayers, for instance that of Simon the high priest in LXX ziMacc. 2.2ff. Introduced by phrases like: κόμως τὰ γόνατα (1), and τὰς χεῖρας προτεόνας εὐτάκτως (1), Simon's prayer includes expressions such as: βασιλεὺς τῶν οὐρανῶν (2), δέσποινα πάσας τῆς κτίσεως (2), μονος (2), σύ γὰρ ὁ κτίσας τὰ πάντα (3), ἀπαλείφων τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν (19), and ἐξήθησαν τὸ ἔλεος σου (19). All these expressions, as well as the anaphora of σὺ in 3–9, find their parallels in the present hymn. However, in general the two texts differ, not only because 1.1.30 refers mostly to the Trinitarian God, while the Biblical prayer to the Godhead, but also because Simon the archpriest prays on behalf of a community and therefore his petitions are expressed in the plural, while 1.1.30 is a private hymn addressed to God by an individual about his own particular needs.

1. The text of line 1 is not found in Swete's edition of LXX, but in that of A. Rahlfs.
I. Introduction (1-3): The Sole-ruler is implored to grant the poet the ability to praise Him

1. of: The emphatic position of the second person pronoun (here referring to the Godhead) at the beginning of hymns, or a section of them, may be seen in 1.1.32.1, 19, 21, 33, 39 (but ouv oof) and 46, Mag. hymn. Typhon (ed. Heitsch p.185f.) = Pap. Mag. Gr. iv. 261-73 in which of is in anaphora in the first ten lines, and Synes. hymn. e.g. 1. 12-14, 23, 25-27, 191-96 and 2. 1-4 (see above the note on 1.1.33.1).

1. θεόνομα: On this universal divine epithet see the note on 1.1.34.6 and the examples cited in Smolak p.435 n.39.

1. μονάρχην: In line 26 this title refers to the Trinity. In Greek pagan literature it mainly refers to men (cf. Solon fr.9.3 (West) and Theogn. 52). As a divine epithet μονάρχης seems to have replaced μόναρχος which is used in Aesch. Prom. 324 of Zeus and Pap. Mag. Gr. xii. 264 of god (cf. also Smolak p.435 n.37). The latter epithet (i.e. μόναρχος) is found once in LXX 3Macc.2.2 (in the prayer to God by Simon mentioned above in the introductory analysis of 1.1.30); and thereafter in a prayer from the Clementine Liturgy in Const. Apost. 8. 11.2 (Brightman p.12.11), and in Orac. Sibyl. 3.11, 704.

Line 2: At the beginning of his hymn the poet asks God to grant that he may praise Him. Similar requests may be found in 1.35.2 (see the note ad loc.), Hom. hymn. 10.5: δός δ' ἀμερόθεσαν ἀνε-δήν (cf. Hesiod. Theog. 104) and Synes. hymn. 7.47: οὖν τοὺς ἀνέδειν δε-δείου, although in the last two passages the requests appear towards the end of each hymn. The present request paves the way to the Praise which follows and both of them anticipate the Prayer.

On requests with δός see the note on 1.1.34.26.

The late Greek verb ἀνεξάταυ which is used also in 1.1.34.11, Nonn. Dion. 24.328, 31.66 and the Appendix to AP 6.261.18 (ed. Cougny, 1890 p.519) does not appear to have been used in order to begin any
Greek pagan or early Christian hymn is the case with the common verb ἀναίων (see above p. 23). The latter verb is found in 1.1.33.11, 1.1.34.10 and 1.1.31.9. The close position of verbs of singing may be seen also in 1.1.31.7,9, Clem. hymn.6 and Clem. Alex. hymn.Christ.7f. ap. Paed. (ed. Heitsch p.158).

3. ἀναίων: On this universal divine epithet see the note on 1.1.36.1.

3. ἄσκοτην: This is another universal divine epithet, used of many Greek gods (see above p. 25 and Eur. Hippol.88), and often found in the Magic papyri (see T. Schermann, 'Griechische Zauberpapyri und das Gemeinde- und Dankgebet im I. Klemensbrieven', TU 34. 2b (Leipzig, 1909), p.22f.). As a Biblical epithet (see e.g. LXX 1Esd. 4.60, Ecclus.23.1, the Nunc dimittis in Ev.Lc.2.29 and Act.4.24) it has been widely used in Christian literature: Clem.Rom.1Cor.7 (see Lightfoot's note ad loc.), and in the liturgical prayers and those found in the Apostolic Constitutions and Serapion's Euchologion.

In these three introductory lines the poet praises God by reference to His kingship and lordship seen in the three epithets he uses. These themes are commonly found both in Greek pagan hymns and the Biblical Psalms and prayers.

II. Praise (4-35)

As is noted in the introductory analysis this may be divided into three sections: a) 4-12, b) 13-24, and c) 25-35.

a) 4-12: The Godhead is praised by reference to the work each part of creation is destined to fulfil.


The juxtaposition of ὦμοις and ἀνδρεύς may be found also in the Evening hymn ap. Const.Apost.7.48.3, and in Serap. Euch.13.1. Both
words are defined in Gregory’s *carm.* 1.2.34.143f. (955f.) which Smolak mistakenly regards as inauthentic (p.437), possibly having confused this poem with *carm.* 1.2.32(916-27): θυμικα δυστυχα - first disputed by Davids (see Davids pp.51-55 and Lefherz p.71f.). The two definitions run:/ αλνος δ’ έξαινος είς θεον σεβάσμονος./ δ’ ήνος αλνος ἐμελής.

As has been maintained the repetition of various predications (here δυ’ δυ is repeated seven times) is a characteristic of Hellenic and oriental texts alike (see Norden p.168ff., particularly p.175 where reference is made to our hymn). Besides, on the feature of anaphora in the hymns under discussion see above the note on 1.1.33.8.

δυ’ δυ : Cf. Hesiod. *Oper.* 3: / δυ τε δυάδ which is used in anastrophe and refers to Zeus (see West’s note ad loc., and Norden p.259 n.1). A quadruple anaphora of this expression is found in Anacreontea 36. 7-10 (FLG iii p.319 Bergk): (ἀναμελήφομεν δ’ Ἥδεων)

... δυ’ δυν η μέθη λοχεθηθεν,/ δυ’ δυν η χάρεις ἑτέχθηθε,/ δυ’ δυν ἀμασεται λυπα,/ δυ’ δυν ευνάζετ’ ἀνύα./ and a triple in a passage from a tomb inscription mentioned in Philostratus *Vita Apollonii* 4.13 and referred to by Norden p.50 n.4: ναξ Παλάμηνες, δυ’ δυν λόγου, δυ’ δυν Μούσας, δυ’ δυν ἐγώ. An elaborate example from Patristic literature (though of a slightly later period than Gregory’s ) is a prose hymn to the Virgin Mary by Cyril of Alexandria which is found in his *homiliae diversae* 4 (Μ.77.992Bf.) and is formed mostly of eighteen cola, each beginning with δυ’ ἡς or δυ’ ἤν. Cf. finally, Ep. *Heb.* 2.10.

Line 5 : Cf. *or.* 7.17 (Μ.35.776B): ἀγγέλων ... χορεύων and Gottwald p.47f. for other references to χορεύα from Gregory’s orations; also Synes. *hymn.* 9.92, 4.18f., 2.1.38.47f. and the note on 1.1.34.6: ἀγγελικῆς στρατης.

refers to the eternity of the next life and 1.1.4.63 (420): αἰῶνες κενεοτάνυ υπέρτονος ἐμβασιλεύων, / (α.ρ. θ. k.) where αἰῶνες κενεοτάνυ is interpreted by Sykes (see his note ad loc.) as 'ages devoid of temporal events' and is considered as equivalent to the singular αἰών, 'eternity'. Gregory defines eternity in *carm. 1.2.34.14* (946) as:

/ αἰῶν, διάστημα ἀχρόνως ἀει ἱδέον, / and describes it in more detail in *or. 38.8* (M.36.320Af.) = *or. 45.4* (628C): Αἰῶν γὰρ οὐτε χρόνος, οὐτε χρόνου τι μέρος οὐδὲ γὰρ μετρητὸν ἀλλ’ ἀνεπ ἡμῖν ὁ χρόνος ἡλίου φορημένος (cf. Ps.-Plat. definit. 411b). τούτῳ τοῖς ἄγωνοις αἰῶν τὸ συμπαρεκτελευμένον τοῖς ὀδόν, οἴων τι χρονικὸν κύμημα καὶ διάστημα; see also *or. 29.3* (Gallay p.182; M.36.77A) and Gallay’s note ad loc.

As is mentioned in the introductory analysis, Smolak considers the plural αἰῶνες as hypostatized beings and suggests that Gregory must have been influenced by Greek magic papyri to include them in an otherwise orthodox poem. In these papyri God is said to reign over αἰῶνες and the Demiurge is called Αἰῶν αἰῶνος. However, he admits that perhaps Gregory might have found in the Biblical expression Σα- σιλεύς τῶν αἰῶνων (Ep. 1Tim. 1.17), which is a doxological predication of God, justification for using the plural αἰῶνες in this hymn. The same scholar then goes on to cite two passages from St Ignatius of Antioch where αἰῶνες appear in his view to have an astral character (p.438f.).

It is true that the plural αἰῶνες ('aeons') as hypostatized beings/powers had considerable importance in: a) Neoplatonism (see e.g. Procl. Inst. Theol. 53 ed. Dodds and his note ad loc.), b) Hermetic literature and Magic papyri (see Le R.P. Festugière, La Révélé- tion d’Hermès Trismégiste, vol. iv (Paris, 1954), chapter viii: Aiôn dans les textes Hermétiques', ch. ix: Aiôn en dehors de l’Hermétisme', pp.152-99), and c) Gnosticism (see Hippol. haer. vi.29.3ff. (COS 3 p.
It is also well-known that on a number of occasions in his works Gregory made serious attacks on Gnosticism. See for instance or.41.2 (M.36.429c): καὶ τὴν ὄγδοσά καὶ τριακάτα (sc. τιμῶσιν) οἱ ἀπὸ Σώμωνος καὶ Μαρκιάνου, οὐς δὲ καὶ ὑσαριθμοὺς τῶν Αἰώνως ἑκονομάζοντες καὶ τιμῶσιν, or.36.16(233c): Φεσύοντας (sc. the flock of Christ) ὧσαλεντίνον τὴν τοῦ ἐνός εἰς ὅνο κατατομῆν, οὐκ ἀλλον τοῦ ἁγαθοῦ τὸν Ἀπολουργὸν πιστεύοντες καὶ τὸν Βυθὸν καὶ τὴν Συγκαὶ τῶν μυθικῶς Αἰώνας, τὰ Βυθὸ καὶ Συγκαὶ δύνας ἄξων καὶ De Vita Sua: carm.2.1.11.1165ff. (Jungck p.110; M.37.1109): οἱ τὸν Βυθὸν Συγκαὶ τε προχρόνους φύσεως/ τιμῶντες αἰῶνας τε τοὺς θηλάζοντες, Εὐμνωνος ὅς τοῦ Μάγου. For further instances and a discussion on Gnosticism see Jungck's note ad loc.

In view of the above criticism by Gregory I cannot accept that the plural αἰῶνες here are meant by Gregory to be considered as hypostatized beings; nor that they found their way into the hymn because of the influence either of any of the above texts, or particularly of the magic papyri (as Smolak claims). The reason why I reject this view is because references to αἰῶνες are found outside the areas covered by these texts: in the Bible there are such references which not only were accepted by the early Church, but were even introduced in liturgical prayers and various confessions. I am referring particularly to two passages from the epistle to the Hebrews: one in 1.2: δε' οὖ (sc. of the Son) καὶ ἐποίησεν (sc. God) τοὺς αἰῶνας; and the other in 11.8: Πύλῃ νοοῦν κατηγοροῦν τοὺς αἰῶνας ἀτίματε θεοῦ. The former was introduced for instance in the Anaphora of Liturg.Bas. (Brightman p.325.22ff) and the latter was incorporated in various Creeds (cf. Hahn p.143 and 145).

Despite the ambiguous meaning of αἰῶνες in the two Biblical passages (Bauer s.v. αἰῶν 3.interprets αἰῶνες as 'the world' as a
spatial concept and Westcott on Heb.1.2 simply 'the world'(see his note). These two passages could have led Gregory directly or indirectly through the intermediary of liturgical prayers and confessions - which should have been familiar to him - to include αἰῶνες in his poem.

Therefore, both Ep.1Tim.1.17 (mentioned already by Smolak) and the two passages from the epistle to the Hebrews provide not a possible (as Smolak wants to believe) but a certain justification for Gregory's use of the plural αἰῶνες here. Besides, Ep.Heb.1.2 seems to be also the source for Gregory's or.39.12 (M.36.348B) where the Son is called παντός χρόνων (here χρόνων must have been used instead of αἰῶνες of the Biblical passage).

To come now to the meaning of αἰῶνες in our passage: the word in the plural may mean generally either 'the world' as a spatial conception (as the two passages to the Hebrews mean according to Bauer s.v. αἰὼν 3.); or 'ages'/ 'generations' as segments of time (see Bauer s.v. αἰὼν 2.). Here αἰῶνες are described as ἁπαύγιον, an epithet which, according to the above two interpretations, seems to me to mean 'keep going' (but not necessarily 'never ending').

If now, as Sykes suggested (in his note on 1.1.4.63(420) which is cited above), the plural αἰῶνες in our hymn stands for the singular αἰὼν ('eternity': see Bauer s.v. αἰὼν 1.), then ἁπαύγιον should mean 'going on for evermore'.

The position of αἰῶνες second in the list: after angels (who are created, according to Gregory's or.38.9f.(M.36.320C-321A) = or. 45.5f. (629A-0) before the material world; see also Lampe s.v. ἄγγελος II.B.3 and Trempelas, Ἀγγελική, vol.i, p.412f.) and before the celestial bodies and man is appropriate to their sense in the above three interpretations.

In whichever way we interpret αἰῶνες one thing remains clear:
the passage (5-9) (where most of the verbs are omitted and the action in each sentence is implied by the adjectives used in it) is not didactic, but is intended simply to praise God. Therefore, it seems to me fairly certain that even Gregory himself did not have a specific meaning for αἰῶνες in his mind when he composed this hymn.

Line 7: Cf. Synes. hymn. 5.2: πάλιν ἄμερα προλάματε (also ib. 37).

Line 8: Cf. 1.1.36.9a and the note ad loc., or. 28.30 (Gallay p. 170; M. 36.69BF): ἐν οὖ ἐγγὺς σελήνης ψύσιν, καὶ πάθον, καὶ μέτρα φωτός, καὶ ὀρθος. The phrase ὁρθός σελήνης may be found in Ps.-Plat. Axioch. 370b, while in Mag. hymn. Pantocrator. 13 (ed. Heitsch p. 180) = Pap. Mag. Gr. xii. 251 we find ἐν τῇ ὄρθοσ. Cf. Pap. Mag. Gr. xiii. 575. In Christian texts the phrase may be seen in Epist. Diogn. 7.2 (Marrou, SC, p. 68) and Synes. hymn. 1.31. Cf. also Orac. Sibyl. 3.221.

Lines 10-12: The list of the various parts of Creation, given in a chronological order, ends with a reference to man, who, as the king of earthly creation, had to be left last. Such an idea is expressed in Gregory's or. 44.4 (M. 36.612A): ἔστε γὰρ ἄσπερ βασιλεῖ προὐποστήναι τὰ βασιλεῖα καὶ οὕτως εἰσαχθῆναι τὸν βασιλέα (sc. man) πᾶσιν ἥν ὄρθοφροιοῦμενον and Const. Apost. 7.34.6. Man comes last also in the equivalent section in 2.1.38.15-26. But, while there man's task is to sing the glory of Christ (see the note ad loc.), here man's work (which is an ability bestowed on him: ἔλαχεν) is to think of / contemplate (νοεῖν) God, since he is a rational being.

10. σειμνός: Smolak compares in p. 440 n. 52 this epithet with Const. Apost. 3.7.6. Serap. Euch. 1.3 and Orph. hymn. 55.28.

Line 11: Smolak (p. 440) quite unjustifiably sees a parallel to this line in Cleanth. hymn. 4f.: θεοῦ (corr. Pearson) νοεῖν λαχεῖν/ μοῦνοι and Gregory's carm. 1.1.8. 91 (453): ἤγεοίν νοεθήν λάχειν (sc. the soul), by suggesting hazardously that in line 11 νοεῖν replaces
I think that if the poet's intention in lines 10-12 had been to underline man's primary duty to offer hymns to God (as he does in 2.1.38.25f. and 1.1.31.9f.), he could have stated it more clearly.

Line 12: The explanation why man can 'think of /contemplate' God is found in his rationality. The Aristotelian definition that man is a 'rational animal' (λογικὸν ζῷον) : see fr.192. (Rose, 1886) may be found also in the Stoics : e.g. Chrysip. fr.390 (Arnim SVF iii p.95.10) and Philo Alex. ii 182.18 (Cohn-Wendland). Later it became a common topos in Patristic literature (see Lampe s.v. λογικὸς A. and Smolak p.441 n.53). This expression is used quite often in the prayers of Const.Apost. e.g. 7.34.6, 38.5, 8.37.5 and 41.4.

b) 13-24: Participation of the three persons of the Trinity in the creation and preservation of the world

The same subject appears in 1.1.33. 1-4 and 1.1.31. 3-6 (see the notes ad loc.).

Lines 13-16: Creation, order and providence over the world

13. γὰρ: Section 13-24 is the ground for the previous section (4-12): all the parts of creation praise God because He is their Creator. On the introduction of Praise by γὰρ see the note on 1.1. 35.3 and the examples cited by Smolak p.441 n.54.

13.(σὺ γὰρ) ἔκτισες τὰ πάντα: Cf.Apoc.4.11, 1.1.33.3 and 1.1. 31.3 (and the notes ad loc.).

14f. παρέχων ... συνέχον: This is an example of the use of participial predications for the praise of gods (see Norden p.166ff., 201ff. and above p. 25 ). However, such predications are rarely used in our hymns: see two further examples in the same hymn in lines 33f.

Line 14: The order in the creation is underlined in De Virtute:
carm.1.2.10.944f. (748): τὰ πάντα καὶ προῆλθε καὶ μένει... τέταρτος καὶ λόγω τηρομένα, ib.186 (694) and in more detail in or.32.

71. (M.36.181B-D) - a homily on Moderation in Disputes:

τάξει τὰ πάντα ὀλεκουσμηθῆ καὶ ὁ ὀλεκουσμηθεὶς λόγος(...)

αλλὰ διὰ τοῦτο προῆλθεν καὶ διέτερον ἀριθμεῖται καὶ τρίτον καὶ τὰ ἔξης ἕνα τάξεις εὐθὺς συνεισέλθη τοῖς κτήμασιν.

Τάξεως οὖν τὸ πᾶν συνειστῆσαι. Τάξεως συνεχεῖ καὶ τὰ ἐπιγένσια... τάξεις ἐν νοτοῦς... τάξεις ἐν αἰσθητοῖς... τάξεις ἐν ἀγγέλοις... τάξεις ἐν ἀστροῖς... τάξεις ἐν ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς μέτρωσι... τάξεις ἐν στοιχείοις...

Finally, the order in the creation which is governed by providence (cf. line 15) is the subject of or.16.5 (M.35.940B):

πότερον κύσινς τις τοῦ παντὸς ἀταχτὸς καὶ ἀνώμαλος καὶ ἀυγερμότης φορὰ τε καὶ ἀλογία, ὡς οὖν ὁ θεὸς οὐκ οὕτως ἐπιστατοῦντος, καὶ τὸ ἀυτοματον ταῦτα φέρει, ὡς δικεῖ τοὺς ἀσφως σοφοῖς...

η λόγῳ τυλί καὶ τάξεις ὅσπερ ὑπεύθυν τὸ πᾶν ἄπτο ὄρχης καὶ ἐκράτη καὶ συνεδρία καὶ ἐκλυθη κοσμώς, ὡς μόνῳ τῷ κυνησαντὶ γνώριμον, οὕτω καὶ μετακινεῖ, καὶ μετατύπωσαν προφοράς χαλνοὶς ὀδηγομένουν;

All these passages show to some extent a dependence on the Platonic notion of τάξις in the Cosmos: see e.g. Tim.30a ,52e, Leges 898a-b and cf. Gorgias 504a-d and Epinom.982a 7.

Smolak (p.441) notes that τάξις (as well as πρόνοια: 15) is a

1. Gottwald (p.27) thinks that ἀσφως σοφοῖς refers to Aristotle, who, according to Epiphanius Haer.iii.2.9.31 in Doroograph. p. 592 appears to have said: φορὰ τυλί λόγῳ φέρεται ὡς ἐτυχεύ (sc. τὰ κάτωθεν τῆς σελήνης). However, I could not trace such a passage in Aristotle's works. Yet, I think that only τὸ αὐτοματον ταῦτα φέρει' (which is separated from the rest of the passage by Gregory's view in ὡς... ἐπιστατοῦντος) is what Gregory assigns to the 'un-wise wise one', possibly the Greek physical philosophers (notably the atomists) as Aristotle seems to suggest in De Phys.195b 31-198a 13 on spontaneity (τὸ αὐτοματον).
philosophical term, without however giving any evidence for this.
He cites only Athenagoras Legat.10 (Goodspeed, Die Altesten Apologeten, p.325; M.6.909B): ὁ ποιητὴς καὶ δημιουργὸς κόσμου θεός διὰ τοῦ παρ' αὐτὸν λόγου διένεμε καὶ διέταξεν ... καὶ τὸν κόσμον καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν τούτων εὐταξίαν, in order to show that the order in the world was the work of Logos, the second person of the Trinity. Such a view is expressed also by Gregory in or.32.7 (M.36.181B) which is cited above in the same note. The idea of τὰς is recalled by that in 20.

Line 15: Gregory calls God in or.28.6 (Gallay p.110; M.36.32C) πάντων ποιητὴν τε καὶ συνεκτικὴν αὐτόν and in carm.1.1.6.3f. (430) αὐτόν/ ποιητὴν τε καὶ συνεκτικὴν ἀλών (a passage alluding to Aριστotle. De Mundo 6.397b). See also or.31.29 (Gallay p.334; M.36.165C) where the Holy Spirit is said to συνέχεσαι πάντα (the actual text is cited below in the note on line 22). Mason, commenting on the first passage, provides for comparison Ep.Col.1.17: τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ (sc. the Son of God) συνέστηκέν (but the verb here is συνιστάναι and not συνέχεσαι). A more appropriate Biblical passage is LXX Sap.1.7 (which both Gallay and Mason mention when commenting on the third Gregorian passage above).

A similar idea may be found in Xenophon Cyrop.8.7.22: (sc. οὗ θεοῦ) τὴν τῶν δῶν δάσει κατήχησαν καὶ Memorab. 4.3.13: ὁ τῶν δῶν κόσμον συντάττων τε καὶ συνέχων.


15. τῇ προνοίᾳ: Gregory wrote two poems On Providence: carm. 1.1.5 and 1.1.6 (424-38). It is surprising, however, that the word προνοία is used in them only once in 1.1.6.7 (430). The definition of προνοία according to Gregory appears in carm.1.2.34.265 (964): ἡ δ' (sc. ἐστὶν) οἰκλειψός (a hapax meaning according to Lampe s.v. 'guidance'), ὁ φέρει τὸ τάν θεός. On the subject of Providence see
or.40.45 (M.36.424A): Πώστευε τὸν σύμπαντα κόσμου ... προούξ τοῦ 
κοιλήσαντος δωοκούμενον, or.2.35 (Bernardi p.134; M.35.444A): τῆς 
τὰ πάντα συνάδεσθις τε καὶ διεξαγοῦσ τοὺς, or.16.5 (M.35. 
940B) which is cited in the note on line 14, or.32.27 (M.36.205Bf.) 
and De Virtute: carm.1.2.10.188 (694).

The subject of providence in Greek philosophy (e.g. Plotinus and 
the Stoic Epictetus) is discussed by Sykes on carm.1.1.5. See also 
Gottwald p.27f. for various references to Stoic philosophers.

Line 16: Cf. the Biblical expression καὶ εἶλεν (sc. ὅ σεῦ) -
καὶ ἐγένετο in e.g. LXX Gen.1.3 and Ps.32.9: αὐτὸς εἶλεν, καὶ ἐγενή-
θησαν, αὐτὸς ἐνετεύλητο καὶ ἐκτύσησαν (= Ps.148.5). The same Psalnic 
passage is used by Gregory to support his view in or.20.9 (Mossay p. 
74; M.35.1076B): λόγῳ, φησί, τὸ πᾶν ὑπέστησε (sc. God) καὶ βουλήμα-
tα. The close position of λόγον (16) and Λόγος (17) may be explain-
ed in terms similar to those for the choice of the by-name Λόγος in 
1.1.33.3 (see the note ad loc.). Thus, it is not a mere word-play, 
but, on the contrary, it has been cleverly used by Gregory to make 
a theological point.

As has been said in the introductory analysis to the hymn, line 
16 serves the double purpose of: a) expanding the subject of creation 
in lines 13-15 by adding how it took place and b) leading over to 
the content of the following subsection (17-21). Thus, it links these 
two parts. Its importance in the structure of the hymn is obvious 
and totally disproves both Scheidweiler's and Musurillo's suggestions. 
The former claims that line 16 must be omitted because it repeats 
what has been said in line 13; while the latter thinks that a line 
(which should refer to the union of the Father and the Son in the 
creation of the world) has been lost immediately after line 16 (see 
above p. 57).

Lines 17-21: Son's nature in relation to the Father and His
participation in the creation of the world

Line 17: Cf. 1.1.33.3: ἡεός Ὕδος ὁ σὸς Ἀγώς and the note ad loc.

18. ὀμοουσίως: In or.31.7 (Gallay p.288; M.36.140D) and or.30.20 (G. p.268;129B) Gregory states the consubstantiability (τὸ ὀμοουσίων) of the Son with the Father. The cognate noun ὀμοουσιώτης appears in or.40.41 (M.36.417B) : θεόν τὰ τριά (εκ. κρόσω) σὺν ἀλήλους νοούμενα, ἐκεῖνο διὰ τὴν ὀμοουσιώτητα, τούτῳ διὰ τὴν μοναρχίαν.

The epithet was first used in Greek philosophy: e.g. Plot. Enn. iv.4.28.55, 7.10.19, Porphyrius De Abstinentia 1.19.1 and Syrianus in Metaph. (= Comm. in Aristot. Graec., vi.1, p.129.3); in Hermetic literature: Corp.Herm.i.10 (ed. Nock-Festugière p.10); and in Gnosticism: see Lamp. s.v. II. A. Later it was brought into prominence in the patristic literature by the disputes with which the Council of Nicaea was concerned (see Lamp. s.v. II.B.). Its introduction into the Creed may be seen in Symbol.Nic.(325) (Opitz, Athanasiuswerke iii p.44.14; M.20.1540B). See also Hahn p.135, 138, 141, 143 etc.

19. ὁμότιμος τῷ τεκόντι: The Son is ὁμότιμος ('equal in honour') to the Father. The subject of the ὁμοτιμία or τὸ ὁμότιμον of God, and particularly of the Spirit, is often discussed by Gregory: or.29.2 (Gallay p.178; M.36.76B), or.31.12 (G. p.298;145D), or.32.5 (M.36.180A), or.34.11 (252B) and or.31.12 (Gallay p.300;M.36.148A).

The epithet is used in II.15.186 where Poseidon claims to be ὁμότιμος with Zeus, in Nonn. Dion.7.103 to show the relationship of Dionysus to the other gods and in Theocr. Idyl.17.16 where Ptolemy Philadelphus is compared to the gods. Other epithets in ὀμο- or ὀυ- are occasionally used in Greek pagan hymns to describe the relation between two gods, or between a god and his followers (see Keyssner p.129f.).
Line 20: The poet uses the Biblical κτύπεων (13) for the Father, ἐφαρμόζεων (20) for the Son and περιλαμβάνειν (22) for the Spirit (in all cases the verbs are connected with πάντα), not merely for reasons of variation, but above all to show the different function of each person (see above the note on 1.1.33. 3b-4).

Smolak (p.441) compares this line with Cleanth. hymn. 20: εἰς ἐν πάντα συνήθμοιν. Finally, the addition by the editio princeps (ed. 1568) of ἑν ἕφελκυστικόν was necessary to restore the metre.

Line 21: Cf. 1.1.33.1 = 1.1.34.1: πάντων βασιλεῖα, 1.1.31.1: παμβασιλῆς (said of the Son) and the notes ad loc.

Note the syntactical chiasmus in lines 20-21.


22f. περιλαμβάνον ἐδ πάντα/ Ἄγιον Πνεῦμα: Behind this passage one may discern a reference to the notion of the presence of God and particularly of the Holy Spirit in the universe. This notion is based on certain Biblical passages: e.g. LXX Jer.23.24 and Sap.1.7. See Moreschini p.1385f. where this idea is traced in Gregory and other preceding Fathers. The sense of our passage may be illustrated with or.28.8 (Gallay p.114; M.36.33D):

Πῶς ἐδ καὶ σωθησέται τὸ διὰ πάντων διήκειν καὶ πληροῦν τὰ πάντα θεόν, καὶ τὸ ὄχι τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν ἐγὼ πλη- ρῶ; λέγει Κύριος (cf. LXX Jer.23.24) καὶ Πνεῦμα Κυρίου κε- πληρώσει τὴν οἰκουμένην (Sap.1.7), εἰ τὸ μὲν περιγράφου, τὸ ἐδ περιγράφοιτο;

and or.31.29 (Gallay p.334; M.36.1650): (sc. the Holy Spirit) πάντα τῇ οὐσίᾳ πληροῦν, πάντα συνέχουν πληρωτικὸν κόσμου κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν ἄχροντον κόσμῳ κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν ... πληροῦν, οὐ πληροῦμεν, συνέ- χουν, οὐ συνεχόμενον.

The latter passage justifies Smolak's observation (p.429) that there is a thematic correspondence between lines 15 and 23-25.
Besides, the Spirit is called ὁ πνεῦμα τὰ πάντα in a prayer addressed to Him at the beginning of the Third Hour (see Horologion ad loc.).

Finally, passages from Greek and Latin writers alike, in which the similar Stoic idea, namely that god imbues and fills everything, is discussed, are cited in Gottwald p.23 to show the Stoic origin of the Gregorian passages mentioned above. However, such a view is challenged by Moreschini (p.1386).

23. τὸ θεόν: It is added possibly to support the divine nature of the Holy Spirit which was a controversial matter in Gregory's times. See for instance Gregory's or.39.12 (M.36.348C): (τὸ Νῦνα) ... ἐστὶ (sc. because He is) θεός, κἂν μὴ δοκῇ τοῖς ἀθέους and the entire of his fifth theological oration on the Holy Spirit.

Line 24: On providence see above the note on line 15.

c) 25-35: The nature and functions of the Trinity

25. Τριάδα γίνον: The phrase stands for the equivalent common Biblical expression θεός γίνον (e.g. in Ev.Mt.16.16, Act.14. 15), which is used also in Nonn. par.Jo.1:50 (M.43.760A).

Line 26: It is an emphatic pleonasm. The whole verse is contrasted to Τριάδα of the previous line. On the subject of the tri-une God see above the note on 1.1.31.3a. Further relevant passages to this subject are: De Vita Sua: carm.2.1.11.658f. (Jungck p.86; M.37.1074):/ πῶς ἢ μονᾶς τριάδες, ἢ τριάδα πάλιν/ ἑυεξετ' 2.1.12.310ff. (1188): τὸς ἢ Τριάδα μοι, πῶς ἐνύεσται θεός/ καὶ τέμνετ' αἰθας, ἐν σέβας, φύσις μια,/ μονᾶς, Τριάδα τε, or.25.17 (Mossay p.198; M.35.1221C): Νῦν δὲ δύδασκε τοσοῦτον εἰδέναι μόνον, μονᾶδα ἐν Τριάδαι καὶ Τριάδα ἐν μονᾶδι προσκυνουμένην.

In the above passages Gregory tries to explain the tri-une God in terms of a paradox which in the Synesian hymns degenerates into mere word-play. See for instance his hymn.1.210ff.: Ὑμνῷ σε, μονᾶς/ ὑμνῷ σε, τριάδες/ μονᾶς εἰ τριάδες ὠν,/ τριάδες εἰ μονᾶς ὠν,/ The same
subject appears also in Ps.-Dionys. Areop. div.nom. 13.3 (M.3.980D-981A) and 1.4 (589D-592A).

26. μόνον: On the use of expressions with μόνος to praise gods see above the note on 1.1.31.8.

26. μονάρχην: Cf. line 1 and the note ad loc.

27. ψόνων άτρεπτον: Cf. Philo Alex. i.174.16: το μὲν θεόν άτρεπτον and iii.294.7: (έγ' σε. ο θεός) άτρεπτος οὖν. The unchangeableness of the nature of God is expressed in Basil. Eunom.2.23 (Sesbohē, SC, p.92; M.29.621C): τὴν άτρεπτον καὶ ἀναλοιμωτόν οὐσίαν and other passages cited in Lampe s.v. άτρεπτος. Smolak p.443 n.58 quotes a passage parallel to the present one from Chrysostom. hom.3.4 in Rom. (M.60.415): ο θεός, ἢ ... άτρεπτος ψόνως. Besides, the Son is not τρεπτός according to Symbol.Nic.(325): see Hahn p.161 and Opitz, Athanasiuswerke iii p.45.3.

In Greek pagan literature άτρεπτος is used of Μοτα in Nom.
Dion.12.144, 25.365 and Kaibel ep.507.2, though in a different sense.
ψός is repeated in anaphora in the following line. On the device of anaphora in the hymns under discussion see the note on 1.1.33.8: οἶα.

27. ἀναρχον: Cf. 2.1.38.7 and the note ad loc. The epithet in the sense of 'without beginning' may be seen e.g. in Const.Apost.8. 37.2: ὁ ἀναρχος θεός καὶ άτελεύτητος and in a confession cited in Hahn p.178.

Line 28: Cf. or.31.8 (Gallay p.290; M.36.1410): (ο ην ... ὑνωμενοι) ... ὁ ὑπέχειν τῆς οὐσίας άρρητον καὶ ὑπέρ λόγου φύσεως, and below the extended note on God's ineffability in 1.1.29.2,4.
This line may be compared also with Synes. hymn.1.221: ψός άφθαρτος/, ib.236f.: άφθαρτος γόνε/ πατρός άφθαρτοι/, 2.91 and Orph. fr.132.2 (Kern) = fr.305.2 (Abel).

Line 29: As it stands this line literally means (Trinity, I
shall call you) 'a mind full of wisdom and beyond man's reach'.

However, if ἀγίασμα stands here instead of ἀνέφωνον according to the figure of hypallage (see Smyth 3027) the meaning becomes: 'a mind of unattainable wisdom'. The former interpretation makes the line similar to line 30, whereas the latter with line 28.

In either case it is clear that the point made in this line is that God (as Mind) is beyond man's reach. This idea is expressed in similar terms in a confession cited in Hahn p.178: (sc. God) ω ... τὸ μὲν γεύσομαι ἐξ ἐξηγούμενα ... ἀνέφωνον φῦσιν ἀνέφωνον.

In favour of the second interpretation (i.e. that with hypallage) is Carm. 2.1.45.192 (1367): κράτος ἐν ἔνθος ἔχει (sc. God) σοφίας which seems to allude to Ep. Rom. 11.33f.

God (here the Trinity) is called Mind - after the common philosophical idea - also in Orat. 28.13 (Gallay p.126; M. 36.410). See on this the note on 2.1.38.5.

ἀνέφωνον is a fairly rare epithet used in Julian. Orat. 3.26 (82d): ed. Bidez, BL, p.157 to describe the φύσις of deities.

Line 30: 'a ceaseless power over the heavens'. Greek gods were occasionally called κράτος: Aesch. Sept. 127: (Athene) ἐν ἄνεφωνον φιλόμυχον κράτος/, Suppl. 525f.: (Zeus) τελεσθεν τελεότατον κράτος and Orph. Hymn. 12.5 (Heracles). More often they were praised for their κράτος or κράτος: Archiloch. 89.1f. (PLG ii p.408 Bergk): ἐν Ζεύ, κάτερ Ζεύ, σοῦ μὲν οὐρανοῦ κράτος, / σὺ δ' ἔργ' ἐπ' ἀνέφωνον ὄργαν (see also above p.29).

Examples of this idea in early Christian hymns are: Synes. Hymn. 3.62:/ χαύρος, ὁ παλιός (sc. Son of God) κράτος/ and 7.49f.: (ἐκ) ... κάρτευ σῷ (sc. Christ) ... ὑμνοπολεύω. Besides, κράτος appears in the formulaic Biblical doxology with which 1.1.32 ends (see below the note on 1.1.32. 49-50).

31. ἀτέρ ἀρχῆς: Cf. ἄναρχον in line 27.
31. ἀπέραντον: As Smolak notes (p.443 n.58) the epithet is used in Homiliae Clementinae 16.17 and 17.9,10 (M.2.380A,392C,393B) of God or His οὐσία. See Lightfoot's note on Clem.Rom. 1Cor.20.8 (p.72). Here the epithet (probably in a temporal sense) describes θάτος.

The Trinity is an 'infinite power', a notion which seems to recall LXX Ps.144.3: καὶ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ (sc. God) οὐκ ἔστιν πέρας.

32. ἀνατασκόπητον αὐγήν: This passage is the only citation in Lexica of ἀνατασκόπητος which Lampe s.v. renders as 'not to be gazed on'. The Trinity thus is called αὐγή (an alternative for the Biblical φῶς in Ev.Jo.8.12 though it is used of Christ) on which one cannot gaze. Such a notion may be compared to Ep.1Tim.6.15: (God) ὁ ...

... φῶς οἰκών ἀκρατίου ἡν οἶκεν οὐδες ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ ἐδειξαν ἀναταν (cf. Ev.Jo.1.18 and Ep.1Jo.4.12) on which Synes. hymn.1.197f.: (sc. sc. God) φῶς θυρστομενον/ ἡδέας αὐγαῖς seems to be based (cf. Idem 1.118-25 and 158f.).

The same notion may be seen in Orph.fr.65 (Kern) and Pap.Mag.Gr. xii.230.

Line 33: Cf. carm.1.2.1. 176f. (536): (sc. Christ) πάντι ἐφοράθη καὶ πάντα κυθερωθή/ αἵνεν ἄδεα καὶ μεσευθεν ἀκερατος, and 1.1.35.1: πανεπίσκοπε and the note ad loc.

The idea that God sees everything appears both in the Bible: LXX 3Macc.2.21: ὁ πάντων ἔτοιτος θεός and Esth.5.1 (= D.2); and in Greek pagan literature: Soph. Elect.175: / ζεύς, ὃς ἐφοράθη πάντα καὶ κρατοῦνευ, / Archiloch. 88.1f. (cited above in the note on line 30) and Xenophon Cyrop.8.7.22. See also Orac.Sibyl.fr.3.42 and from early Christian literature: Clem. Alex. Strom.vii.2.5,6 (GCS 3 p.6.2) - the passage alludes to Xenophanes fr.24 (Diels, Vorsokr. 1 p.135) - Clem. Rom. 1Cor.59 (Lightfoot p.174) and AP 1.117.2 where Christ is called ἐν κανόνιματος χάρις.

Lines 34-35: They expand the idea in line 33 and may be compared to Ep.Heb.4.13. See also Clem.Rom.1Cor.28.3 (Lightfoot p.92), which is a loose quotation from LXX Ps. 138.7-10, and Pap.Mag.Gr.iv. 1120 : ἀπὸ γῆς ... ἄρχε τῶν περάτων τῆς ἀβύσσου (cf. ib.1210).

III. Prayer (36-49)

The transition to the prayer is made asyndetically (see above p.30). Line 36 = Line 48.

36. Πάτερ: See the note on 1.1.34.14.

36. ζηλεύς γενοῦ μου: On the common requests for mercy which are used in the hymns under discussion see above the note on 1.1.33.5. The expression ζηλεύς γενέσατι is used quite often in the Biblical prayers : LXX Dt. 21.8, 4Macc.6.28 and Num.14.19. It is also addressed to Hermes in Pap.Mag.Gr.v.420.

Note that in 1.1.29.15 the epic and lyric form ζηλεύς is used, while here the late Greek form ζηλεύς was preferred instead. Thus, in both cases the poet appears to obey the laws of form and style.

37. ὁδὸς καντός: Cf. 1.1.31.9 and the note ad loc.

37f. ἡρακεύσων/ τὸ σέβασμα τούτο δῆς μου: Smolak takes τὸ σέβασμα to mean 'worship' (see Lampe s.v.). However, since τούτο denotes something in hand, I think that τὸ σέβασμα τούτο refers more
possibly to Gregory's present hymn (which is written in honour of God and may thus be described as a sort of worship/adoration of Him).

In this case line 37f. appears to repeat in other words the introductory request in line 2, and thus it may be compared to the requests in 1.1.35.2f. and 1.1.31.11f. Such a correspondence between θεραπεύον and ἀνυψεῖν - ἀξιοῦν (2) was noticed also by Smolak (p.447).

Lines 39-41: A request for forgiveness of sins and cleansing of the poet's conscience

Line 39: Cf. Procl. hymn.1.35: καὶ με κάθεσον ἀμαρτάδος although it is used in a different sense.

Line 40f.: Cf. Ep.Heb.9.14: καθαρίζετ (sc. το άλμα του Χριστου) την συνείδησιν ὑμῶν ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἐργῶν εἰς τὸ λατρεῖεν θεῷ τοῦτο, 1Cor. 5.7 (for the use of ἐκκαθαρίζειν), and 1Tim.3.9 and 2Tim.1.3 (which both refer to καθαρά συνείδησιν). The last two Biblical passages are used in Serap. Euch.27.2 and 11.3.

Note the reference for το συνείδης ('conscience', used only in writers of late antiquity: see LSJ and Bauer s.v.) instead of ἡ συνείδησι of the above Biblical passages.

Lines 42-47: The poet expresses in three purpose clauses the reasons why he made his previous requests: in order to glorify God, praise Christ and beg Him to receive him as a servant in His kingdom. That forgiveness of sins and a clean conscience are prerequisites for glorifying God properly has already been seen in 1.1.31.11f. (see the note ad loc.). However, these purpose clauses may serve also the same purpose as the one in 1.1.34.24, namely be a sort of promise which the poet will fulfil if his previous requests receive a favourable answer from God the Father (see above the note on 1.1.34.24).

42. δοξάω: On this verb see above the note on δοξα (sc. ελνα) in 1.1.31.1.
42. τὸ θεῖον: Note the use of this common philosophical term (instead of the more general τὸν θεόν).

Line 43: The allusion to Ep.1Tim.2.8: Ὑπολογάζω οὖν προσεύχεσθαι τοὺς ἄνδρας ... ἐκατορροθαῖ τοὺς χείρας is obvious, although the poet departs from his model when he chooses the more common feminine form ἡ δόξα instead of ἡ δόξος of the Pauline passage (cf. Bauer s. v. and Blass-Debrunner-Funk 59.2). See also Athenagoras Legat.13 (Goodspeed, Die Kleinsten Apologeten p.328; M.6.916Bf.).

Our line may be compared to or.33.3 (M.36.217A): 'Τίνας εὐχουσών ϑεολόρκησα καὶ τὰς χεῖρας πρὸς τὸν θεόν αἰροντας;' and Serap. Euch.1.1: καθαράς ἐκτείνουει τὰς χεῖρας.

This way of praying by raising the hands to heavens is both pagan and Christian (see above the note on 1.1.34.14 and Origen. orat.31.2 (GCS 2 p.396. 2-6), Clem.Alex. Strom.vii.7 40,1 (GCS 3 p.30. 19-25) and Lightfoot's note on Clem.Rom. 1Cor.29.1 in p.93). Examples of it appear in Isyllus paean Apoll.-Asclep.13 (Coll.Alex. p.133):/ χεῖρας ἀνασχόντες μακάρεσον ἐς οὐρανὸν εὐφύ[ν] /, II.18.75 (for other examples from the Homeric epics see Beckmann p.70 n.3) and Orac.Sibyl.3.559, 591, 4.166.

44. εὐλογήσω: Cf. 1.1.32.1 and the note ad loc. Note the variety of terms especially chosen to describe the various ways of man's communication with God: εὐλογεῖν (for a hymn of praise), δοξέων in 42 (for a doxology) and ἱκτεύειν in 45 (for a petition). See also above p. 31. To these one may add ἀνασαλάξω, ἀύξάξεω (2), ὀμνος, αἰνος (4) and δόξα, χάρις (a thanksgiving) in 50.

45. γόνυ κάμπτων ἱκτεύεσθαι: This should be another purpose clause with ἐνοτ omitted, possibly metri gratia. On the Biblical posture of supplication by kneeling down (LXX 1Par. 29.20, Ep.Rom.11. 4, Ep.Eph.3.14) see above the note on 1.1.34.14f.: γόνυ κάμπτω / ἱκτεύον προσκύνη.
Lexiessa: This verb of praying may be found in both Greek pagan and Biblical/Christian prayers: Pind. paean 9.8 = fr.52K (ed. Snell-Maehler, 1975 p.46), Eur. Hec.97, Ion 454 for the former category of prayers and LXX 3Macc.6.14 (cf.Ps.36.7, 2Macc.11.6), Const.Apost.8.6.7 and Liturg.Jac. (Brightman p.53.15), for the latter.

46. тοτε: This is a correction of the editio princeps of the poem (ed. 1568) instead of the reading οτι of all Codd. The error is a dittography of οτι in the following line.

46. δοθλον: The usage of the word in the sense of god-fearing people as servants of God is particularly Biblical: Ep.1Petr. 2.16, Act.4.29, LXX Ps.26.9 (see Bauer s.v. 4.).

In this sense it has replaced θεοφανεω already seen in the hexameter hymns: 1.1.34.20 (see the note ad loc.).

47. ἔλαθε βασιλεύσων: This is a correction of the editio princeps (ed. 1568) needed, not only for syntactical reasons (since purpose is usually denoted with future participles: see Smyth 2065), but also to restore the sense (since the second coming is usually associated with Christ: see above the note on 1.1.36.16).

Line 48 = Line 36.

Line 49: Cf. carm.1.1.34.27b (and the note ad loc.), LXX Sap. 3.9: οτι χαρις και ελεος τοις εκλεκτοις αυτου (sc. of God), 4.15. Besides, on the Biblical phrase χαριν ευρεται see for instance LXX Gen. 6.8, 18.3 and Ecclus.3.18, and from NT Ev.Lc.1.30 and Act.7.46

IV. Final doxology (50-51)

The same feature of a final praise appears in 1.1.34.29f. and 1.1.32.49f. (see the notes ad loc.).

50. οτι: See the note (on this) above on 1.1.34.29.

50. χαρις σοι: Cf. 1.1.34.1,2,12,29,30 and 1.1.33.1 where the phrase σοι χαρις is used instead (see the note on 1.1.33.1).
Line 51: A variant of the αἰών-formula may be seen in 1.1.32, 50 and 1.1.34.30 (see the note ad loc.).

As a conclusion instead of summing up the various features of the poem (as I normally do for each hymn) I would like to make a comment on Smolak's conclusions about this hymn.

Firstly he detects that the hymn must have been influenced either directly or indirectly by the hymn to Zeus by Cleanthes.

Most of the similarities (Smolak mentions in his article) between the two texts are related to features of form and content which appear generally in any Greek pagan hymn and are not restricted particularly to the hymn of Cleanthes. See for instance his notes 36, 40 and p.436f. Therefore, when our poet makes use of them, he simply follows the custom of any Greek hymnographer and not that of Cleanthes specifically.

Besides, of the few cases left, (in which the two texts are compared in terms of similarities in philosophical ideas) some comparisons made by Smolak seem to be contrived: they show, I think, apparent (but not real) similarities between the two texts. See for instance above the notes on lines 10-13.

That the two texts inevitably in some (but very few) cases have such similarities is easily explicable: not only the philosophical hymns in general, but also the magic papyri, Orphic hymns and fragments, and Hermetic literature: a) occasionally touch ideas concerning the nature and characteristics of a monotheistic conception of god (see above p.18ff.); and b) contain requests of a moral character (see above p. 31). All these are features also of Biblical and other early Christian hymns and prayers and consequently of our hymn.

Smolak's second conclusion is that the magic papyri exercised an
influence upon the language and form of this hymn (more than they did upon the hymns of Synesius and Proclus).

Again, I would argue that Smolak was misled in reaching this conclusion for reasons that I state below.

As has been said in the introduction to 1.1.30 and 1.1.32, the metre of both hymns and the resulting simplicity of their style make them resemble in language and form the Biblical hymns and prayers. Such a view is, I think, sufficiently proved by the many Biblical expressions quoted in the commentary on these hymns.

It is also well-known that there are marked similarities between the language of the Bible and that of the non-literary papyri (including the magic ones). Not wanting to go into detail I refer the reader for instance to J.H. Moulton-G. Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament illustrated from the Papyri and other non-literary Sources*, (London, 1930). Cf. also T. Schermann, *Griechische Zauberpapyri und das Gemeinde- und Dankgebet im I. Klemensbriefe*, TU 34. 2b, which reaches similar conclusions but from a different starting point.

Therefore, it becomes clear that the dependence in language and form of this hymn upon the magic papyri is, in my view, only apparent and results from the close connection of both texts with the Bible.

Smolak's argument that the magic papyri had an influence on this hymn greater than that on the Proclean and Synesian hymns is self-evident in the case of the Proclean hymns, which have a completely pagan content. However, the hymns of Synesius have more similarities with the magic papyri but, as in Gregory's case, they seem simply to reflect the same notions (see Terzaghi's commentary on Synes. hymn. passim).

To come now to his third and final conclusion with which I wholeheartedly agree: 'the hymns 1.1.31 and 1.1.34 from the point of view of interpretation have the right to be regarded as
genuine works of Gregory (p.448). Such a view needs no further support here since it has been dealt with in the concluding remarks on all the disputed hymns (i.e. 1.1.31, 1.1.33-35).

Carm.1.1.32

This hymn, together with Exhortatio ad Virgines: carm.1.2.3. (632-640), is the only poem of the Gregorian poetic corpus written in non-quantitative metre which a number of scholars has tried to explain and set under various rules without however finding any convincing solution to the problem. This peculiar metrical structure of the poem led some of them to cast doubts about its authenticity and date it instead at a later period, although the external evidence leaves only very little room for such disputes (see above pp.75ff.). However, the metrical structure of the hymn had one positive effect: it attracted the interest of some scholars to produce a better critical edition of it, than that in the Patrologia Graeca, based on a wider range of MSS (see above p.86f.).

The hymn is addressed to Christ as are also 1.1.36, 1.1.37, 1.1.38 and 2.1.38, although the last six lines refer to the tri-une God. In the first six introductory lines Christ is praised with reference to His characteristics in relation to the other two persons of the Trinity: a) as Logos and Light of God the Father, and b) as the Dispenser of the Spirit. The first two by-names are common and are found elsewhere in the hymns under discussion, but the second appears only in this hymn (see below the notes ad loc.). However, the predominant idea of this section (as for the rest of the hymn too) is that of 'light' (3,5-6), which is here used metaphorically to show the relationship between the three persons of the Trinity.

In Praise (7-32) the poet refers to the works of Christ in re-
lation to the world and man. These are: a) The creation of cosmic light (7-12), b) the enlightenment of man's mind (13-18), c) the creation of celestial bodies and the administration of the harmonious succession of night and day (19-24), and d) the administration of man's works during night and day (25-32). As happens in the introductory invocation (1-6), in all these four subdivisions the idea of light (expressed in the word ἀρχή and its cognitives and synonyms) is central and is used successively in a literal or metaphorical sense. More precisely, in sections (a), (c) and the first four lines of (d) it is used in a literal sense, while in the rest in a metaphorical.

In the Prayer (33-48) firstly Christ is implored to grant the poet 'light's sleep so that he may offer Him his nocturnal hymns imitating the angels (33-38); secondly the poet wishes that his thoughts at bed may be pious and his dreams free from any sinful illusions (39-44); and thirdly he expresses his great desire that his mind (even without his body) may speak to the tri-une God (45-48). All these requests are commonly found in early Christian evening hymns and prayers (see below).

The hymn closes with a final doxology which is a form of the common clausula for the majority of Christian hymns and prayers (49-50).

As we see from the above, the hymn may be divided into eight sections each consisting of six lines except for the fifth which has eight lines. The clear demarcations between these sections (each of which refers to a different subject) may be seen also from the fact that the first, fourth, sixth and seventh sections begin with a second person personal pronoun, while sections two and three with the relative pronoun ὅς.

The hymn is carefully and symmetrically structured so that the
syntactical order in a section may correspond to that in the following one with the same or reversed ratio of lines. This may be seen in sections (2) and (3) which both consist of one or two relative clauses (ός) followed by two positive purpose clauses (ονα), but in a reversed ratio of lines: (2): 2 + 4, (3): 4 + 2 (see below the note on line 18). The same may be seen also in sections (6) and (7) — which correspond antithetically to each other: each begins with a main clause in two lines (introduced with όυ μέν and όυν σοι δέ respectively) and is followed by two negative clauses in two lines each (introduced with ύς μή — μήτε and μηδέ — μηδέ respectively).

Section (4) contains two parallel clauses in two and four lines respectively (both introduced with όυ). Section (5) — the only eight-line unit — includes two antithetical main clauses in two lines each (τη μέν — τη δέ) followed by one four-line purpose clause. In the last section the four-line main clause (where σοι appears only at the beginning of the second line) is followed by a two-line relative clause.

In the MSS the hymn is entitled δοξολογία (εξι κοινης), or ουνος ἐσπερινός, or even εὐχὴ ἐσπερινή. All these three titles are justifiable: the first because the hymn ends with a doxological formula and the other two because all the requests are appropriate only in evening prayers. But as the hymn begins with the verb εὐλογεῖν I would rather prefer to characterize it εὐλογία (i.e. a hymn of praise). (see below the note on line 1).

Another point to mention here is the fact that a version of a few lines from the Prayer (33-38, 41-42 and 45-46) is incorporated in a prose prayer under the title: Είς τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰσοσύν Χριστοῦ, ἵστατος καὶ κατανυκτικός, which is found in a modern Prayer Book and is assigned by its editors to Gregory (see Προσεύχεσθε published by 'Εωτήρ', fourth edition (Athens, 1974), pp.63ff.). Unfortunately,
and despite my efforts, I have not been able to investigate the origin and authenticity of this prayer which, as far as I know, is not included in the Migne edition of the Gregorian works.

This poem is not the only example of an evening hymn in which one finds on the one hand light-images used for the praise of Christ (or of God in general) and on the other requests appropriate to it, since in the adoration of the early Church there were a number of such evening hymns and prayers chanted or recited during evening services, namely during the Office of Vigils or that of Τὸ Μυκρὸν or Μεγάλου Ἀποστόλου. From these we may refer for instance to the seventh prayer in the Office of Vigils part of which runs as follows:

'Ὁ θεός ... φῶς οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἀπόστις, ὁ πάσαν τὴν κτύσιν ἐν σωφροσύνῃ ἄνους, ὁ διαχωρίζεις ἀνά μέσον τοῦ φωτός καὶ ἀνά μέσον τοῦ σκότους, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἡλιον ἑμένος εἰς ἐξουσίαν τῆς ἡμέρας, σελήνην δὲ καὶ ἀστέρας ἐν ἐξουσίαν τῆς νυκτός, ὁ καταξιώσας ἡμᾶς ... καὶ τὴν ἐσπεριουμένην σοι δοξολογίαν προσκυνήσοντες. (...) καὶ δὸς τὸν ὀνόμα, διὸ εἰς ἀνάπαυσιν τῇ ἁγιοποιήσει ἡμῶν ἑσπερίας, πάσης ἡμαβολῆς φαντασίας ἀπιλλαγένην. ...

(see Goar, Euchologion p.29f.); also to a prayer addressed to Christ from Τὸ Μυκρὸν Ἀποστόλου (part of which is cited below in the note on lines 41-44) and to the Candle light hymn ('Ἐκλύσιμος Ἐὐχαριστία: see W. Christ - M. Paranikas, Anthologia Graeca Carminum Christianorum (Lipsiae, 1871), p.40 and J.B.Pitra, Analecta Sacra, vol.1 (Paris, 1876), p.lxxiii).
I. Introduction (1-6): Invocation to Christ and praise of His nature and characteristics

1. σε καὶ νῦν εὐλογοῦμεν: On the use of σε (or σοι) at the beginning of hymns see above the notes on 1.1.33.1 and 1.1.30.1; while for καὶ νῦν see 1.1.36.33 and 1.1.38.5.

The verb εὐλογεῖν is used in carm.1.1.30.44 and Orac.Sibyl.4.25, but not in Greek pagan hymns. It has a Biblical origin as it is commonly found in such hymns and prayers, especially at the beginning of Psalms : LXX Ps.33, 102, 103; and is then used in various early Christian hymns : The Morning Hymn ap. Const.Apost.7.47.2 and The Evening Hymn ap. ib.48.2: Its appearance here determines the character of the present hymn which may thus be called εὐλογεῖν. This type of hymn is equivalent to the pagan hymns of praise (see Haldane p.103).

2. Χριστε μου: This title is used in 1.1.35.1, 1.1.36.1,31, 1.1.37.2, 1.1.38.6, 2.1.38.1,37,39 and 1.1.30.44; while the addition of the first person pronoun gives a personal character to the hymn and marks the poet's devotion to Christ.

2. Λόγος θεοῦ: On the by-name Λόγος see above the note on 1.1.33.3.

3. φῶς ἐκ φωτός: This credal formula is discussed above in the note on 2.1.38.6. A similar formula is used by Gregory in carm. 1.2.1. 20-24 (523f.) where the generation of the Son from the Father is described as : ἐκ μὲν ἀνόρχου/ Πατρός Υἱὸς ἀναεί, ... ως ἐκ σέλας σέλας ἔφτεινα, while in or.45.9 (M.36.633C) = or.38.13 (325B) Logos is called το ἐκ τοῦ φωτός φῶς. The same credal expression may be found in Nonn. par.Jo.1:1 (M.43.749A).

3. ἀνόρχου: On this epithet (here describing the Father) see the notes on 2.1.38.7 and 1.1.30.27.

4. καὶ Πνεύματος ταῦτα: 'and despenser of the Spirit'.

Various pagan divinities were praised for being ταῦτα: Dionysus in
Soph. Ant. 1154, Poseidon as ταύτας τριάνθος in Aristoph. Nubes 566, Zeus as τῶν μελλόντων/ ταύτας in Soph. fr. 531 (Neuck TGF p. 259) and Helius as πυρὸς ταύτας in Nonn. Dion. 12.36 and 23.240 (see also above p. 29).

In carm. 2.1.45.31 (1355) Christ is called ταύτας ταύτας. See also or. 40.29 (M. 36.400C): αὐτὸς (sc. Christ) γὰρ καὶ τοῦ πατέρου ἂν ἐκεῖνοι ταύτας, ὠσεὶ καὶ τῆς γεννήσεως, or. 5.1 (Bernardi p. 294; M. 35. 665A): δεκαδέκα τρία ..., τῷ τεντόντι λόγῳ δοκῇ καὶ ταύτας τῶν ἱμετέρων and Kertsch p. 136 n. 3. On the contrary, in carm. 2.1.13.2 (1227) bishops are addressed as: ὤ ψυχῶν ταύτας μεγαλόδεες.

God is called ταύτας, among other appellations, in a prayer in Const. Apost. 8.11.5 and a number of times in the hymns of Synesius: 2. 182 (cf. Terzaghi's note ad loc.), 1. 35f. and 693f.

When Gregory calls Christ the dispenser of the Spirit he does not refer to the Eternal Procession of this Spirit, since this is caused only by the Father according to his or. 20.11 (Mossay p. 78; M. 35.1077C): Πνεύμα τὸ προδίκε ό με τοῦ Πατρὸς, carm. 2.1.1.630 (1017):/ Πνεύμα ἡς ὁ πατρός εἶς, or. 31.8 (Gallay p. 290; M. 36.141B) and or. 39.12 (M. 36.348Bf.). On the contrary, I think that the present passage, compared to Ev. Jo. 15.26: ὁ παράκλητος ὃν ἐγὼ (sc. Christ) τέμπω, refers to the mission of the Spirit in the world. On the progression of the Spirit see P. N. Trempelas, Διακονία, vol. 1, second edition (Athens, 1978), pp. 278-98 and J. N. D. Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, fifth revised edition (London, 1977), pp. 258-63.

Lines 5-6: Gregory was fond of using light images to describe the relationship between the three persons of the Trinity. From the innumerable passages we cite only those which have verbal similarities to the present one. These are: carm. 1.2.1.29 (524)/ εἰς οὗ ἐν τρισοφαῖς ἀνοιγόμενος φαέσσει, 1.1.4.65 (421) ἐν τρισοφαῖς θεοτόκος ὑμῶν σέλας, 2.1.88.174 (1442): (ὁ ψυχής)
II. Praise (7-32): Works of Christ in relation to the world

a) 7-12: Creation of the cosmic light

This subject is discussed in Kertsch pp. 152-59.

Lines 7-8: This couplet seems to be based on Ep. 2 Cor. 4.6: ο θεός ο εὐριόν 'Εκ σκότους φῶς λαμψει, and may be compared with or. 5.31 (Bernardi p. 356: M. 35. 704B): Λόγω τὸ σκότος ἔλυσε, λόγῳ τὸ φῶς ὑπεστήσατο and or. 38.2 (M. 36. 313A): Πάλιν τὸ σκότος λύεται, πάλιν τὸ φῶς ὑφίσταται, although the latter passage is used in a metaphorical sense.

The two lines are parallel in structure: pronoun + verb + object, and polar in sense as happens also with 25f.-27f., 35f.-37f. and 41f.-43f. Such a rhetorical device - common in Greek prose - became relatively more important in later Greek literature and may be compared with the feature of parallelismus membrorum of Hebrew and oriental, or orientalized Greek texts as is for instance the Septuagint. But, while the latter feature in the view of many scholars became a primary characteristic of Byzantine hymnography (see Mitsakis, passim), for the case of Gregory I believe that the appearance of parallel or antithetical cola in his poetry is owed to his rhetorical training in Athens (see above p. 46).

The same device appears very often in the hymns of Synesius: 1. 191-96, 25-27, 280-83, 555-59, 2. 1-4 and 3.24f. and that of Clement
of Alexandria.

The creation of the cosmic light is discussed in or.44.3f. (M.36.609C-612A):

In this passage where the Platonic terminology is obvious (see above the note on 1.1.30.14) it is made clear that Gregory differentiates the creation of cosmic light from that of the sun and by doing so he follows the Biblical exposition of the creation as this is related in Genesis. The same order appears in our hymn as well: first comes the creation of cosmic light (7f.) and then that of the various celestial bodies (ϕωστήρων:19; also in or.40.5 (M.36.364C): οὐδα καὶ ἄλλο φῶς, ὃ τὸ ἀρχέγονον ἠλάθη σκότος, ἦ δεικνύῃ πρῶτον ὑποστάν τῆς ὀρατῆς κτόσεως, τὴν τε κυκλικὴν τῶν ἀστερῶν περιόδουν and carm.1.2. 1. 66-69 (527):

(δια τοῦ μὲν πρώτου θύρω τός γένεσιν, ὡς κεν ἄπαντα
ἐγένετο πέλου χαράνεντα φάσος πλέα. αὐτὰρ ἐγένετα
οὐρανὸν ἀστεράσαντα κυκλώσασα, θαῦμα μέγεστον,
ἡλιόφ μήνῃ τε διανυῖα.

(which alludes to Hesiod. Theog.116, 127). On the subject of creation in general see above the notes on 1.1.33. 2-4 and 1.1.34.2-3.

The image of light succeeding darkness is used metaphorically in or.45.15 (M.36.644A).

7. ὡς: On the relative style of predications see above the
note on 1.1.34.2; while on the feature of anaphora (here ὅς is repeated at the beginning of lines 8,13) the note on 1.1.33.8: oἶα.

8. ὑπερσηνος: Apart from the passages cited above, this verb is used in the same context in or.45.6 (M.36.629C) = or.38.10 (321B), or.20.9 (Mossay p.74; M.35.1076B) and or.16.5 (M.35.940B). See also Kertsch p.157 n.4.

Line 9: It gives the reason why cosmic light was created first. This is illustrated further in carm.1.2.1.66f. (527) which is cited in the note on lines 7-8.

On the use of expressions with κας in the present hymns see above the note on 1.1.33.1.

Lines 10-12: Cf. or.41.2 (M.36.429C): ὁ θεὸς τὴν ὕπερ
σηνος τε καὶ μορφὰς καὶ ὑπερσηνος παντοῦς εἴδει καὶ συγκρίμα-
σι καὶ τὸν νῦν ὄρθωνον τούτου κόσμου κολῆσας .... Cf. the note on 1.1.30.14.

The emphasis, placed on the antithetical pair: ἄστατον - στήθες and the parallel one: κόσμου - εὐκοσμίων, may be seen in other Gregorian passages similarly constructed : carm.2.1.46.14 (1379): ἁκομνον ὅλης κόσμου ἔθηκε (sc. Christ) λόγη . Cf. also 1.2.1.65 (527).

The same contrast may be seen in a non-quantitative hymn attributed to Clement of Alexandria and edited by Stählin at the end of the scholia on the Paedagogus (GCS 1 p.340.19f.): ὁλον τε κόσμον ἐξ ἁκομνιας κτύσαις/ ὅλης ἀμόρφου, τόδε το πάν κατήρτισας,. Cf. Apost.Const.7.34.1: ὁ διὰ Χριστοῦ ... κοσμίων τὰ ἄκατακενάτα.

11. στήθες: This verb is used with reference to creation also in 1.1.34.3 (see the note ad loc.).

b) 13-18: Enlightenment of man's mind with reason and wisdom

Line 13: Cf. or.2.76 (Bernardi p.188; M.35.484B): (sc. God) ὅς νοῦν φωτίζει, and De Virtute: carm.1.2.10.959 (749)/ ὅς νοῦν σοφιζει. The closest Biblical parallel to the present passage seems to be Ep.Eph.1.18 where God is implored to grant κεφαλουμένους τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς
God appears to illuminate also the rational natures in Gregory's Or. 40.5 (M.36.364B): θεός μὲν ἐστι φῶς ... πάσης φωτιστικῆς λογικῆς φύσεως. Interpreting Ev.Jo.8.12 Origen uses the same idea in his in Jo.1.25 (GCS 4 p.31. 17-20; M.14.68C): ὃ δὲ σωτήρ, ... φωτίζει οὖ σώματα ἄλλα ἀσωμάτως δυναμεῖ τὸν ἀσωμάτων νοῦν, ἐνα ως ὕπο ἥλιον ἕκαστος ἡμῶν φωτιζόμενος καὶ τὰ ἄλλα δυνηθεὶ βλέπειν νοητά. If Kertsch is right in noticing that Gregory follows the example of Alexandrian Fathers in his use of light images, then this passage from Origen may have been Gregory's source here (see Kertsch p.157 and n.3).

Lines 15-16 : Theodorou interprets these lines by saying that Christ makes man ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ καὶ σύνοψιν ἄτάσις δημιουργίας'. (see Theodorou p.263). Hence, he seems firstly to take man and not νοῦν ἄνθρωπον as the object of θεοῦ (possibly according to the figure of synecdoche ); secondly to regard καὶ κάνω as referring also to λαμπρότητος as τῆς ἀνω does (following thus the interpretation of the Benedictine editors: see the note on line 16 in M.37.512); and thirdly to interpret η ἀνω λαμπρότης as 'God', (ἡ) κάνω (λαμπρότης) as the 'creation/world' and man as an image of both. On the other hand, the Maurist annotator refuses to accept that κάνω refers to λαμπρότητος because it is not accompanied by the article τῆς as ἀνω is (see the note on line 16 in M.37.512). Since man is generally regarded only as image of God and not of creation too, I would accept the view of the Maurist annotator, namely that κάνω does not refer to λαμπρότητος, and rather that καὶ is used with 'κάνω θεοῦ' in the sense: 'even/also placing (sc. man) down' (on earth).
16. εἰκόνα: Man is an image of God; LXX Ge.1.26, 27, Ep.1Cor.11.7 (cf. also Ep.Col.3.10) as is also Christ (see 2.1.38.7 and the note ad loc.). This idea is used a number of times in Gregory’s poems: carm.1.1.8.74f. (452), 1.2.1.96f. (529), 2.1.45.8, 9, 67 (1354, 1358), and 2.2.6.89 (1549). However, the obvious preference for philosophical terminology in this hymn leads Gregory to present instead the mind of man as the image of the 'splendour above' (i.e. God). The idea that man is an image of god appears in pagan texts as well (see Bauer s.v. εἰκόνα).

Line 17: It seems to be based (at least verbally) on LXX Ps. 35.10: ἐν τῷ φωτὶ σου (sc. God) ὁφόμεθα φῶς which is used also in or. 40.34 (M.36.408C). The same Psalmic passage has inspired the last prayer of the first Hour which is addressed to Christ as: φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν τὸ φωτίζον καὶ ἀνατέλλει κάντα ἀναρρωπικόν ἑρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον and includes the request to Him: σημειωθήτω ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς τὸ φῶς τοῦ προσώπου σου, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ ὁφόμεθα φῶς τὸ ἀπέρσοντον (see Horologion ad loc.). Cf. carm.2.1.45.38 (1356), or.20.1 (Mossay p.58; M.35.1065A): φωτὶ προσλαμβάνοντα φῶς, or.32.15(M.36.192A) and Moreschini pp.1358ff.,1363ff.

This line is reminiscent of the common philosophical view that 'τὸ ὁμοιὸν φέρεται πρὸς τὸ ὁμοιὸν' (see Theophrastus De Sensu 1.1f. (ed. E. Wimmer p.321) and Empedocles fr.90 (H. Diels, PPF, p.140)).

Lines 17-18: They may be compared to or.39.2 (M.36.3360): ἦν ἡμεῖς τὸ σκότος ἀποθέμενον, τῷ φωτὶ ἐλπισάμενον, εἶτα καὶ φῶς γενόμενα τέλειον, τελεῖον φωτός γεννήματα. To this we may add a passage from Symeon the New Theologian cited in Theodorou p.44: Μετὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τούτου φωτός ὁ νοῦς ὑπερφυώς ἐνοῦται, φωτίζεται, καθώτισταν ἄλος φῶς.

Line 18: After calling God and angels the first and second light respectively, Gregory goes on to name man the third light in or. 1. Or more likely, the doctrine of cognition by assimilation as in Aristotle’s De Anima.
40.5 (M.36.364Bf.): Τούτον φῶς ἄνθρωπος, ὥς καὶ τοὺς ἐξω δῆλον ἔστιν. Φῶς γὰρ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὑμοῦδχουσι διὰ τὴν τοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν λόγου δύναμιν. See also or.39.20 (360A). The idea that man is light is found not only in the Bible (see e.g. Ev.Mt.5.14), but goes even back to Homer: see Od. 16.23—though not carrying its philosophical sense— and Bauer s.v. φῶς.

While in the previous section (7-12) the relative clauses (7,8) occupy two lines and the purpose ones four (9-12), in this section (13-18) the ratio is reversed: one relative clause in four lines (13-16) and one purpose clause in two (17-18).

c) 19-24: Light produced by celestial bodies to distinguish night from day

Lines 19-20: 'you decorated the sky with various lights'. The word φωστήρ is used in the Biblical exposition of creation in LXX Gen. 1.14,16 where it appears to be restricted only to the sun and the moon, while in this passage it is more likely to include the stars too, since it is characterized by ποικίλος, an epithet which implies a variety of celestial bodies and not only two. The same word may be found in Orac.Sibyl.8.341, 2.186,200, 3.88.

καταγνίζειν is a late Greek verb used in the Septuagint in Sap. 17.5 and 1Macc.6.39.

Line 21: Cf. 1.1.36.26: σὲ νύκτα καὶ ἡμαρ and the note ad loc.

Lines 21-23: σῷ ... ἕτας: The succession of night and day may be seen in Comparatio Vitarum: carm.1.2.8.178 (Werhahn p.27; M.37.661): / νὺξ ἡμέραν ἐπαυσε, νύκτα δ' ἡμέρα and or.32.22 (M.36.200C): κοινή νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐναλλαγή. On the equal interchange of night and day see Eur. Phoen.541ff.

On ἡμέρας see above the note on 2.1.38. 19-20.

23f. νόμον ... φιλίας: The metaphor whereby the night and day appear as personified beings to give way to one another obeying the law of brotherly love and friendship may be compared to similar ones
found in Greek philosophy: e.g. Plat. Gorgias 507e-508a (which recalls the φιλότης in Empedocles fr.17 (Diels,PFF, p.112)); cf. also Heraclitus fr. A 14.a (Diels, Vorskr., i, p.147.17f.).

A similar metaphor is used by Gregory to show the relationship of the various virtues in or.45.13 (M.36.641A): τὸν τῶν ἄρετῶν κύκλον ἢπέως ἐπιμυγγυμένων καὶ κυριακέων ἀλλήλαις νόμῳ φιλίας καὶ τάξεως.

d) 25-32: Man's works during night and day

Lines 25-28: This passage consists of two pairs of lines antithetical to one another: τῇ μέν - τῇ δὲ, ἐπαυσας - ἤγειρας.

The Biblical overtones of this passage, as well as of lines 21-24, may be easily discerned if one takes into account another passage in Gregory's or.32.9 (M.36.184Bf.) which is obviously based on LXX Ps. 103 (known as the Prooemiac Psalm and read at the beginning of the Office of Vigils: see Goar, Euchologion, p.2 §20 and p.23 n.20).

This passage runs as follows:

... ἡσυχεῖν οὔτε ἡλιον (sc. οὔτε τις) ἐν νυκτὶ μελούμενον ἡ πληρούμενον, οὔτε σέληνην ἐν ἡμέρᾳ πυρρεύουσαν .... 'Επούλησε σέληνην εἰς καιρούς: ὃ ἡλιον ἔγνω τὴν δύσιν αὐτοῦν νύξ καὶ ἄνθρωπος ὑπνω συστέλλεται καὶ τὰ θηρία παράβαλεται .... ἡμέρα, καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἑπὶ τὴν ἐργασίαν ἐπεγέται καὶ ἀλλήλους ὑποχωροῦμεν ἐν τάξει, νόμῳ καὶ λόγῳ φύσεως.

The above text alludes to LXX Ps.103.19 and 23 (which is rendered by Apollinarius in Met.Ps.103.50 as: (sc. άνήρ) / ἔσπερον καιμάτου τελος ποτιδέγενος ὑπνη. See also the passage from an evening prayer in Const.Apost. 8.37.2: (sc. ὁ θεὸς) ... ὁ ποιήσας ἡμέραν πρὸς ἔργα φωτὸς καὶ νύκτα εἰς ἀνάπαυσιν τὸς ἄθετεῖας ἡμῶν, and 34.6.

The idea that night is the time for man to have a rest from daily work is common in Greek literature too. See e.g. Quintus Smyrnaeus 7.672: νύξ, ἢ τ' ἄνθρωποι λύσιν καιμάτου φέρουσα/, 10.437, and cf. Alexis fr.240.9 (CAF, ii; p.385 Kock) where "γνὸς is called ἀρτέτων
It is used again in carm. 1.2.1.725 (577) and 1.2.13.7 (755) connected with γάτα and ζωή (i.e. the poet's life) respectively. See also Procl. hymn. 2.19.

Lines 29-30: Gregory may have used σκότος here in the sense of ἀμαρτία as he does in or. 30.20 (Gallay p. 268f.; M. 36. 129ff.) where explaining Christ's appellation as ψως he identifies σκότος with ἀγνοεια and ἀμαρτία, and ψως with γνῶσις and βίος ὁ ἐννοεις. Besides, in or. 18. 28 (M. 35. 1017D) he uses the expression το σκότος τῆς ἀμαρτίας, and in or. 45. 15 (M. 36. 644B) he calls the present life as ἡ νῦς τοῦ παρόντος βίου; while in or. 40. 13 (376B) he uses: ἡ νῦς τῆς ἀμαρτίας. On this see Kertsch p. 156 n. 2 and Theodorou p. 506f. Accordingly, ήμέρα (30) should be the eternal day (i.e. the eternity). The closest Biblical passage to this meaning of ήμέρα here is Ep. 2 Petr. 3. 18 where the phrase ήμέρα αἰώνος ('day of eternity') may be interpreted as the day which itself constitutes eternity (see Bauer s.v. ήμέρα 3.b.8; also Apoc. 22.5 and C. Spicq, Les Épitres de Saint Pierre, Sources Bibliques (Paris: Gabalda, 1966), p. 264f.). However, the metaphorical use of ήμέρα for eternity is possibly of the Patristic era (see Lampe s.v. 2.b.).

Lines 31-32: Meyer suggested in his apparatus criticus of this hymn that these lines should be omitted, in spite of the fact that they are found in all the MSS (W. Meyer, Die zwei rhythmischen Gedichte des Gregor von Nazianz, p. 152). Although Meyer's suggestion may be supported by the fact that these two lines extend the normal six-line rhythmical unit, these lines are needed by the sense: lines 25-28 refer to the pair 'night-day' in a literal sense and lines 29-32 to the same pair in a metaphorical sense. Note the anadiplosis ήμέραν ήμέραν (30f.), a typical feature of the solemn style of hymns and prayers.

The epithet στυγνός describes νῦς also in LXX Sap. 17.5.

III. Prayer (33-48)
The transition to the Prayer is made with μὲν.

a) 33-38: A request for a 'light' sleep

Lines 33-34: In a letter to Gregory St Basil uses the phrase ὄνυν ὑπὲρ καὶ εὐάκαλαταιντο: epist.2.6 (Courtonne BL p.12; M.32.233A). In his Epithea Deorum Bruchmann does not mention ἐλαφροὶ (or any other similar word) as an epithet of 'Ὑπονος', nor does Stephanus in Thesaurus s.v. ὄνυν, although he mentions a number of other epithets commonly associated with sleep. The closest passage to the present one seems to be II.10.2: μαλακῷ ... ὄνυν; while the opposite epithet βαθύς is used in AP 14.128.4 (Metrod.). However, Greek pagan gods were implored (as is Christ here) ὄνυν ἐκλεφαρωτε βάλλειν (or χεύειν, or even ἐπιχεύειν): see Od.16.450f.: ὄνυν/ ἡδύν ἐκλεφαρωτε βάλε γλυκῶτες Ἀθην./ and cf. 12.338.

Lines 35-36: The reason why Gregory begs for a 'light' sleep is to be able to offer nocturnal hymns to Christ. In homil.5.4 (M.31.244Cf.) St Basil advises his fellow Christians to divide night time between sleep and prayer: μετρεῖσαν συν τῆς νυκτὸς ὁ χρόνος εἰς τε ὄνυν καὶ προσευχήν· ἄλλα καὶ οἱ ὄνυν αὐτοὶ μελετήματα ἔστωσαν τῆς εὔσεβείας. Nocturnal hymn-singing was Gregory's habit as he himself tells us in carm.2.1.34.169f. (1319): ὄνυνος ὑπνυκτεύουσιν/ στηλώθην. Such was also the custom of the Psalmist: LXX Ps.118.62, 91.2f. and 133.2.

35. γλώσσαν ὑπνυφῶν: This expression is used in carm.2.1.20.2 (1279); while in 2.2(epit.).78.3f.(M.38.51f.) = AP 8.35.3f. one finds : ὑμνημεσθαν/ γλώσσαν instead.

Lines 37-38: The two lines repeat the idea of the preceding two lines and are similarly constructed - yet with some variation: ὡς μὴ + infinitive (35f.), but μήτε + optative (37f.).

As a substantive ἀντίφωνος is a technical term used for the antiphonal singing of Psalms in Church (see Lampe s.v. ἀντίφωνος 2.
and Mitsakis, Byzantine Hymnography, pp.53ff. for a discussion on the origin and development of such singing). Here it is used as an adjective describing πλάσμα to denote that Gregory in His hymn is responsive to that of the angels, since both human beings and angels have hymn-singing as their main task (see above the note on 2.1.38.26: ὑμνοτολογος).

b) 39-44 : Request for 'pious' thoughts


40. ἐτατέτω : This is a common Biblical verb: LXX 1Par.29.17, 28.9, Ps.7.10 and Jer.17.10.

Lines 41-44 : What the poet wishes positively in the previous two lines (namely to make only pious thoughts at bed) he expresses it negatively here where he wishes that he may avoid examining anything impious of the day and his dreams may be free from any sinful illusions. All these requests are commonly found in early Christian evening prayers. Apart from that cited in the introduction to this hymn we may here refer to two prayers from the Office of Vigils. The first (entitled Εὐχὴ τῆς κεφαλαχλαδῆς) is found in Goar, Euchologion, p.32 and reads: οὐς (sc. τοὺς σους δούλους) διαφύλαξαν ... κατὰ τὴν καρούσαν ἐσπέραν καὶ τὴν προσούσαν νύκτα ἀπὸ παντὸς ἐχώρου, ἀπὸ πάσης ἀντικειμένης ἐνεργείας διασκέδασις καὶ διαλογισμῶν ματαίων καὶ ἐνθυμήσεων κοινωνίαν. The second is in Goar, p.36 in which similar requests are expressed: ἀπόστησον δὲ ἄφ' ἡμῶν πάσαν φαντασίαν ἀπρεπὴ καὶ ἐπίθεμμαν βλαβερῶν. Διαφύλασθεν δὲ ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ καρπῷ τῆς προσευχῆς ... . From Τὸ Μικρὸν 'Απὸστητήνου is taken the following part
of a prayer in which Christ is implored: ὁ ὁμοίως ἡμῶν ... ἦν τὸν ἐλαφρὸν καὶ πᾶσας σατανικὰς φαντασίας ἀπελλαγμένον. ... Παννύχιον ἡμῶν τὴν σήν δοξολογίαν χάρωσα ... For other requests for a sinless night in evening prayers see Const. Apost. 8.36.3, 37.3, and cf. the prayer Ἰάτρῳ τοῦ ὑπάτου καὶ ἐλέες ἐνυπνιαζόμενον in Goar p.529.

Behind these lines one may even discern the standard philosophical view that dreams reflect events of the day (see e.g. Aristot. De Somn. chapter 3 and Costelloe-Muirhead, Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics, vol.2, p.76f.).

Note the emphatic antithesis in the juxtaposition: ἡμέρας νύξ.

The verb ἐλέγχειν is used in the sense 'to examine' (see Lampe s.v. B.) or more likely 'to find out'.

Lines 43-44: 'Let not the illusions of the night disturb my dreams'. The verb θροέειν is used not in its classical meaning but in the sense 'to disturb' (see Lampe s.v.).

c) 45-50: Request that the poet's mind may communicate with God and final doxology

Lines 45-46: These lines may be compared to a number of other Gregorian passages which are related to the notion of the purification of mind and body as the prerequisite for the contemplation, vision and knowledge of God (discussed also in the notes on 1.1.34. 21b, 26 and 1.1.29. 14b-15a). The Platonic and Neoplatonic terminology used in them has been noticed by various scholars: Gottwald p. 43f., Pinault p. 195ff. and Moreschini pp.1358-62. From these I choose: or.2.7 (Bernardi p.96; M.35.413Bf.) ≠ or.20.1 (Mossay p.56 M.35.1065A): οὗτοι γὰρ ἐδόθησιν μοι τοιούτοις οἷον μέλαντα τὰς αἴσθησις ἐξαίτω σαρκῶς καὶ κόμου γενόμενοι, εἰς ἑαυτὸν συσταθέντα, μηδενὸς τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων προσακάμομενον, δι' τὴν ἡμείαν ἀνάγκη, ἐαυτῷ προσαλαμβάνοντα καὶ τῷ λόγῳ. This passage, together with or.28.12 (Gallay p.126; M.36.41B) and ib.13(p.128;44A): οὗτοι κάμνεις ἐκβήναι τὰ σωματικά ὁ
Moreschini (pp.1358-62) with Plato's *Phaedo*, particularly 65a-67d. Gottwald (p.46) cites some further passages worth quoting here: or.12.4 (M.35.848A): τὸν νοῦν εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἀναχωρήσας καὶ συσταφάναι ἀπὸ τῶν αἴσθησεων, ὡςτε ὑμιλεῖν ἀκηλιδώτως θεῷ and or.26.7 (Mossay p. 242; M.35.1237A): χρῆναι τῷ καὶ ἁρυχαίζειν, ὡςτε δεσμοὶς προσομλεῖν τῷ θεῷ καὶ μεγάλα ἐπανάγειν τὸν νοῦν ἀπὸ τῶν πλανωμένων; and he sees some connection of these texts with Plat. Rep. 500c.9 and Numenius fr. 11 (E.-A. Leemans, p.131.11); while Theodorou (p.509) sees in the former passage an influence from the Plotinian mystic philosophy.

However, the addition in line 45 of καί ('even': see LSJ s.v. B.5) leads me to believe that the poet here does not refer simply to the purification of mind from the abstractions caused by the body or flesh (or even from the distractions of the sensible world as is seen in some of the above passages), but rather to the common philosophical view that during sleep the mind remains awake and separate from the body (cf. e.g. Aristot. De Anima iii.4-5(429a10-430a25), Ross's note ad loc. and Costelloe-Muirhead, *Aristotle...*, ii, p.93ff.).

Line 46: The expression προσολατεῖν τῷ θεῷ ('to address God', i.e. 'to pray to God': see Lamp s.v.1.) apart from the passages cited above, may be seen in or.21.19 (Mossay p. 148 ; M.1104A): οὐ μὲν τὸν τάντα μοναδικὸν τε καὶ ἄνωτον διαθέλουντες βίον ἑαυτοῖς μόνοις προσολατοῦντες καὶ τῷ θεῷ (said of the hermits and monks) and in Clem.Alex. Strom. vii.7 39,6(GCS 3 p.30.15ff.) which is cited below in the note on 1.1.29.10b; while the equivalent προσομλεῖν τῷ θεῷ is seen in some of the above Gregorian passages and in those quoted in Lamp s.v. 6.f.

Lines 47-48: Although the rest of the hymn refers to Christ this does not prevent the poet from closing it by addressing God in this common trinitarian formula.
Lines 49-50: Final doxology

Such doxologies are to be found in the prayer of Manassis 15
(Swete, OT, iii p.826): διὰ σὲ ὑψωτέρα καὶ ὁμομούς τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ
σοῦ ἐστιν ὁ δέξα εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας. ἀμήν, very often in the prose hymns
of NT: Ep.Rom.11.36, 1Tim.1.17, 6.15, 1Petr.4.11, Apoc.1.6, 7.12 (see
der Goltz, Das Gebet in der Ältesten Christenheit (Leipzig, 1901),
pp.157-60); and at the end of most of the Christian hymns and
160), hymn in Christum 6 ap. Pap.Berol.Mus.8299 (Iadem p.161), The
Morning and Evening Hymns ap. Const.Apost.7.47.3 and 48.3 respective-
ly and ib.8.13.10. Similar doxological formulae are also used
to end various homilies: see e.g. Gregory's or.31.32 (M.36.172B), or.
45.30 (664Bf.) and or.36.12 (2800). See finally, the notes on 1.1.
34. 29b-30 and 1.1.30. 50-51.

The necessity for a final doxology (yet in prayers) is under-
lined by Origen in his Orat.33.6 (GCS 2 p.402.32ff.;M.11.561A): εὐ-
λογον δὲ ἁρέταν ἀπὸ δοξολογίας εἰς δοξολογίαν καταλήγοντα κατα-
pασεῖν τὴν εὐχὴν, ὑμνοῦντα καὶ δοξάζοντα τῶν τῶν δόλων πατέρα διὰ Ἰ-
νοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν ἀγίῳ κνένυματι, ὃ ἡ δέξα εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας.

50. ἀμήν: Greek pagan hymns and prayers end occasionally with
a conventional wish which serves the same purpose as the Amen: Soph.
OT 1096f.: ᾧ ἡ τὸ πλῆκ, σοὶ δὲ/ τὰυτὶ ἁρέτα εἰς/ and Aristoph. Pax
453 : ἡμῖν 6' ἀγαθά γένοιν (see RAC s.v. Amen vol.1, cols 378-80).

As a conclusion to this poem it would be appropriate, I think,
to discuss the problem of its authorship. As we have said above the
authenticity of this hymn (and that of carm.1.2.3) has been challenged
by various scholars primarily on grounds of its peculiar metrical
structure. (see above pp.58ff.). A summary of the arguments expressed
until 1958 in favour or against the authenticity of 1.1.32 may be found in Lefherz p.69f.

From the examination of the MS tradition of the hymn (see above pp.75ff) we have seen that our hymn is included not only in poetic but also in prose MSS and that a version of it is found in Syriac and other MSS. Generally the external evidence supports the authenticity of the hymn, although a slight possibility for the opposite remains in the fact that among the texts in which 1.1.32 is included and which constitute the appendix to the Gregorian orations in the prose MSS one finds inauthentic works (e.g. the epistle 243). Despite the support from the external evidence of the authenticity of this hymn and the rejection by Werhahn of the opposite views of Keydell, the former scholar insists on keeping the hymn in the category of the dubious poems until further and fuller investigation on it is undertaken (see Werhahn, TU 92, p.343f.).

In the commentary we have seen a number of expressions and ideas which find their parallels in authentic Gregorian works so that Keydell appears to be wrong when, suggesting the inauthenticity of this hymn, he notes that it has nothing in common with Gregory's thought or style (see Keydell, BZ, 43 (1950), p.337). These similarities are, I think, sufficient to support the authenticity of 1.1.32.

It is true that, apart from Christ's appellation as ταυτός, the entire poem is similar in themes and structure to other early Christian hymns (particularly in the use of εὐλογεῖν, the final doxology, the various requests, the parallel or antithetical cola and other rhetorical figures). However, this is not sufficient reason for placing the hymn at a later period (around A.D. 600), since in it the obvious preference for philosophical terms (instead of those commonly accepted in Christian usage), together with the careful arrangement of the various themes, is, as we have repeatedly
seen a beloved Gregorian custom which in turn gives the hymn such a character as to differentiate it from the more vulgar style of the anonymous early Christian hymns.

Besides, the fact that the hymn is written in non-quantitative metre and in a style somewhat distant from that of the hexameter and elegiac hymns, in my view, does not cast doubt on the authenticity of the poem, but, on the contrary, this should be seen to be in line with the techniques used by Gregory in verse-composition (which are observed a number of times in the commentaries on the hymns under discussion and in Appendix III). As Gregory did not compose poems only in common Greek metres (hexam., iamb., eleg.), but also in hemiamb (carm. 2.1.88 (435)), or in a combination of iambic trimeters dimeters and monometers (1.2.24 (790-813); see also West, Greek Metre p.175f. and 183 n.66), I am not convinced that he could not have written also in non-quantitative metre (since the feeling for quantity had already started to become weaker: see West pp.161-63).2

On the other hand, the reason provided by Keydell (BZ, 43, p. 337) that in Gregory's poetry which was destined to replace the pagan one non-quantitative poems have no place is in my view not a strong one, since Gregory wrote poetry also for consoling himself in his old age and 1.1.32 (as a personal evening hymn) could have been composed precisely for this reason (see above p.38).

Finally, both the external and internal evidence seem to support the Gregorian authorship of this hymn, although the problem still remains with regard to the metrical structure of 1.1.32.

1. On the various metres used by Gregory see Wyss, Museum Helveticum, 6 (1949), 203f.
2. As we have seen above (pp.32ff.) most of the so-called quantitative early Christian hymns (e.g. the hymn to Christ by Clement of Alexandria) which are even earlier than Gregory's do not strictly follow accepted Greek metres, but rather show tendencies of non-quantitative poetry.
This poem which is better known as a Neoplatonic Hymn to God has attracted the greatest interest among the hymns examined in the present research, ever since Jahn disputed its authenticity as early as 1838 (see A. Jahn, Lesefrühchte altdeutercher Theologie und Philosophie (Bern, 1838), p.19). The Neoplatonic elements in it and the fact that it is found in a Proclean MS (Monacensis gr. 547) led Jahn to attribute it to Proclus (see A. Jahn, 'Hymnus in Deum platonicus, vulgo Gregorio Naz. adscriptus nunc Proclo platonico vindicatus', in Eclogae e Proclo de Philosophia Chaldaica sive de Doctrina Oraculorum Chaldaeorum (Halis Saxonum: Pfeffer, 1891), pp.49-77).

The opinions of later scholars were divided: some followed Jahn's thesis, some criticized it and retained the Gregorian authorship, while others suggested an attribution to any Neoplatonist, or even to Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite. A summary of the various opinions provided till the early fifties to defend this or that view may be found in Lefherz p.68f. However, all the opinions provided were primarily based on internal evidence, yet not systematically examined.

The first who focused his attention on the external evidence was Werhahn. His investigation of the surviving MSS with Gregory's poems revealed that our hymn is found not only in one group of Gregorian MSS, but also in a Proclean and two Ps.-Dionysian MSS. The results of his investigation were announced at the fourth International Conference on Patristic Studies which took place at Oxford in 1963 (see H.M. Werhahn, 'Dubia und Spuria', TU 92 p.345f.).

In his communication Werhahn expressed doubts similar to Jahn's on the authenticity of the hymn. Yet, he too based his remarks on partial evidence, and therefore his view should be given no greater
weight than the earlier opinions, even if it seems to have been accepted as authoritative by later scholars.

Here I am going to examine these MSS, together with Vaticanus Palatinus gr.39 (s. xv) which came to my attention in the course of my research but is not mentioned by Werhahn. Such an examination cannot be the final word on the problem either, since, despite my efforts, it was impossible for me during the course of this research to visit the various libraries and have an autopsy of the MSS involved. However, the descriptions of them in the various catalogues and the readings of the hymn which have been available to me, partly on photostats or photographs and partly through Professor Sicherl's first collation (kindly sent to me), would, I think, help us in reaching a further step towards finding a possible solution to the problem of authenticity.

As I have shown in a communication presented at the Ninth International Conference on Partistic Studies (which took place at Oxford in September 1983), these MSS may be classed in two different groups: one (α) containing ten MSS where the hymn appears among Gregory's poems and the other (β) containing a Proclean and three Ps.-Dionysian MSS (see above pp.81ff.).

The text of the hymn in group α omits lines 8-10; while that in group β retains them, but reverses lines 3 and 4, and follows three major different readings: ὑπάρχειν, πολύλογος, ὑπερφανεῖς instead of καὶ οὐδέν (12), πατώμως (13), ὑπερνεφέας (14) of the text of group α respectively. The discussion of these textual problems appears below in the commentary.

On grounds of their similarities, at least in the main three

1. I do hope soon after the completion of this research to have the opportunity of visiting these libraries so that firmer conclusions may be drawn on this matter.
readings (mentioned above), the MSS of group α. (where the hymn appears always among Gregory's poems) seem to descend (though not directly) from the oldest, namely Cod. Vh. Therefore, the results from the examination of this MS with regard to the authenticity of 1.1.29 may apply also to the rest of the MSS of this group.

Cod. Vh consists of an anthology of works from Gregory, Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite and Maximus the Confessor. The hymn is entitled "Ὑμνος εἰς Ἁγνούμενον, and not Εἰς το Εὐαγγελίον όνοματιν ὡς Werhahn says (TU 92 p.345), possibly by confusing it with that in Cod. Vk (see below). It appears at the beginning of the section which includes an anthology of Gregory's hexameter poems. The section is entitled Ἀπανθισματα ἐκ τῶν ἐπίσκοπον τοῦ ἡγίστου Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου and is placed after a long section (ff.130-165) which contains Gregory's epistles, and before another one (ff.172-181) including an anthology of his iambic poems. Since the description of the MS in Devreesse's Catalogue (see R. Devreesse, Cod. Vat. Gr., vol.ii, pp. 294-80) and the photostat of the folio containing the hymn show that the hymn is clearly not a later interpolation by another scribe, we must accept its Gregorian authorship unless of course such an interpolation took place at an earlier stage in the transmission of the hymn-in a non-surviving MS. On the present MS evidence of group α 1.1.29 is attributed to Gregory.

To turn to the MSS of group β and first to the Proclean MS (Cod. Ms): From I. Hardt's description of Cod. Ms in his Catalogus Codicum Manuscriptorum Graecorum Bibliothecae Regiae Bavariae, vol.5 (Munich, 1812), p.366 we learn that the hymn is written on a parchment sheet, while the Proclean text covering the rest of the MS is written on paper. Furthermore, the photostat at my disposal of this parchment sheet shows that the hymn is anonymous and bears no title. Finally, Saffrey has claimed that the hymn was written by a second hand, that
of Cardinal Bessarion (see H. D. Saffrey, 'Notes autographes du
Cardinal Bessarion dans un manuscrit de Munich' Byzantion, 35 (1965),
p. 538; cf. also Idem-L. G. Westerink, Proclus. Théologie Platonicien-

From the above it is more than obvious that the hymn is a later
interpolation and that the possibility of its attribution to Proclus
is, if not impossible, at least improbable. Another reason which may
also exclude such possibility is the fact that the extant Proclean
hymns (addressed to particular Greek gods and not to the transcendent
god) are completely different in content and structure from 1.1.29.

The possible reason why Bessarion added the hymn in the Proclean
MS is, I think, because it has some similarities with Proclus's
philosophy and not because he believed it belonged to Proclus.

Of the remaining three Ps.-Dionysian MSS of this group (i.e. 8)
Cod. Vκ (the oldest MS of the group), according to Giannelli's descrip-
tion (see above p. 83 ) is partly of the eleventh and partly of
the thirteenth centuries. Here, the hymn is found in f. 88v, and
(again according to Giannelli) is written by a different hand, that
of a fourteenth century scribe. It is preceded by two empty folia
(f. 87v, 88r) which mark the end of the first section of the MS. This
section contains the De divinis Nominibus (ff. 8v-86r) and a prologue
to Ps.-Dionysius's works by Maximus the Confessor (ff. 86v-87r). From
the photostat I have of f. 88v I see that the hymn is cited anonymous-
ly and carries the title Ἐν τῷ περὶ θεών ὄνοματι. From this we
may infer with Werhahn (TU 92, p. 345) that the addition of the hymn
at the end of the first section was possibly made in order to provide
a sort of poetic summary of the Ps.-Dionysian work with the same title:
Despite the poem's misleading title, the preceding empty folia and the
fact that 1.1.29 is written by a later hand, strongly favour the view
that here too the poem is a later interpolation and, consequently, its
attribution to Ps.-Dionysius remains groundless.

The other two Ps.-Dionysian MSS on grounds of their similarity to the readings of Cod. Vk seem to descend (if not directly) from the latter MS. In one of them, namely Cod. Lr, the hymn is entitled ΕΤΥΧΟΤ ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΜΕΣΙ ΣΕΛΩΝ ΩΝΩΜΑΣ and is placed at the beginning of the section which follows the Ps.-Dionysian works and contains scholia on them (see above, p. 83). The reason which led the copyist to preface these scholia with 1.1.29 is possibly the same as that which led to the interpolation of the same poem in Cod. Vk. Therefore, the appearance of the hymn in this MS must be explained quite independently from its authorship.

Finally, in Cod. Pl 1.1.29 appears (according to H. Stevenson's description of the MS in his Codices Manuscripti Palatini Graeci Bibliothecae Vaticanae (Vatican, 1885), p.21 and the photostats I have), between the De divinis Nominibus (ff.81-138\(^V\)) and De mystica Theologia (ff.139\(^V\) onwards) in ff.138\(^V\)-139\(^R\) and is entitled ΤΟΥ ΔΥΤΙΚΟΥ ΔΩΝΟ\(^S\) Α\(^S\) ΣΙΛΗΝ ΗΡΩΔΙΧ\(^W\). I gather from the photostats containing the hymn that it is written by the same hand as the rest of the MS (so that there seems to be no possibility of the hymn having been interpolated). Besides, its attribution to Ps.-Dionysius, I believe, must be due to the scribe of Cod. Pl himself (who took it for granted that since the hymn appeared in the Ps.-Dionysian MS he was copying from, it must have come from Ps.-Dionysius's own pen, even if in the MS he was copying from the hymn appeared anonymous.

To conclude: it looks as if in the case of group \(\alpha\) the attribution to Gregory of the poem (i.e. its 13-line form) relies entirely on the degree of accuracy of the scribe of Cod. Vh to include the poem among Gregorian works. On the contrary, in the case of group \(\beta\) there are two possibilities: either the poem (i.e. its 16-line form) has no authorship connection with that in group \(\alpha\) (in which
case its author—possibly a Neoplatonist or a Christian Neoplatonizing—will remain anonymous till more evidence, if ever, comes to light); or it came from the Gregorian 13-line form, in which case the differences between the two forms are likely to have been caused by scribal activities (i.e. of interpolating lines 8-10, reversing lines 3 and 4 and replacing the original readings of the 13-line form by a gloss or similar word).

The first possibility, namely that more than one hymn and several authors lie behind the two forms of 13 and 16 lines respectively, is supported by the fact that two short versions of the present hymn are found: one as a Christian epigram in AP 1.102 and the other in two forms in Olympiodorus's Commentary on Plato's Gorgias: a) in Gorg. 4.3 (Westerink p.32. 22-24) and b) ib. 47.2 (p.243. 21-22).

In order to facilitate the discussion on them it was thought necessary to cite the text of all three versions. Thus, the Christian epigram, taken from P. Waltz's edition of Anthologie Grecque, vol.1 (Paris:BL, 1928), p.40 reads:

Eis ton Ewthra kal Kýronon hýmow 'Igapouh Xriston,

ulon tov theou

'Ω pánntwn épékvena - t' γáro pléon állo se mélepsi-

pws se tov ev kántesou uléiropou éxounomh

pws de lógy mou mélepsi se, tov oudé lógy peri lýptov;

The text in the work of Olympiodorus is that of L.G. Westerink in his Olympiodori in Platonis Gorgiam Commentaria (Leipzig:T, 1970).

The first form of in Gorg. 4.3 (Wester. p.32. 21-24)= Olymp. a runs:

'mélepsi légwn tis hýmow eis tov theon phsou

'Ω pánntwn épékvena t' γáro pléon állo se mélepsi-

pws se tov ev kántesou uléiropou éxounomh

pws de lógy mou mélepsan tov oudé lógy peri lýptov;

21. mg. on. tov theou kámpson tov hýmow.
The second version of Olymp. in Gorg.47.2 (p.243.19-22)= Olymp. b is:

δει δε ειδέναι διτι ο Ψυλδοφον μεν των πάντων ἄρχην οὐδοται εἶναι καὶ ἐν τῷ πρῶτων αἴτων ὑπερκαθομον, 'ἐξ οὗ πάντα πέφυκεν', δ' οὐδὲν ὑμνομετέρακεν τοῖς γὰρ ὀνοματοθεσσα έκέλειτο; ἀμέλει

20 καὶ φησὶν τις ἐν ὑμνῷ

'πῶς σε τὸν ἐν πάντεσσων ὑπερφροκον ὑμνοπολεσσων;

τοῖς δὲ λόγοις μέλψει σε τὸν οὐδέ νόρ περιλππτόν;

All the three versions, as we see, are cited anonymously. Besides, the Christian epigram and Olymp. a begin with the opening line of the present hymn but have two slight differences: κλέον for θέμως and μέλψω for μέλψειν of our hymn.

In the same commentary by Olympiodorus there are two variations of another verse, also taken from an anonymous hymn to God: one in Gorg. prooem.8 (p.7.15) and the other in ib.16.1 (p.93.9). In its context the former reads (p.7.12-15)= Olymp. c:

ἀκλοῦς γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἐς οὐδένος παραγόμενος, θεεν καὶ ὕμνος λέγειται εἰς αὐτὸν φάσιν

15 'ἐξ οὗ πάντα πέφυκε, σὺ δ' οὐδένος οὔνεκα μοῦνος'.

and the latter (p.93.7-9)= Olymp. d:

οὗ δὲ ἔρημται μόνως οὔνεκα τὸ πρῶτον αἴτιον, ὁπλοτ καὶ ὁ ὕμνος ὁ λέγων

9 'ἐκ σοῦ πάντα πέφυκε, σὺ δ' οὐδένος οὔνεκα μοῦνος'.

The earliest version of this line seems to be the verse which is quoted twice - again anonymously - by Asclepius in his Commentary on Aristotle's Metaphysics. The first is: in Metaph. (Comm. in Aristot. Graec., vol.vi.2 (Berlin, 1888), p.20.27f.) and runs:

δο τὰ γανάμες φησὶν ἐκείνος 'ἐκ σεο πάντα πέ-

φυθείς, σὺ δ' οὐδενὸς εὔνεκα μοῦνος'.

27. ἐκείνος] nescio quis Orphicus
and the second in ib. (p.123.14f.):

"ὦς τε σᾶσχ ἐστιν ἄνδρης εἰναι τὸ τελικὸν αἴτητον. διὸ φησὶν
15 ἐκείνος ἐξ ἀσέο πάντα πέφυμε, σὺ δ' οὐδένος εὔνεκα μοῦνος'.
15 ἐκείνος] nescio quis; cf. p.20, 27.28

A variation of the first hemistic of these lines is found only a few lines before the 2-line version in Olympiodorus (see Olymp. b line 18: 'ἐξ ὧδ' πάντα πέφυκεν').

Whether of course this single verse in its various forms, and the variation of its first hemistic form part of Olymp. a or b is not certain, although the close position of this hemistic with Olymp. b might suggest such a possibility.

What is however clear from the above exposition of the short versions of 1.1.29 (and may be drawn also from its MS tradition) is that the hymn was circulated among both pagan (and more precisely Neoplatonic) and Christian authors.

In order to explain the existence of so many versions, in my paper (which will be published in due course in the Proceedings of the Oxford Conference) I maintained the theory of variatio, a device so commonly used in Hellenistic and late-Greek epigrams. Following this theory I suggested that the opening line of the present hymn was likely to have originated in a Neoplatonic environment and later to have been taken by Christian writers.

Provided that the information derived from the various MSS is correct, one must, finally, not overlook the fact that Gregory lived earlier than either Ps.-Dionysius, or Proclus, Olympiodorus and even Asclepius (all people associated with the hymn) and that, there-

---

fore he should be considered the first possible author of the hymn (at least of its 13-line form).

We may now turn to analyse the content of 1.1.29. The hymn begins with the invocation to God ὦ πάντων ἐξερευνά ('you who are beyond everything') the meaning of which is discussed in detail below ad loc. My view expressed in this discussion is that when the poet uses this epiclesis he means that God is beyond knowledge and expression, and not that He is transcendent in the Neoplatonic sense by being situated in the outermost sphere of cosmos. In support of my view is also the fact that by calling God ὦ πάντων ἐξερευνά (an expression standing in the place of the non-existent proper name of God, or one of His common titles) the poet fittingly anticipates his view expressed below in the same hymn that God is without any name by which to be called upon (see ἀκλήτως:14 and the note ad loc.).

The rhetorical question which follows (1b) serves the same purpose as this epiclesis and to some extent is added by the poet: a) as his self-justification for using this epiclesis and b) in order to anticipate the main subject of the hymn: the incomprehensibility and ineffability of God.

These two themes are treated first in lines 2-5 (which are in reality a development of line 1b) and then in lines 13b-15a. Lines 2-5 are carefully structured and well balanced, since they may be divided into two couplets (A,B), each line of which deals with one of the two themes: 1) God is ineffable (A1,B1) and 2) God is unknowable (A2,B2), arranged in a parallel order (A1-A2-B1-B2). Besides, the strong trochaic caesura breaks each line into two hemistichs: a,b (where b always gives the reason for the ideas expressed in a). Finally, although the two couplets (A,B) contain the same themes (1,2) they are expressed with some variation: in A1,2 with a rhetorical
question and a γνωριμία-clause; while in B1,2 the definition by negation in the first hemistich is followed by an ἐπιτήδευμα-clause.

Apart from the above observations on the structure and themes used in lines 2-5 one may add the various rhetorical figures: anaphora (πῶς:2,3, μοιχος:4,5), homoioioteleuton (2a-3a, 2b-3b, 4a-5a, 4b-5b), and polyptoton (ἄγων-ἄγων:2, νοσίς-νοσίς:3). All are common features of Gregory's poetry (see above p. 46).

The reference to God's creation in lines 4b and 5b leads on to the following two lines (6-7): All (sc. the creation) praises God. Such a notion whereby the whole of the creation responds to its Creator by addressing a thankful song of praise to Him appears in 1.1.31.7-10 where it is discussed in detail (see the notes ad loc.).

The structure of this couplet with the anaphora of πάντα and the homoioioteleuton follows that of lines 2-5. To these features one may add the fact that the poet states the content of πάντα in two pairs each including antithetical terms: a) λαλέοντας - οὐ λαλέοντας and b) νοσίν - οὐ νοσίν. Both pairs are deliberately chosen so that the former corresponds to λαλεῖται (4) and the latter to νοσίται (5); also the former recalls the theme of God's ineffability (2,4) and the latter His incomprehensibility (3,5). In other words God is ineffable and incomprehensible because He is the Creator of all that: a) can be spoken of, or thought, and b) have or have not the ability to speak or think. So, although the poet in lines 4-7 appears to play with a limited number of verbs used in various forms: active (positive or negative) and passive, in reality every word he writes is cleverly chosen to serve the main subject of section 2-7.

Let us come now to lines 8-10 which are missing from the MSS of group α. Two possibilities may explain such an omission: a) lines 8-10 are a later interpolation in the MSS of group α and therefore do not belong to the original hymn, or b) they form part of the
original hymn, but were lost well before the earliest extant MS of group a.

Before examining these possibilities with regard to the internal evidence it seems important to say a word about the extant editions of the hymn (see above p. 87f.). All of them attribute the hymn to Gregory and follow the readings of group a, but include lines 8-10 (which as has been said are missing from all the MSS of this group). Besides, the text of the hymn in the earliest extant edition (that of Canter in 1567) was based, as Canter tells us (see ed. 1567; p.219) on a very old MS containing Gregorian poems (which was at that time in the possession of Levenlavius). Jahn (p.50f.) casts some doubts as to whether the hymn was really taken from this Gregorian MS and whether it was written by Gregory. However, his doubts do not prevent us from suggesting that this MS of Levenclavius (or any other carrying such a text of 1.1.29 as described above) is very likely to have been earlier than the extant MSS and belonged to group a. The appearance of lines 8-10 in this early MS support the second possibility, namely that these lines form part of the original hymn but were lost some time before the earliest extant MS.

Let us now discuss the content of lines 8-10 with regard to the rest of the hymn. The interpretation of these lines is discussed in detail in the commentary ad loc. Here it will suffice to give briefly their content. These three lines refer: a) to the great desire and pangs of all for God, b) to the prayer of All to Him, and c) to the silent hymn which All offer to God realizing that they are God's own 'creation/composition' (σώσθησαί:10).

As they stand, these lines (particularly 9-10) appear to repeat to some extent the content of lines 6-7. Besides, their structure
differs from that of the rest of the hymn in the use of enjambement in lines 8f. and 9f. Such observations may be used to support the possibility of interpolation. However, as will be shown below, a closer examination of these lines will prove that they could well be part of the hymn.

The apparent repetition of the content of lines 6-7 in 9-10 can be easily explained. Lines 6-7 refer, as we have seen, to the hymn of all creation: rational (νοεοντα, λαλεοντα) and irrational (ου νοεοντα, ου λαλεοντα). On the contrary, lines 8-10 refer only to animate beings (or, better, to rational beings: νοεοντα in 10). Therefore, section 6-10 seems to correspond to 1.1.31.7-10 where, as we have seen, the first couplet refers to the hymn of all the creation and the second to that of the rational natures. Besides, in both poems the two hymns are offered as a response to God's creation (see the note on 1.1.31.7-10). According to this interpretation άνανκαί (8), and πάντα (twice in line 9) should refer to all rational beings only and not all the creation as πάντα and οσα do in lines 6-7 and 4-5 respectively. That only rational beings show great desire and suffer pangs in the search for God may be seen for instance in Gregory's or.28.13 (cited below in the note on νοεολου:8).

The conjunction γαρ (8) is used to join the content of lines 8-10 with that of 6-7 and explain why the νοεοντα (7) praise God: because, as rational beings, they all have common desires and suffer pangs for God. Besides, the fact that they are rational beings explains why they alone pray to God. And, finally, using their reason they know that they are God's 'creation/composition', and as a result praise Him. The characterization of their hymn as silent is, I think, made only to be contrasted to λαλει (or even to λαλεοντα in line 6).

To come now to the rest of the hymn and first to lines 11-13a:
they describe God in relation to All. All remains in God and All is
directed towards God who is the end of All. Then (12b-13a) in terms
of a paradox God is at the same time One and All and Nothing — and
not One and not All. The anaphora of οὐς in the two hemistichs of
line 11, the polysyndeton in line 12 and the use of antithetical
words in line 12f. are the main features of this section.

With lines 13b-15a the poet returns to the subject of lines 2-5
(God's ineffability and incomprehensibility ) which he expresses here
with two rhetorical questions only. God is ἄκλητος (cannot be
called/named: see below ad loc.) and yet He is πανώνυμος ( has every
name). His anonymity is contrasted to His 'having every name'. The
subject of God's incomprehensibility lies behind the second rhetorical
question, each word of which is cleverly chosen (see below the dis-
cussion ad loc.). However, in these lines the two themes are not
simply repeated, but, I think, are expressed in such a way as to show
that the poet has made his greatest and final effort to name/express
or understand God but did not manage to do so. Therefore, aware of
his lack of ability he asks for God's mercy and repeats his introducto-
ry epiclesis (since throughout the hymn he did not manage to find any
other proper way of invoking God).

The repetition of the first line at the end gives the hymn a
ring form, while, as is seen from the above analysis, all the sections
of 1.1.29 seem to flow naturally from one to another. A main chara-
teristic appearing throughout the hymn is the extensive use of
second person pronouns (14 times) and of ἄνω (or ἀνατο):12.

Finally, we may conclude by observing that the word-play is the
primary feature of this hymn as it is composed throughout with a
limited number of words arranged in such a way as to make the main
point of the hymn, namely that God is, and will remain ὁ ἄνω τῶν ἐξε-
κευα ( 'the One beyond human expression and understanding').
I. Introduction (1)

1. ὧ πάντων ἐξέχεινα: 'oh you who are beyond everything'. In the introduction to the hymn I have maintained the theory of variatio in order to explain the existence of more than one version of this hymn and suggested that the opening line seems to have originated in a Neoplatonic environment before it was taken over by Christian writers.

For a Neoplatonist this introductory epiclesis to God would obviously refer to the notion of God's transcendence, since for him God is understood as 'something extra, something outside and beyond, (...) [something] which is left over, which remains outside and transcending our systematisation and classification of the cosmos' (see A.H. Armstrong, The Architecture of the Intelligible Universe in the Philosophy of Plotinus: An Analytical and Historical Study (Amsterdam: A.M. Hakkert, 1967), p.5, although the author here refers to the Plotinian One). However, for Gregory (if he is the writer of this hymn), or any Christian, such an interpretation would be, I think, unacceptable. This may be shown for instance by Gregory's acceptance of both the transcendence of God and His appearance/immanence in the world (see the passages cited below and on the rejection of immanence by Neoplatonists the note on Procl. Inst. Theol. 30 by Dodds). Therefore, the meaning of this epiclesis for Gregory is, I think, different, even if he happened to take it from Neoplatonism. The content of the hymn as a whole will help us to decide what precisely Gregory means by this epiclesis.

As is noted above in the analysis of 1.1.29, the general subject of the hymn is God's incomprehensibility and ineffability (the latter idea expanded by the paradox that God has all names and no name). Had the poet chosen any other expression from those commonly used in Christian hymns and prayers to address God, this would have been, I
think, inappropriate to the general theme of the poem, since such an expression would to some extent have described God (either His nature, or His characteristics). The only way the poet could make an address to God and not describe Him was to use this general epiclesis "πᾶντων ἐπέχεινα (i.e. you who are beyond any human understanding and expression).

Having established the meaning of this epiclesis, in the following lines I shall refer briefly to the development of the Neoplatonic notion of the transcendent God, insisting particularly on expressions similar - yet only verbally - to the present epiclesis, and give some Christian texts (though later than Gregory's) where such expressions are found, only in order to show the wide range of texts using such expressions and, consequently, to justify Gregory's readiness to use in a hymn (possibly intended only for private worship) this Neoplatonic expression without fear of being misunderstood by his contemporaries - as he has been by some modern theologians (see Lefherz p.68ff.).

The idea of transcendence is first hinted at in Plato Rep. 509b: τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ... ἐπέχεινα τῆς ὀφθαλμοῦ, reaches its fullest development in Plotinus in expressions e.g. ἐκεῖνο (sc. το ἔρημον) ἐπέχεινα τῶν πάντων in Enn. v.4.2.39f. (cf. v.3.13.2) which Norden p.78f. regards as the origin of our expression), and then is used as a doctrine by later Neoplatonists such as Proclus: see his Theol.Plat.2.12 (Saffrey-Westerink p.73): τὸ ἄρρητον τοῦ πάντων ἐπέχεινα θεοῦ and the passages cited in Jahn p.65 and L.J.Rosán, The Philosophy of Proclus (N.York:Cosmos, 1949), p.54. Similar expressions are found also in Christian writers influenced by Neoplatonism such as Fs.-Dionysius the Areopagite: see his Epist.2.1 (M.3.1068A): ὁ πάντων ἐπέχεινα, epist.4.1 (1072A) and Div.Nom.11.6 (956B); and Synesius: see hymn.1. 164-166: (sc. ἀνοξ) ἐπέχεινα θεῶν, ἐπέχεινα νόμων, ἐπέχεινα νόμων, ...

Likewise, Origen in Gels.vii.38 (GCS 2 p.188.11) calls God: ἐπε-
κενα νου και ουσιας (cf. vi.64 (p.135.4)); while Elias of Crete, the ancient scholiast of Gregory's orations, uses phrases such as: ονος ελη ο παντων επεκεινα και πασαν νοησιν και καταληψιν υπερβασινων (M.36.801B) when commenting on or.20.9, and ιτης αγυς και υπερουσιου και παντων επεκεινα και διπτου Τριαδος (802A and 811A), a comment on or.20.10 and or.29.13. For other passages from Christian authors see Lampe s.v. επεκεινα.

Such an idea is hinted at in Gregory's writings, although, so far as I know, he nowhere uses the phrase ο παντων επεκεινα. See e.g. carm.1.1.5.2f. (424); νοος μεγας (sc. God) ιντος οπαντα φερων και παντος οπερθεν/ αυτος εων, De Virtute:1.2.10.958f. (749); ος παντα πληροι και ων παντος μενει/ ος νοον σοφιζει και νοος φευγει θολες,/ or.6.12 (M.35.737B): καλλιστων μεν των δινων και υφιληταυν θεος, ει μη τω φυλον και ιπηρ την ουσιαν αγελων αυτων, η δολον εν αυτω τιθειαι το ελναι, καρ' οδ και τοτς αλλους (cf. Gottwald p.23) and or.2.76 (Bernardi p.188; M.35.484A): (sc. θεος) ος εν τω παντι τιθε και του παντος εστιν εξω, ος καλον εστίν οπαν και δων παντος καλου, ος νοον φωτιζει και διαφευγει νου ταχος και ως. In these passages Gregory, by contrasting God's transcendence to His appearance in the world, appears to accept both ideas (in their Christian meaning of course). Finally, the expression that God is υπερ οπαντα whereby the second theological oration ends (or.28.13 (Gallay p.174; M.36.72C)) in the view of Fernández could be said that it substitutes the more philosophical and poetical παντων επεκεινα (see Fernández, Emerita 36 (1968), p.243f.).

An exclamatory phrase to begin a hymn may be found in e.g. hymn. Apoll.1 (Heitsch p.168): 'ει μεγα καιναν χαρια βροτουν.

Line 1b: The reason why the poet addresses God by the general invocation ο παντων επεκεινα is given in the rhetorical question which stands in the place of a negative statement: 'because there is no
other lawful way of praising you'.


The rhetorical question becomes a device for praising God and may be compared to the use of negative sentences for the same reason (see above the note on 1.1.37.1). Both ways serve the 'hyperbolic' style of hymns as do various other features, for instance the use of compound epithets in παν- or παντο- (see Keyssner pp.28ff.).

On the phrase ἡμέρα (sc. εἰς ναῦ) see the note on 2.1.38.3. Here we may add that the *hymn to Zeus* by Ceanthes, after the introductory salutation to the god (with a κατον-formula), is followed in line 3 by a clause with ἡμέρα (sc. εἰς ναῦ) which serves the same purpose as the present one: σε γὰρ πάντις συνέσει ἡμέρα θυτοσκι προσαναβάν.

μέλπευν: The verb may be found in 2.1.38.24,48, 2.1.22.12 (cited above on p.196 ), *carm.* 2.1.34.71,75,77,85,87 (1312, 1313); 1.1.63 (451) = 1.2.1.85 (528) and 2.1.45.26 (1355). It is used also in Synes. *hymn.* 1.21,271,278, 2.7,26, 3.55 etc. and *Anonym. hymn.Dion.* 1,26 (= AP 9.524.1,26 or in Abel, *Orphica,* p.284f.). As a verb of celebrating it could be used to introduce Greek pagan hymns (see above p.23).

The two versions in Olympiodorus and the Palatine Anthology (cited above p. 309 ) have πλέον and μέλπω instead of ἡμέρα and μέλπευν of the present hymn.

In his edition of this hymn and after the first line Jahn completely unjustifiably and without any MS evidence adds line 2 of Olymp. a which is cited on p. 309 (see Jahn, p.76). However, this line, as well as that in the Anthology version (which has ἔξονομήνω
instead of ύμνοποιεύω) has no structural connection with either line 1 or lines 2ff. of our hymn (each of which consists of two distinct hemistichs). On the contrary, the Olympiodorus and Anthology lines may be compared in structure with the sentence in line 13f.: πῶς ... ἄκλητον. Jahn's innovation is further extended when he adds after line 10 the single line from the Asclepius version (cited above p. 310f.).

The verbs ἐξονομάζειν (of the Anthology version) and ύμνοποιεύειν (of Olymp. a and b) are both used by Dioscorus in one of his verse encomia: No. 6.13, 15 (Heitsch p. 136). For the latter verb see also Apollinarius Προεξεπέλα 108, Met. Ps. 9.4, 20.27, 21.45, 103.71 etc. and Golega p. 44 for examples in other authors.

As has been said in the introductory analysis of 1.1.29, the hymn acquires a ring form with the repetition of line 1 at the end. Hymns 1.1.34 and 1.1.31 are also ring compositions. Similar ring compositions may be found in Procl. hymn. 6. 1-3 = 13-15, Anacreonta 36. 1-2 = 26-27 (PLG iii p. 319 Bergk) and LXX Ps. 8, 117, 103. Other types of line-repetitions in Gregory's poems may be found in Appendix III.

II. Praise (2-15a)

a) 2-5: Ineffability and incomprehensibility/unknowability of God. Description of God by negation

Line 2b: A similar question used possibly to show the poet's embarrassment/hesitation as to how he should praise the god is: πῶς τ' ἄρ σ' ύμνησον πάντως εὐμυνον εὖντα; in Hom. hymn. Apoll. 19, 207. See also Callim. hymn. Jov. 4 and McLennan's note ad loc.

The use of five questions in the hymn (1, 2, 3, 13, 15) may place it in the category of διαφορισμοῖς ύμνοι (see above p. 27).

ὑμνησεί: See above the note on 1.1.31.7.

Note the variations of the Anthology version and Olymp. a and b: πῶς λόγῳ μέλῳ σε(3), πῶς σε λόγῳ μέλῳμι and τύς δὲ λόγος μέλῳσε respectively.
Mommsen observed a three-syllable 'sigmatismus' in this and the following line which is 'mild' (gemildert) as one such syllable is the ending of a verb and between the second and third there is a punctuation mark (see Mommsen, *Griechischen Präpositionen* p.670f. and 723).

**Line 2b**: See above the note on 2.1.38.5: φέρησε μύθου.

This passage, together with line 4a refers to the notion of God's ineffability. This notion is usually connected with the conceptions of God's unnameability and incomprehensibility (which are expressed in lines 3,5 and 13b-14a respectively). To save repeating the same texts, a survey of the passages dealing with these ideas will be given below (cf: line 5a). Here we may confine ourselves to a reference to ἄνωθεν which is used as a divine epithet of Persephone, since as an underworld deity her name was too dangerous for pronunciation (see Haldane p. 176). The same epithet is used of various deities six times in the Orphic hymns (e.g. 6.5, 30.3) and of Zeus in Arat. *Phaenom.2*. Cf. also Procl. *hymn.1.14* and *Pap. Mag. Gr. xii.171.*

3. ἀνωθεν : The verb is used in Gregory's *carm.2.1.45.19* (1355): ἀνωθεν ἄνωθεν ἄνωθεν ἄνωθεν, 1.1.4.11 (416), and 2.1.32.14 (1301).

See also Procl. *hymn.6.9.*

3. νῦν ... ληπτός : Cf. *or.38.10* (M.36.321B) = *or.45.6* (629C): αὐ νοερὰ φύσεως καὶ νῷ μὸνῳ ληπτός.

The Anthology variation: (τῶν) οὐδὲ λόγῳ περιληπτὸν and that of Olymp. a and b: (τῶν) οὐδὲ νῷ ψέ κεριληπτόν may be compared - yet in wording only - to Plat. *Rep.529d*: α ὁ λόγῳ μὲν καὶ διαγωγῇ ληπτό, and Empedocles fr.2.8 (H.Diels, *PPF*, p.106): οὔτε νῷ περιληπτό.

In spite of the fact that the reversal of lines 3 and 4 (followed by the MSS of group B) produces a more attractive and smoother syntactical arrangement for lines 2-7, it cannot be accepted because it spoils the symmetrical structure of the section (explained in
detail above in the introductory analysis to 1.1.29). Lines 2-7 consist of three pairs of lines each of which may be compared in structure with Callim. hymn.Jov. 87-88 and hymn.Apoll.26-27 where anaphora exists both at the beginning and end of the two lines in each pair (see also McLennan's note on Callim. hymn.Jov.87).

4. μούνος: For the significance of the use of expressions with μούνος in hymns see above the note on 1.1.31.8.

4. ἁμαρτός: The epithet (a variant of ὁμοίως ἡμῖν in line 2) is used by Gregory in carm.2.1.32.56 (1305) to refer to the Trinity:

κάλλες μαρμαρώτα τοῦ Ἴδρυτον καὶ τῆς θεούτος ἐν δύο πλεον ἁμαρτότοιν and in 1.1.30.28 to the οὐσία of the Trinity (see above the note ad loc.). The epithet is not cited in Bruchmann, Epitheta Deorum, under any Greek pagan god. However, Hesychius s.v. ἁμαρτός regards this as a by-name of Hecate (see Haldane p.116,n.7). On the contrary, the equivalent ἁμαρτάνω τοὺς appears in the Magic papyri (e.g. Pap.Mag.Gr.xiii.983) and the hymns of Synesius: hymn.1.221 (see Terzaghi's note ad loc.) and 236-37.

Line 4b: This phrase, together with the parallel one in the following line, refers to the creation of the world, which consists of all that can be spoken of (ὁσα λαλεῖται) and all that can be thought of (ὁσα νοεῖται). The reason why the poet states the content of the creation in these terms is, as has been noticed in the introductory analysis of 1.1.29, to contrast God the Creator with His creation: God the Creator is ineffable and incomprehensible, while His creation is 'effable' and comprehensible, and at the same time to explain why God has these qualities.

The poet uses here τύχες to describe the act of creation instead of the Biblical κτύσεως which is found in 1.1.33.3, 1.1.31.3, 1.1.30.13 and 1.1.32.9. Thus, he appears to imitate the practice of Greek pagan hymns in which gods are said to give birth to everything. However, the common verb used in these hymns is not τύχες (which
nowhere seems to have been used in the sense of 'producing the world') but γεννάω (possibly metri gratia). See for instance Orph. hymn. 55.5 (Aphrodite): γεννάς δὲ τὰ πάντα. More examples of this verb or its cognitive nouns and epithets may be found in Keyssner pp. 20-22.

5. ἄγνωστος: The notion of the unknown God (expressed here in ἄγνωστος) has been the subject of Norden’s monograph on Agnostos Theos in which it was maintained that neither the expression ἄγνωστος θεὸς nor the idea it represents is genuinely Greek (see particularly p. 84 and 109). Besides, Dodds tried to show that in Neoplatonism the meaning of the doctrine of the unknowableness of God is quite different from that in Gnosticism (see E.R. Dodds, Proclus. The Elements of Theology, second edition (Oxf., 1963), 'Appendix I', pp. 310-13).

Whatever the case may be, for our purpose it is sufficient to mention simply the various areas where this notion (together with that of God’s incomprehensibility in line 3 and His ineffability in lines 2 and 4) appears, insisting above all on expressions similar to the present ones. Most of the passages cited below have been collected and discussed by various scholars: Norden, particularly pp. 69ff., Terzaghi on Synes. hymn. 2.227, Le R.P. Festugière, La Révélation d’Hermès Trismégiste, vol. iv, (Paris, 1954), pp. 1-140; and in relation to Gregory: Gottwald pp. 17-19, Moreschini pp. 1370-74, Theodorou pp. 236-39, Fernández, Emerita, 36 (1968), 236-45, Pinault, pp. 61-110.

These ideas are first hinted at in Plat. Tim. 28c: τὸν μὲν οὐν ποιητήν καὶ πατέρα τοῦ τοῦ καντῶς εὑρέθη τοῦ ἔργου καὶ εὑρόντα εἰς πάντας ἀδύνατον λέγειν, Parmen. 142a: οὐδ᾽ ὄνομάζεται ἂρα οὐδὲ λέγεται οὐδὲ δοξάζεται οὐδὲ γυνώσκεται, οὐδὲ τὶ τῶν ἄντων αὐτοῦ αἰσθάνεται and Epist. vii. 341c: ὁπτὸν γὰρ οὐδομαίος ἐστιν. Later they appear in Albinus Introductio in Plat. 10.4 (ed. Louis p. 55): "Ἀρρητός δὲ ἐστὶ καὶ τῷ νῷ μόνῳ λατρεύως and in Neoplatonism: Plot. Enn. v. 3.13.1: ἄρρητον τῷ ἁληθεύῃ (sc. τῷ ἔν), v. 5.6.12: οὐδὲ δυσομα αὐτοῦ λέγει and
vi.9.4.11f.: Αὐῷ οὐδὲ ῥητῶν, οὐδὲ γραπτῶν. However, Plotinus does not use ἀγνωστός. Finally, they culminate in Procl. Theol. Plat. iii. 7.12 (Saffrey-Westerink): ἄρρητος μὲν κατὶ λάγυ καὶ ἄρρητος, ἁγνωστός δὲ κάση γνώσει καὶ ἀληθος, Inst. Theol. 162 (Dodds p.140.33-142. 1): ἄρρητον γὰρ καθ' αὐτὸ πάν τὸ θεῖον καὶ ἁγνωστόν, 123 (p.108.25f.); Πᾶν τὸ θεῖον αὐτὸ μὲν διὰ τὴν ὑπερούσου ἐννοίαν ἄρρητον ἐστὶ καὶ ἁ-

Further examples from Proclus are cited in Jahn p.66f. and 68.


These ideas are not absent from the Hermetic and Gnostic literature either: a) Corp. Herm. i.31 (Nock-Festugière): ἀνεκδάλητε ἄρρητε, σωφρὴν φανοῦμεν (see the note of Nock-Fest. ad loc. where further examples on ἄρρητος are cited), vii.2: οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἀκουστός (sc. ὁ θεος), οὐδὲ λεκτὸς, x.9: ὁ γὰρ θεος οὐτε λέγεται οὐτε ἀκούεται and 5 where ἀκαταλήπτον is used for τὸ κάλλος τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ; and b) Const. Apost. 6.10.1 where Gnostics are reported to call god ἄρρητον καὶ ἁ-

γνωστόν and Clem. Alex. Strom. v.11, 77.2 (GCS 2 p.377.24): οὐκοῦντα (sc. ἀγγέλους) θεοῦ ἄρρητον ψυχῶν (a passage taken from the Apocalypse of the Gnostic Sophonias).

The same ideas either through the mediation of Philo, or directly from Neoplatonism have been introduced into Christian literature, although a reference to the phrase ὁ ἁγνωστός θεος appears in St Paul’s speech on Areopagus (Act. 17.23) and ἄρρητος is used again by St Paul
to describe ὑάματα (Ep.2Cor.12.4). We may here refer to: Synes.

\[\text{hymn.2.132f.: νῦος ἀρρητοῦ/ τέκτει σε πατρός,} \] and 227-30: πάτερ ἀ-

γνωστε/ πάτερ ἀρρητε,/ ἀγνωστε νῦ,/, ἀρρητε λόγυ/ (see Terzaglihi's

extended note ad loc. for various passages on these ideas taken from
the magic papyri, Platonic and Neoplatonic philosophers, minor late
Latin poets, gnostic and Christian writers). On ἀρρητος see also


349.20f.), Didymus De Trinitate iii.2.1 (M.39.788A) and Lampe s.v.

The same ideas are common in Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite, whose

philosophy, according to Schedel-Williams, approximates very closely
to that of Proclus (see I.P. Schedel-Williams, 'The ps.-Dionysius
and the Holy Hierotheus', Studia Patristica viii (= TU 93, Berlin,


588B): ἁρήτην τε λόγῳ παντί το ὑπὲρ λόγου ἄγαθον, ..., καὶ νῦς ἀνθ-

πτος καὶ λόγος ἀρρητος, 1.5 (593Af.) where God is described as ἀλη-

πτος,

ἀκλητος (which is interpreted in Max.Conf. schol.div.nom.

(M.4.2010) as: ἀκλητον, φινος, αντι του μη καλουμενου των γνωρισμα-
ti and may be compared to ἀκληςτος in line 14 of our hymn) and ἕπε-

ἀυνος; while in 2.4 (641A) God's nature is ἀφθεγκτος. See also epist.

3 (1070B): και λεγουμενον (sc. το μυστήριον Ἰνσοῦ) ἁρητον μενει, και

νοουμενον ἀγνωστον.

In the School of Alexandria Plat. Tim.28c, together with the two
Biblical passages cited above, becomes a regular starting point for
any discussion on the ideas of incomprehensibility and ineffability
of God. See for instance Clem.Alex. Strom.v.12 78.1 (GCS 2 p.377.25
25ff.) and 79.1 (p.378.14ff.). A number of examples from pagan and
Christian literature which make use of the Platonic passage are
mentioned in J. Geffcken, Zwei griechische Apologeten, Sammlung
Wissenschaftlicher Kommentare zu griechischen und römischen Schrift-

We now turn to Gregory's works where a number of parallel passages are found dealing with both ideas (which are expressed in various developing stages). These are: ὁρ.40.5 (M.36.364B): θεὸς μὴν ἐστι φῶς τὸ ἁγιότατον καὶ ἁγροῦτον καὶ ὁδῆπτον, οὕτω νῦν καταληπτῶν, οὕτε λόγῳ ὁδῆπτον κάσις φωτιστικῆς λογικῆς φύσεως, ὁρ.30.17 (Gallay p.260f.; M.36.125B): Τὸ θεόν ἀκατονόμαστον .... οὕτε γὰρ ἀ-έρα τῶν ἑνευσεν δολον πάντοτε, οὕτε οὕσῳ πάντοις παντελῶς ἡ νοῦς κεχωρηκεν, ἡ ψωφὴ περελαβεν, ὁρ.45.3 (M.36.625C-628A) = ὁρ.38.7 (317Bff.): οὐκ ὅπως σκληροπύθευσας καὶ τούτῳ λέγων ἀμφότεροι καὶ μετρώς .... "Ἀπελευρον οὖν τὸ θεόν καὶ διαθέωρητον" καὶ τούτῳ πάντη καταλη-πτὸς αὐτοῦ μόνον, ἡ ἀπελούσα' .... ἡ διον ἄληστον εἰναι. The incompre- hensibility of God is discussed at length in the second theological oration having as its starting point Plat. Tim.28c: ὁρ.28.4 (Gallay p.106f.; M.36.296f.): θεὸν νοῆσαι μὲν χαλεπὸν, φράσαι δὲ ἀδύνατον, ὡς τοις τῶν παρ' "Ελληνικοὶ θεολόγοι ἐφιλοσοφήσαν, - οὐκ ἀτέχνως ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν, έναι καὶ κατεληπήσαν τὸ χαλεπὸν εύκειν, καὶ διαφύγῃ τῷ ἀνεκφάρα-στῳ τῷ ἐλεχχον. Ἀλλὰ φράσαι μὲν ἀδύνατον, ὡς ὁ ἐμὸς λόγος, νοῆσαι δὲ ἀδύνατερον. In paragraph five (p.108f.;32B) God's nature is described as ἄληστος and ἄκαταληπτος (which is interpreted by Elias of Crete as ἀκατάληπτος : M.36.770A); while in paragraph eleven (p. 122;40B) the idea of incomprehensibility is given in a short state- ment: Τὸ μὴ ληστὸν εἰναι ἀνεφωτίζω διάνοιξα τὸ θεόν. See ib.17 (p. 134;48C). In ὁρ.31.8 (Gallay p.290; M.36.1410) the nature of God is
called ἀρρητός καὶ ὑπὲρ λόγου. Finally, both ideas given with some flexibility may be seen in carm.2.1.87.13f.(1434): / μὴ τέρ έμη, τέ μ' εἰσιν, εἴπει θεὸν οὐτε νοήςαν, / οὗτε φράσας ὄνομαζα τόσονι, δῦνον πο-
θεώ; and De Virtute:1.2.10.934-36 (747f.): θεος νοεται μὲν τισιν, 
εἰ καὶ μετρόως ὑπ' οὔδενδε δὲ φράσετ' οὖθ' ἀκούεται,/ δῦνον πέρ ἐστι, 
κἄν τις οὕτη λέγει./

The question whether Gregory based the exposition of both ideas directly on Plato (as his reference to Tim.28c in or.28.4 leaves us to believe) or indirectly through his acquaintance with the School of Alexandria contributes little to the problem of authenticity of the hymn, since in either case the hymn could have been easily written by Gregory. The dependence of Gregory's second theological oration on Clem.Alex. Strom.v.12 (GCS 2 p.377.25ff.) was pointed out by H. Pinault, pp.73-82. Cf. also Otis, Dumbarton Oaks 12 (1958), p.108 n.31.

b) 6-10: All the creation in relation to God

Lines 6-7: All the creation praises God

On the notion of the creation (πάντα;6,7) praising its Creator see above the notes on 1.1.31. 7-10.

6. πάντα: It corresponds to δοσα (4,5) and is contrasted to μούνος (4,5).

6. λυγαίνει: Cf. Synes. hymn.5.4f.: / πάλι μου λόγανε θυμή,' /
θεὸν ὄρθροσουν ὄρνους,/, Apoll. Met.Ps. e.g.18.2, 25.23 (both in the same sedes), Anacreonta 48.3(PLG iii p.325 Bergk) and Nonn. Dion.e.g. 48.197. Besides, the same verb is used by Marinus (a pupil of Proclus) in an epideictic epigram referring to the latter and found in AP 9.197. 5 (same sedes).

7. γεραίρει: Cf. Gregory's carm.2.1.45.349 (1378), 2.1.1.634 (1017), Orph. Arg.619 (Abel) and Apoll. Met.Ps.e.g.4.10, 21.47 (all in the same sedes).

On the structure of lines 6-7 see the introductory analysis to
the hymn. Here, it seems necessary to point out that such techniques as those used in these lines are common in Gregory's style. See for instance the antithetical juxtaposition of active positive and passive negative forms of the same verb in ορ.41.9 (M.36.441B). See also Ruether p.59ff., 70ff. on figures of language and thought respectively.

Besides, the same feature, whereby the content of πάντα is stated by two antithetical words, may be seen in 1.1.33.1f. (πάντων: οὐρανὸς-γαῖα), 1.1.34.1f.(πάντων: τὰ νομίμα - τὰ ὀφέλη) and 1.1.31.3f.(πάντα: οὐρανὸς - γαῖαν). In all these cases the poet chooses the antithetical pair in connection to the general context of each hymn and not in order to describe exactly the full scale of πάντα.

Lines 8-10: The possibility that these lines may be a later interpolation in the hymn is discussed in detail in the introductory analysis to the hymn.

8. ξυνο...ξυναί: The epithet is used four times at the end of carm.1.1.9. 97-99 (464) to produce the same effect as here: ξυνο-νόσ μὲν πάντεσσων ἄηρ, ξυνη δὲ τε γαῖα, ξυνος δὲ ... / ξυνον δ' .... The double repetition of this epithet within the same line is featured also in Hesiod. fr.1.6 (Merkelbach-West), Apoll. Rhod. Arg.3.173 (cf.1.336,337), Theocr. Idyl.7.35 (see Gow's note ad loc.) and Oppian. Cyneget.4.43.

8. τέ ... δέ: For this irregular corresspondion (instead of the more common τέ ... τέ or τέ ... καί) see J.D. Denniston, The Greek Particles, second edition (Oxf., 1954), p.513. See also above the note on τέ ... τέ in 2.1.38.21.

8. πάθος: The word, together with ξυνος (which is similar in sense), appears in Moreschini's view to be a technical term in Neo-Platonic philosophy, used to describe the great desire of the purified soul to ascend to God (see Moreschini p.1369f.; cf. Gottwald p.39). An example of this is Plot. Enn.1.6.7.
In Gregory it is used for instance in *carm.* 1.1.7.10 (439): ὅς κε πόθοισι/ τεννώμεσθα πρὸς τὸ φῶς ἑλ νέον, 1.2.15.151f. (777):/ ψυχὴ δ' ἐστὶν ἁμα θεοῦ, καὶ κρείσσονα μονήν/ αἰεν ἄγαν ποθέει τῶν ύπερουρ-ρανών, *or.* 28.13 (Gallay p. 128; M.36.44Af.): Ἐπεὶ ἐφέτευ μὲν πᾶσα λογικὴ φύσις θεοῦ καὶ τῆς πρώτης αἰτίας καταλαβέθων δὲ ἀδύνατε ὑμῖν ἕλπιν αἰτίας. Κάμψουσα δὲ τῷ πόθῳ, καὶ οἶον σφαδάζουσα, ... δευτερόν ποιεῖται πλοῦν καὶ *or.* 32.15 (M.36.192A).

Examples with πόθος or ποθέμην from the Platonic Theology of Proclus are collected in Jahn p. 69. Here we cite only Procl. *hymn.* 2.5: πόθων ἀναγάγω κέντρα λαβοῦσα/ (sc. ψυχαί).

8. ὠδείτες: Delfgaauw (p. 148) sees under the whole verse (8) an allusion to *Ep.* Rom. 8.22 where the world - inanimate creation - appears to 'groan and suffer' with mankind: πᾶσα ἡ κτύσεις συνυπενδευτε καὶ συνσυνώνυν. However, if lines 8-10 belong to this hymn, such a meaning for ὠδείτες is not suitable to the general context of lines 6-10: the relation of All with God and the prevailing notion of All praising God. Jahn, on the other hand, influenced by the Neoplatonic overtones of the whole hymn, interprets ὠδείτες in connection with πόθος as meaning 'great love' (Lebenswehen in p. 69). The word in this sense may be found in Plat. *Phaedrus* 251e 5: ὠδύων ἔλιξεν (sc. ψυχή), *Epist.* ii. 313a 5 and *Rep.* 490b 7 (on which Plot. *Enn.* v. 3.17.16 and later Procl. *Theol.* *Plat.* ii. 8 (Saffr.-West. p. 57) are based).

This word is used, I think, in the same sense as the participle σφαδάζουσα of *or.* 28.13 which is cited in the previous note.

8. ἄπάντων: This, as well as the two πάντα in the following line, refers (as I have maintained above in the introductory analysis to the hymn) to all rational beings (*νοοῦσα: 10*).

9. ὧν ὑπὲρ: 'about you'. The object of the longing and great desire of all rational beings is expressed with a prepositional phrase.

9. σοῦ ... προσεύχεται: Another characteristic which marks the
relation of all rational beings with God is that they offer prayers to Him.

9f. εἰς σὲ ... ὄντων: Note another preference of the poet for prepositional expressions to denote this time the person to whom the hymn of All is addressed. The significance of the use of such expressions in this hymn is discussed below in the note on σοι ἐν in line 11.

10. σύνθεσις: None of the meanings provided in LSJ s.v. is here appropriate. On the contrary, the word appears to mean 'creation', according to Delfgaauw (p.148), or 'composition', according to Lampe s.v. The attitude of the poet to use this word with a different meaning is in accordance with Gregory's tendency to use words with different meaning (see above p. 41).

With this meaning the whole sentence (9f.) becomes: 'to you All (rational beings), realizing that they are (sc. σύντα) your creation/composition, 'say' 'a silent hymn'.

10. (τάντα) νοέοντα λαλεῖ: This juxtaposition recalls (τάντα) νοέοντα (7) - λαλεῖντα (6) which might be further internal evidence for regarding lines 8-10 as part of this hymn.

10. λαλεῖ ζυγώμενον ὄντων: This oxymoron may have been formed to recall the one in line 6 : οὐ λαλεῖντα λιγαύνει (although this is less stressed).

In Gregory this type of oxymoron seems to be common. See for instance carm.2.1.12.364 (1192): συγή δοῦνες, καὶ δοκίμων μὴ λέγελνικα, and other passages from poems and epistles related to Gregory's vow of silence (see above p.203f.): 2.1.34.1f. (1307): "Ἰσχεῖο γλώσσα φύλη· οὐ δὲ μοι, γραφίσ, ἔγγραφε συγῆς/δώματα καὶ φηγγόν τού δυμαστ τὰ κραδένης. / 209f. (1322): ὡς μὲν ἔχοντε / ἡμετέρης συγῆς μιχυύδουνον λαλέουν./ and (though in a different context) epist.112.1 (Gallay ii p.6; M.37. 209a): ἔσθε δεξαμένη σε καὶ σωτηρίν, ἵνα μάθης καὶ σωτηρίς λόγου τῇ γρα
The best parallel seems to be Or. 44.11 (M. 36.620B): πάντα θεόν ὑμεῖς καὶ δοξάζεις φωνάς ἄλαλήτους.

A similar oxymoron appears in other Christian writers: Synes. hymn. 2. 80-86: ἵππον σε, μάκαρ, / καί διὰ φωνῶς, / ὑμνῶ σε, μάκαρ, / καί διὰ σιγῆς / διὰ γὰρ φωνῆς, / τόσα καὶ σιγῆς/ ἄεις νοεράς. / to which Tersaghi ad loc. adds Clem. Alex. Strom. vii. 7 39, 6 (GCS 3 p. 30.15ff.): ἐστιν οὖν .. ὡμιλία πρὸς τὸν θεόν ἢ εὐχή καὶ φθεύσειντες ἀρα μὴ τὰ χεῦλα ἀνοίγοντες μετὰ σιγῆς προσαλῶμεν, ἔνδοθεν κεκράγαμεν. Finally, in a liturgical papyrus (Berol. pap. 9794) God is called σιγῆς φωνοῦμεν (see C. Wessely, Les plus anciens Monuments du Christiantionisme écrits sur Papyrus, vol. ii, in Patrologia Orientalis 18(1924), p. 431 line 51f.). The same expression appears in a similar prayer in Corp. Herm. i. 31 (cited above p. 325; see also note 76 of Nock-Festug. on Corp. Herm. i. 30).

c) 11-13a: God's nature and characteristics in relation to All

11. σοὶ ἐνυ: The alternative reading ἐνυ produces a remarkable contrast with πάντα as both words are juxtaposed. Such a contrast is in harmony with those in μονος (4, 5) - πάντα (6, 7), and καὶ εἰς καὶ πάντα (12). However, the use of the preposition ἐνυ (in anastrophe) seems to be necessitated by the syntax of μέταν (see LSJ s.v.). In this way the prepositional expression σοὶ ἐνυ may be compared to those in line 9: ἄμις σὲ and εἰς σὲ, and add a further internal evidence that lines 8-10 form part of this hymn.

Using these prepositional phrases to express various relations of All with God, the poet consciously or not seems to follow a general attitude, appearing for instance in the stoic-gnostic order: εἰς οὐ - ἐν ὧ (or δι') οὐ - εἰς οὖ (sc. ὁ κόσμος γὰρ γενεται) (see H. Dörrie, 'Präpositionen und Metaphysik', Museum Helveticum 26 (1969),
pp.217-28 and W. Theiler, *Die Vorbereitung des Neuplatonismus*, second edition (Berlin-Zürich: Hildebrand, 1964), pp.31ff.), and in St Paul's epistles (Rom.11.36, 1Cor.8.6 which Norden believes to have been influenced by Stoicism: see Norden p.240ff.).

11. σοι ἐν πάντα μένει: Cf. *carm.*1.1.5.2 (424); νοῦς μέγας (sc. God) ἐν τῷ ἄπαντα ἐστὶν and the rest of the passages cited above in the note on line 1a in which the transcendence of God is opposed to His immanence in the world; alsoCorp.Herm.v.10 (Nock-Festugièrè): πάντα δὲ ἐν σοι (see Festugièrè, *La Révélation d' Hermès Trismégiste*, vol.iv, (Paris,1954), p.69 n.2), Clem.Alex. Paed.iii.12 101.2 (GCS 1 p.291.9f.): πάντα τῷ ἐν, ἐν φ θ πάντα, δι’ ὅν τὰ πάντα ἐν (sc. ἐστὶ), and Marc. Aurel. Εἰς οὐράνιον iv.23.2: ἐν σοὶ πάντα, ἐν σοι πάντα, εἰς σὲ πάντα.

This idea, namely that everything remains within God may be compared to that in 1.1.30.22f.: the Holy Spirit contains everything (see the note *ad loc.*). See also Apoll. Met.Ps.118.166: γαῖα, μάρτυς, παλάμψις μένει σέρ κουσκέτσα/., Procl. Inst.Theol.30 (Dodds p.34): τὸ ἀπὸ τῶν παραγόμενον ἀμέσως μένει τε ἐν τῷ παράγοντι καὶ πρόεισιν ἄξι’ αὐτοῦ (see the note of Dodds *ad loc.*) and Orph. fr.168.10 (Kern) = Orph. fr.169.5 (Kern): πάντα γὰρ ἐν ζηνός μεγάλῳ τάδε σώματι κείται/. The above passages show that the idea in line 11a was widespread and common to different areas.

Line 11b: The idea of this hemistich may be illustrated with a passage which describes the relationship of All with God in *carm.* 1.2.454f.(614): (πάντες γὰρ ἐνὸς γένος: cf. Arat. Phaen.5).../ πάντες ἐνὸς, πάντεσσαι κυνὴ μῦδα, εἰς ἕνα πάντες/ νεόμενον. Thus, θάδεσσα τω (compared to νεόμεν εἰς τοῦ of this Gregorian passage) should, I think, mean 'rushing quickly towards somebody' (see LSJ s.v. θάδεσσα). With this meaning this verb may be contrasted to μένειν of the first hemistich. The above Gregorian passage helps us also to trace for
line 11 a possible source in (or at least a connection with) the famous passage in St Paul's speech on Areopagus: ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ τῶν καὶ κυνοῦμεν καὶ ἐσυμέν (Act.17.28). See also Ps.-Dionysius Areop. div. nom.13.3 (M.3.980B): ἐν ᾧ (sc. Ἐλείμη ἑνότητι) ... πάντα ἐστὶ ... καὶ μένει ... καὶ ἐπιστρέφεται.

12. καὶ πάντων τέλος ἐστὶ: Cf. 2.1.38.9: (sc. Christ) αἰῶνος παύριμα and the note ad loc.

The notion that a deity is the beginning and end of all has come from religion but philosophy, as Keyssner observes (p.15), developed it so that it was spread further. Its appearance in Greek pagan hymns may be seen in: hymn. in Fortunam 11 (Heitsch p.172): τάντων γὰρ ἄρχαν καὶ τέλος αἰῶν ἔχεις, Orph. hymn.4.2 (Uranus) = 15.7 (Zeus): ἄρχη τάντων πάντων τε τελευτή/ and Mag.hymn.Selene 35f. (Heitsch p. 192): ἄρχη καὶ τέλος εἰς, πάντων δὲ σὺ μονὴ ἀνάσσεις* / ἐκ σέο γὰρ πάντ᾽ ἐστὶ καὶ εἰς [αἰῶνες] (οὐδὲ) παντί τελευτά.

In Greek philosophy this notion may be traced in Plat. Leges iv. 715e-716a which, according to Procl. Theol.Plat.vi.8 (Portus,1618 p. 363), is based on Orph. fr.21 (Kern). Cf. also Orph.fr.21a and 168 and the note of des Places on Plat. Leges iv.716a. Later, it appears in the Neoplatonist Iamblichus (e.g. Protrepticus c.iv ed. Pistelli p.23.3ff.) and finally, in Procl. Theol.Plat.ii.8 (Saffr.-West. p.55. 12) and iii.7 (p.29.15f.), as Jahn already observed (p.73).

12. καὶ εἶς καὶ πάντα: Jahn (p.73) suggests a correction of εἶς into ἐν (without any MS authority) in order to correspond to the neuter form ἐν in the following line.

This expression may be compared with Synes. hymn.1.180-82: ἐν καὶ πάντα, ἐν δὲ πάντων, ἐν τε πρὸ πάντων, and 199-201: ἐν καὶ πάντα, ἐν καθ᾽ ἐαυτό, ἐν δὲ πάντων. Terzaghi (pp.87-89), commenting on the first passage, gives - after Norden (pp.247-49) - the history of the phrase ἐν εἶναι τὰ πάντα in Greek philosophy - begin-
ning from Heraclitus fr. 50 (Diels, Vorsokr. i p.161) – Orphicism, and Apocryphal/Gnostic and Hermetic literature. However, this phrase is quite different from that in Synesius (i.e. ἐὰν καὶ πᾶντα), since in the latter phrase ἔν and πᾶντα are both qualifications of God and their connection produces a paradox; while in the former ἔν is a qualification of τὰ πᾶντα, as πᾶντα is a qualification of ὁ εὐς in the opposite expression πᾶντα ὁν ἐνο in Corp.Herm.xvi.3.

The Synesian passage in turn differs from the present one in the use of ἔν instead of εὐς. Nor is the passage mentioned by Norden (p.184 n.1) from the Stoic Seneca: (sc.deus) solus est omnia (Natur. Quest. 1.praef.13) an exact parallel to the present phrase, as Festugière rightly comments (see Festugière, La Révélation, vol.iv, p.69). The latter scholar provides further expressions for comparison taken from Hermetic literature (e.g. Asclep.20) and Philo Alexandrinus: i.72.7 (Cohn): εὐς καὶ τὸ πᾶν αὐτὸς ἐν.

The present expression, as Festugière has already observed (p.69), must be seen in its contrast to line 13a: οὐχ ἔν ἔνον, οὐ πᾶντα (and, may I add, to καὶ οὔδεν:12) as used simply to emphasize that God cannot be conceived (or described).

12 καὶ οὔδεν : This is the reading of all the MSS of group α, while group β has ὑπάρχεις. In order to obtain a better philosophical meaning in line 12b with the triple polysyndeton and avoid the hiatus caused by ὑπάρχεις, I think that the reading of group α is preferable.

Lines 12b-13a : The similarity of this passage with Plot. Enn. v.2.1.1: Τὸ ἔν πᾶντα καὶ οὔδε ἔν· ἀρχὴ γὰρ πᾶντων οὐ πᾶντα, ἀλλ' ἐ-κείνως πᾶντα has already been pointed out by P. Henry and H.R. Schwyzer ad loc. (see also Moreschini p.1386). However, this is a purely verbal similarity because the ideas in both texts are different: in Plotinus the One (τὸ ἔν) is compared to πᾶντα (All); while in
our passage God is paradoxically at the same time One, All, Nothing, and the opposite of these.

d) 13b-15a: God is both πανώνυμος and ἄκλαλτος, and incomprehensible.

This section expands further the subject of God's ineffability and incomprehensibility discussed in lines 2-5.

13. πανώνυμος: This is the reading of group α and as a lectio difficilior (this is the only citation in Lexica) must be preferred to πολύλλογος of group β.

In the meaning 'having all names' it is precisely contrasted with ἄκλαλτος in the following line, which here has the meaning 'without any name' (see below the note ad loc.). The alternative reading πολύλλογος ('multinominis') of group β seems to have been a gloss which eventually substituted the original word (since in some MSS it appears as a marginal or linear note).

The subject of the polynomy of pagan gods (expressed in our hymn with πανώνυμος) features nearly in every Greek hymn (see above p. 27). In these hymns, however, the common epithet used is πολύνωνυμος which first appears twice in the Homeric hymn to Demeter (18.32), very likely as an epithet of Pluto (see the note by Allen-Halliday-Sikes on hymn Dem. 18). Later we find it in the philosophical hymns: Cleanth. hymn. 1 (Zeus) (on this see Adam, The Vitality of Platonism, pp. 119-21) and Procl. hymn. 2.1 (Aphrodite). Finally, it applies quite often to various deities in the Orphic and Magic hymns: Orph. hymn. 45.2 (Dionysus) and Mag. hymn. 5.20 (Selene) (ed. Abel). For further examples see Keyssner p. 47.

14. ἄκλαλτος: In LSJ s.v. we find passages which use the epithet (as a compound from α + κλείω) in the sense 'not closed or fastened'. However, its contrast with πανώνυμος (13) shows (as is also mentioned in Lampe s.v.) that it should mean 'without name'.

It is therefore used here as a compound from α + καλέω. This shows that the poet follows a custom common to Gregory, namely he uses words (appearing in Greek literature) with a different meaning (see above p. 41). Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite uses in the same sense the similar epithet ἀκλητός: div.nom.1.5 (M.3.593B).

In line 13f. the poet expands the subject of God's ineffability (2,4) by stating another paradoxical view: God is at the same time πανώνυμος and ἀκλητός (i.e. has every name, and no name). These ideas are discussed in Ps.-Dion.Areop. div.nom.1.6f. (M.3.596A-C) expressed in the terms: τὸ πολυώνυμον (sc. τῆς θεότητος) and τὸ ἀνώνυμον alternatively. The author explains the latter term by basing it on LXX Gen.32.29 and Jud.13.18. Besides, Maximus the Confessor, when commenting on the above passage (in M.4.208C) says: ἀνώνυμον (sc. τήν θεότητα) διὰ τὸ πάντα εἶναι καὶ μηδὲν τῶν δυντῶν εἶναι, ἀλλὰ πάντα ἐξ αὐτοῦ εἶναι, ὡς αὐτὸς ἐπετύχεται. As we see, this passage bears some relation to our line 12f.

As has been already noticed above, the word-arrangement of πῶς ... ἀκλητόν; (13f.) may be compared to line 2 of the Anthology and Olymp. a and b versions.

14b-15a: This is another rhetorical question with the interrogative pronoun (τίς) postponed as happens for instance in Callim. hymn.Jov.1.92.

With this rhetorical question the poet expresses that it is impossible for any 'heavenly mind' (νόσος οὐρανός) to penetrate the veils above the clouds (ὑπερψεφάς καλύπτρας), or the veils appearing above (ὑπερψεφάς; the reading of group β καλύπτρας). Since in line 13f. the poet expands with the paradox: πανώνυμος - ἀκλητός the first idea of section 2-5, namely God's ineffability, it is, I believe, quite certain that with this metaphor (14b-15a) he wants to do the same with the second idea in section 2-5, namely God's incom-
prehensibility. This may be seen from the fact that in line 2 God is incomprehensible only to νός (most likely the ordinary human mind); while here, God is incomprehensible even to νός οὐρανίως (i.e. to a heavenly mind, or a mind pertaining to heaven). It is obvious that οὐρανίως was added by the poet deliberately to illustrate the expansion of this idea: God is incomprehensible not only to νός but even to νός οὐρανίως (the exact meaning of the expression is given below). This impossibility in understanding God is expressed with the metaphor of the veils which in the MSS of group α are characterized as 'found above the clouds' (ὑπερνεφέσας) and in the MSS of group β as 'appearing above' (ὑπερφανές: see LSJ s.v.). I think that this metaphor is not perfect if these veils are not characterized as 'found above the clouds', because otherwise they could be penetrated by any heavenly mind (through its own heavenly nature). Therefore, the reading of group α is preferable to that of group β. Gregory uses ὑπερνεφέσας in various metaphorical meanings in carm.1.2.2.6 (578), or.43.64 (M.36.581A) and De Vita Sua: 2.1.11.413 (Jungck p.74; M:37.1057)

Let us now attempt to find the exact meaning of νός οὐρανίως and ὑπερνεφέσας καλύπτεις. Provided that the hymn is written by Gregory, νός οὐρανίως may be interpreted as either 'a purified human mind' (i.e. free from the bonds of flesh: see above the note on 1.1.32.45 and that on 1.1.34.21b), or 'an angel' (since νός οὐρανίως in 2.1.38.23 refer also to angels, as I maintain in the note ad loc. where I also note the interchangeability between οὐρανίως, οὐρανίως and οὐρανίως without any particular difference in their meaning (see on this also the note on 2.1.38.24: ἰζουρανίως). The second interpretation may be supported by a passage from Gregory's second theological oration, addressed to his audience and used to show that it is impossible for anybody to know God: or.28.3 (Gallay
In its literal sense θυγερνεψης καλύπτρα is a veil above the cloud and if one takes the cloud as the first veil, the veil above it should be the second. Therefore, in knowing (or seeing) God there are two hindrances. Such an idea may be seen in Gregory's De Virtute: carm.1.2.10. 954-57 (749): (sc. God)

According to this passage it is not possible for anybody to see God because of the double veil which covers Him (δυσπλούν σκέπας:957) and which consists of: a) the σκότος:954, or ζόφος:955 (i.e. the first 'veil') and b) the φῶς:954 (i.e. the second 'veil': δευτέρω προβλήματι). A passage from Gregory's second theological oration may help us to determine the meaning of the first 'veil' (i.e. of σκότος, ζόφος). According to this or.28.12 (Galay p.124; M.36.41A)-what stands in the way of man in his attempt to understand God is: ο σωματικός γυόφος, ο θεός η νεφέλη το πάλα των άνθρωπων και των 'Εβραίων. He then goes on to interpret LXX Ps.17.12: (sc. God) και ές το σκότος ἀνοικρυφήν αὐτοῦ (which seems to be a very close parallel to line 954b of the above De Virtute passage) as τὴν ήμετέραν παράστασιν. In other words the first 'veil' hindering the view or knowledge of God seems most likely to be man's body (σώμα: in its unpurified status), or flesh (ζόφος) (see on this the scholion by Elias of Crete on or.28.12 in M.36.775C-776A). Such an idea may be seen
in a number of Gregory's passages: or.28.4 (Gallay p.108; M.36.32A):

Tò δὲ τοσοῦτον πράγμα τῇ διανοούσῃ περιλαμβανεῖν πάντως ἀδύνατον καὶ ἀμη-χανον, μὴ δὲ τοῖς ..., ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ... καὶ οἷς ὁ ζῷος οὕτως ἐπι-προσθετ καὶ τὸ παχὺ τούτῳ σαρκών πρὸς τὴν τοῦ ἀληθίους κατανύσην, De
Virtute: carm.1.2.10. 90-94 (687):

θεὸς μὲν ἐστὶν εὕτε νοῦς, εὕτε οὐσία
κρείσσων τύς ἄλλη, νοῦ μόνον λπτή βολαῖς,
εἰ μὲν τελεώς τοῖς ἄνω (sc. angels), οὔδε θεὸς,
ἡμέν δ' ἀμυνδρ反响ς, οἷς ἐπιπροσθεῖ ἑφός
σαρκός παχεύς, δυσμενοῦς προβλήματος.

or.2.74 (Bernardi p.186; M.35.481Bf.):

Τὸς περικυκλώσας ἔτι τὸν κάτω ζῷου καὶ τῆς σαρκὸς τὴν παχύτη-
ta δίπλα νοῦ καθαρῶς ἐπιπροσθεῖ νοῦν ὅλον καὶ μυγδάται τοῖς ἐστώ-
σι καὶ ἀδράτοις ἐν τοῖς ἀστάτοις καὶ ὄρωνμανοις; Μόλις γὰρ ἀν τοὺς
ἐνταθὰ τῶν σφόδρα κεκαθαρισμένων καὶ ἐξίσοντον τοῦ καλοῦ θεωρήσει-
ειν, ὥσπερ οἱ τὸν ἴλουν ἐν τοῖς οὐδαῖ.

or.39.8 (M.36.344A), carm.2.1.1.204f.(985): στενάξω δ' ὑπὸ σαρκὲ 
πα-
χεῦρ, τὴν ὅτα σοφοὶ καλέσουσι νῦν ζῷου, 2.1.87. 21-24 (1434f.):

ἀλλὰ οὖν μὲ, οὖν μὲ, θεοῦ λόγος, ἐχ δὲ οὐ πιστὰς
ἐλύσως ἔξερευόσας, ἐς βύου ἄλλον ἄγων,
ἐνθα οὖν καθαρός σε φαντατον ἀμφιχορέουσιν,
μικέθ' ὑπὸ σκεφῆς κρυπτόμενος νεφέλης.

and possibly De Virtute: 1.2.10. 937f.(748). Note in the above passa-
ges the various words used for the body or flesh: νέφος, νεφέλη, πρό-
βλημα, σκότος and ζῷος (on this see also Gottwald p.36).

Having established the sense of the first 'veil' we now turn to
the second 'veil' which, as we have seen, the first De Virtute-passage
calls φῶς (or δεύτερον πρόβλημα). Since God is Light, or source of
light, or He dwells in light (cf.Ep.1Tim.6.16, LXX Ps.103.2), the
second 'veil' seems to be nothing else than God's nature itself. So
applying the De Virtutes scheme to our passage it becomes quite obvious that the first veil (i.e. νέφος which is implied from ὑπερνεφής) should be the unpurified body and the second (i.e. ὑπερνεφής καλύτρα) God Himself who is not accessible to any 'heavenly mind' (νός οὐρανός). Following this interpretation our passage may be compared to or.2.76 (Bernardi p.188; M.35.484A): αἱ καθαραὶ φύσεις μόλις χωροῦσαν θεοῦ λαμπρότητα δύν ἄμμουσις καλύτερες, οὔσινος ἀποκρύφη, φωτὸς δύνος τοῦ καθαρωτάτου καὶ ἄφιεσθω τοῖς πλείοσιν where καθαραὶ φύσεις are interpreted by Bernardi ad loc. as referring to angels following or.28.31 (Callay p.172; M.36.72B).

The idea of line 14f. may be compared also with Ps.-Dion.Areop. mystic.theol.1.3 (M.3.1000Bf.) where the explanation why God is at the same time κολούχος and ἀλογος (i.e. described with many, or no words: see Max.Conf. scho1. ad loc.(M.4.420B)) is given as follows: διὰ τὸ πάντων αὐτὴν (sc. τὴν ἀγάθη πάντων αὐτίκαν) ὑπερστοιχίας ὑπερκειμένην εἶναι, καὶ μόνως ... ἐκαθαρωμένην τοῖς ... εἰς τὸν γνώφον εἰσ-δυομένως, οὐ δύνος ἐστὶν, ὡς τὰ λόγια φησιν ὥ πάντων ἐπέκειλα.

Finally, the idea that God is covered by His own light may be seen in Synes. hymn.1.158f.:/ καλυμμένε νυῆ/ ἱόδαις αὐγαῖς/ and 195-98:/ οὕ το φανούμενον,/ οὗ το θυμισμένον,/ φῶς κρυπτόμενον/ ἱόδαις αὐγαῖς./

III. Prayer (15b-16)

15. ἔλασ εἰναὶ : On the use of the common request for mercy in pagan and Christian hymns alike see above the note on 1.1.33.5. This expression is used for instance in carm.2.2.3.161 (1491) and 2.1.1. 402 (1000). See also carm.2(epit.).2.102.7 (M.38.63) = AP 8.76.7,

1. I speak of one such veil because I do not think that the plural ὑπερνεφῆς καλύτρας bears any particular significance in meaning.

2. For γνώφος in a similar context see also epist.5 (1073A).
Line 16 = line 1. A renewed invocation in the Prayer or at the end of the hymn was a common feature in Greek pagan hymns (see above the notes on 1.1.34.14 and 29f.).

To conclude our examination of 1.1.29 we may refer once more to the problem of its authenticity.

The preliminary investigation of the MS tradition led us to two possibilities: a) the hymn (at least its 13-line form) may belong to Gregory and b) behind the various forms of the hymn may lie more than one hymn and several authors.

The examination in the commentary of the various ideas of 1.1.29 has revealed their connection, not only with Neoplatonism and Christian authors influenced by it, but also with other trends current in late antiquity which are related to a monotheistic conception of God and feature in Hermetic, Orphic, Stoic, Philonic and Gnostic literature, so that the hymn may be characterized as an example of the syncretistic attitudes of the period. However, the hymn does not propagate any ideas of the above theosophical and philosophico-religious systems, since, as we have illustrated in the introductory analysis to the hymn, the poet uses them all in contradiction to each other producing thus various paradoxical statements (about God's nature and characteristics), only for the purpose of showing that none of these ideas is sufficient to define God who is beyond man's reach.

The comparison of the hymn (its 16-line form) with Gregory's works (made in the commentary) has shown many affinities between them in ideas - if not expressed always with the same words - some of
which cannot be illustrated fully and interpreted satisfactorily, unless they are related to various Gregorian passages. Besides, the careful structure of the hymn (illustrated in the introductory analysis to it) is in accordance with the various techniques we have seen Gregory repeatedly using in his verse-composition.

Finally, the absence from the hymn of words commonly associated with the Christian tri-une God (e.g. Θεός, Πατήρ, Υἱός, Νεόνια) need not be a point against Gregorian authorship, since they are also absent from the main body of Gregory's second theological oration, only to be found twice: once in the exordium where Gregory invokes the assistance of the Trinity, and once in the peroration in the phrase: Ταῦτα εἰ μὲν πρὸς ἄξιαν ὤνωνται, τῆς Θεότητος ἡ χάρις καὶ τῆς μαρτύριος  ἐν τοῖς τροποῖς θεότητος (or.28.31 (Gallay p.174; M.36.720)). Furthermore, the words τὸ θεόν or ὁ θεός, used in this oration, have been substituted in our hymn by the second personal pronoun (used 14 times) and the general introductory invocation ὁ πάντων ἐπέβαλε (which, as we have said, are cleverly used by the poet in order to avoid naming and thus defining God, since this would have come in contradiction with the main themes of the hymn). The similarities of the themes appearing in both texts have led Delfgaauw (p.113) and Fernández (p.241) among others to consider the hymn as a poetic summary of this oration.

From the above I believe that we have enough evidence to consider the hymn as written by Gregory, most probably at one of the moments when his tendency to appear more 'Greek' than 'Christian' was at its most.
Appendix I: Metre

Table 1: Caesura and Diaeresis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poem</th>
<th>No. of lines</th>
<th>Troch. 3rd Caesura</th>
<th>Strong 3rd Caesura</th>
<th>Strong 4th Caesura</th>
<th>Bucolic Diaeresis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.38</td>
<td>6 (3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.38</td>
<td>52 (26)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.31</td>
<td>12 (6)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>67.59%</td>
<td>32.41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: The Use of the long Monosyllables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poem</th>
<th>No. of lines</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.38</td>
<td>6 (3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.38</td>
<td>52 (26)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.31</td>
<td>12 (6)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Proportion of Dactyls and Spondees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 725 110 35 97 48 118 27 116 29 140 5 581 144

% 80.14 19.86

Table 4: Number of Lines containing 5 Dactyls, 1, 2 or 3 Spondees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poems Lines</th>
<th>5 Dec.</th>
<th>1 Sp.</th>
<th>2 Spon.</th>
<th>3 Spond.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.38</td>
<td>6(3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.38</td>
<td>52(26)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.31</td>
<td>12(6)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 145 44 64 32 5

% 30.34 44.14 22.07 3.45
Table 5: Proportion of Dactyls and Spondees in the Pentameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poems</th>
<th>Lines/Feet</th>
<th>1st hemist.</th>
<th>2nd hemist.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>4 D.1Sp. 2Sp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.38</td>
<td>6(3)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.38</td>
<td>52(26)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.31</td>
<td>12(6)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Position of the final Accent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>27(18.62%)</td>
<td>79(54.48%)</td>
<td>39(26.90%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Poems | Lines | 1st Hemiepes | 2nd Hemiepes |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>74.29%</td>
<td>5.71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Position of the final Accent in 1.1.32 according to the Length of its Cola

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.30</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>80.39%</td>
<td>13.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Accent</th>
<th>First Colon</th>
<th>Second Colon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 syll.</td>
<td>8 syll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate Syll</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penult. Syll.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antepen. Syll.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix II: Table of Editions

| Auth. | Editor | Place | Publisher | Date | 1.1.29 | 1.1.30 | 1.1.31 | 1.1.32 | 1.1.33 | 1.1.34 | 1.1.35 | 1.1.36 | 2.1.38 | 1.1.37 | 1.1.38 | Vol |
|-------|--------|-------|-----------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----|
| Gr-L  | Greg. Manutius | Venice | Aldus Manutius | 1504 | * | * | | | | | | | | | |
| Gr-L  | Greg. | Basel | J. Hervagius | 1550 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Latin | Greg. Jac. de Billy | Paris | Joan. Benenatus | 1569 | | | | | | | | | | 52 | 54 |
| Latin | Greg. Lœwenklay | Basel | J. Hervagius | 1571 | 1019 | 1012 | 1054(1-50) | | | | | | | | |
| "     | " | " | " | | 972 | 975f. | | | | | | | | | |
| Gr-L  | Syn. Steph. Nyliander | Rostoch | Henr. Stephanus | 1586 | E3-V4 | E8-V4 | F1-V1 | | | | | | | |
| Gr-L  | Greg. de Billy-F. Moral | Paris | Cl. Morel | 1609 | 252 | 185f. | | | | | | | | 127f. | 131f. | |
| "     | " | " | " | | 1630 | (com.6) | | | | | | | | | |
| "     | " | " | " | | Cologne | M.G. Weidmann | 1690 | | | | | | | | |
| Gr-L  | Greg. N.M. Zimmermann | Lunaeburg | M. Lamprecht | 1647 | G4-V4 | G7-V7 | H8-V7 | | | | | | | | |
| Greek | Greg. L.A. Muratori | Patavia | | 1709 | | | | | | | | | | 165 | 170 |
| Gr-L  | Coll. J.Fr. Boissonade | Paris | | 1825 | | 161ff. | | | | | | | | | 6 |
| Greek | Coll. Christ-Paranikæ | Leipzig | B.G. Teubner | 1871 | 24 | 23f. | 29(1-28) | | | | | | | | |
| Gr-L  | Coll. J.B. Pitra | | | 1884 | xlvif. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Greek | Coll. Joh. Sakkelion | Athens | | 1890 | | | | | | | | | | 23 |
| Greek | A.H. Jahn | Halis Saxon. | | 1894 | | | | | | | | | | 76 |

* The edition is without pagination.
Appendix III : Gregory's Techniques in Verse-Composition

Some of the techniques Gregory followed in composing his poems are:

1) The composition of poems with the same subject but different metre: carm.1.1.5, 1.1.6 (424-29, 430-38): De Providentia, carm.1.2.9, 1.2.10 (667-80, 680-752): De Virtute and carm.1.2.26, 1.2.27 (851-54, 854-56): Εἰς εὐγενὴ δύστροφον. The first poem of each pair is in hexameters, while the second is in iambics. In carm.1.2.35, 1.2.36 (965, 965f.): Εἰς πενήνευν ψηλόσφον, and carm.1.2.37, 1.2.38 (966,967): Εἰς τὴν ὑπομονὴν the first poem of each pair is in iambics and the second in elegiacs. Finally, in carm.1.1.36, and 2.1.3 (1020f.) - a hymn and a prayer before a departing journey - the first poem is in hexameters and the second in iambics. As Wyss observes, this technique (namely the composition of poems on the same subject and different metre) was a beloved practice in schools from the Hellenistic period onwards¹.

2) The beginning of two poems with the same verse: carm.2.1.10. 1(1027): Πρὸς τοὺς τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἱερέας καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν κόλυν, and carm.2.1.13.1 (1227): Εἰς ἐκποίησιν begin with:

"Ὡς θυσίας πέντενες ἀναμάκτους, ἱερεῖς"²

3) The beginning of two poems with similar verses: 1) carm.2.1. 87. 1-2 (1433):

Μὴτερ ἐνῆ, τῆς μ' ἐτύλικες, ἐπεὶ πολύσωρον ἐτύλικες;

τόποι μὲ τόδε βυζ δύκας ἀκανθοφόρῳ;

². Repetitions of lines within the poems have been collected by Werhahn, Ἑὐγενὲς Ἑῳν, p.7 n.5. To these we may add: carm. 2.1.22.13 (1281) = 2.1.92.1 (1447), 2.1.13.1(1227)=2.1.10.1(1027), 1.1.7.8-12(439)=1.2.1.15-19(523) and 1.1.7.13-16(439f.)=1.2.1.31-34(524). Similar repetitions appear also in Gregory's orations and have been attested by Sajdak (J.Sajdak, 'Nazianzenica, part I', EOS, 15 (1909), 123-29 (p.124).
and carm.2.1.92. 1-2(1447):

Χρυστῆ ἄναξ, τῷ μὲ σαρκὸς ἐν ἅρμα ποιεῖται ἐνέδρας;

τῷ δὲ βῆς δήκομεν ὑπ' ἀντιπάλην;

ii) carm.2.1.75.1 (1422): ἔχεις κριθῶν

Οὔμοι, στενοθμοῖ τῷ βῆς καὶ τῷ πλέουσι (ζωῆς παρθένειν)

and carm.2.1.76.1 (1423): Ἐπερος θρήνος

Οὔμοι στενοθμοῖ τῷ βῆς καὶ τῷ τέλει.

and iii) a) carm.1.2.17.1 (781): Πολεμοῦ βοῶν μακαρίσμοι καὶ b) carm.2.1.28.1 (1287): 'Ελεγειακὸν

"Ολθίον ὅτις ἔρημον (ἀσαρχὸν b) ἔχει βυῶν, οὕς ἐπυμπικτόν

An elaborate example of variation of whole poems offers a group of four short poems: carm.1.2.20, 1.2.21, 1.2.22, 1.2.23 (788-90).

This can be sufficiently illustrated only if we cite their texts.

1) carm.1.2.20 (788): Περὶ πόθου

Δεινὸν πόθος πάς. Ἄν ὡς καὶ φιλουμένον,

διπλαῦν τὸ δεινὸν. Εἰ ὡς καὶ κόρας νέας,

τριπλαῦν τὸ κέντρον. Εἰ ὡς καὶ κάλλους γέμων,

κλεῖδον τὸ καθὸν. Εἰ ὡς πρὸς γάμου φέρειν,

πῦρ ἐνδον αὐτὴν βοσκεῖν τὴν καρδιὰν.

2) carm.1.2.21 (789): Περὶ θανάτου φιλουμένου

Πυκνὸν τάφος πάς. Ἄν ὡς καὶ τέχνου τάφος,

διπλαῦν τὸ καθὸν. Εἰ ὡς άρισταλοὺ πάλιν,

ἡ συμφραγὶ πῦρ. Εἰ ὡς υμφραγί νέου,

ἡ καρδιὰ ἀδιγθεὶ τῶν γεννητόρων.

3) carm.1.2.22 (789): Περὶ φύλων τῶν μη καλῶν

Δεινὸν τὸ μάχειν. Ἄν ὡς καὶ φύλων ὦκεν,

ὡς χείρον. Ἄν ὡς καὶ λαθραίους δήγμασι,

τοῦτοι οὐ φορητὸν. Ἄν ὡς καὶ πλευτῶν ὦκεν,

ἐπύσχες. Ἄν ὡς καὶ θεοῦ παραστάτων,

ποὺ τῶν τραπεταί; Πῶς φύγῃ κακῶν φοράν;
The art of variation may be seen also in a number of Gregory's epitaphs and epigrams (particularly when they refer to the same person): see M.38 cols 11ff. Besides, the variation in carm.1.1.37 and 1.1.38 is discussed above pp.189ff., 192ff. respectively.

4) A final technique in Gregory's verse-composition is the repetition within the same poem of a line (as a refrain after an equal number of lines) with its second hemistich changed: carm.2.1.78 (1425f.). Here the first line reads:

"Εργον ἔχεις ψυχή καὶ μέγα ἂν ἔθελης
and is repeated in lines 5 and 9 ending in: τοῦσε κάθαυρε βέλου, in line 13 ending in: πρὸς θεὸν οἶον ὄρα, and in the last line (17) ending in: μὴ τῷ πάθεις καμάτῳ.

1. On the art of variation as a particular feature of Hellenistic poetry see above p.311 n.1.
### Appendix IV: Table of Main Features of the 'Gregorian' Hymns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poem</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Praise</th>
<th>Prayer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Epithets/By-names</td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.33</td>
<td>σος (sc. Father)</td>
<td>ζωάναναν βασιλεὺαν, χάρως (εἷς</td>
<td>ασφάτως (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.34</td>
<td>σος</td>
<td>ζωάναναν βασιλεὺαν, χάρως (εἷς</td>
<td>δὲ (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.35</td>
<td>Πάτερ Χριστοῦ</td>
<td>κανεκάρος (1)</td>
<td>κλόους (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.36</td>
<td>Χριστὲ</td>
<td>ἀναζ (1)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poem</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Epithets/By-names</td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.37</td>
<td>Χριστός (2)</td>
<td>ἰδιαῖς (2)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.38</td>
<td>Χριστός (6)</td>
<td>ὁ θεός μερόπων (6)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.38</td>
<td>Χριστός (1)</td>
<td>ἰδιαῖς (1)</td>
<td>-φθέγξου (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.31</td>
<td>Θεό (1)</td>
<td>τῷ Πατρὶ (1)</td>
<td>ἀλάξα (εἰ- να) (1,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.31</td>
<td>Γάλλ (1)</td>
<td>παμβασιλῆ (1)</td>
<td>πανευφήμι (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.30</td>
<td>Σέ (1)</td>
<td>ἄφθιτον μονόρχην (1)</td>
<td>δός (δοὺς) ἀνυ- μενε, ἀ- εδελν(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.30</td>
<td>Σέ (1)</td>
<td>ἄνακτα, ἄστοτιν (3)</td>
<td>δάλ' δεν (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poem</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Epithets/By-names</td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.32</td>
<td>ἸΣ (1)</td>
<td>Χριστός μου (2)</td>
<td>εὐλογοῦμεν (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Λόγε Θεοῦ (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ψῶς ἐν φωτός (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Πνεύματος τομία (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.29</td>
<td>ὁ πάντων (1)</td>
<td>ὅ πάντων ἐπέεξει-</td>
<td>μέλενυ (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἐπέεξενα (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ἀλγαίνει) (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Editions of Gregory's Works

a) Poems

Jungck = Gregor von Nazianz, De Vita Sua, edited by C. Jungck,
Wissenschaftliche Kommentare zu griechischen und lateinischen Schriftstellern (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1974)


b) Orations


c) Epistles

Gallay = Saint Grégoire de Nazianze, Lettres, edited by P. Gallay,


Modern Authors and Editors

Abel = see above the list of Abbreviations (b): Orph. hymn.

Adam = J. Adam, The Vitality of Platonism and other Essays, edited by A.M. Adam (Cambridge, 1911)
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Brightman = see Abbreviations (d): Liturg.
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Cairns = F. Cairns, Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry (Edinburgh: Univ. Press, 1972)

Christ-Paranikas = Anthologia Graeca Carminum Christianorum, edited by W. Christ and M. Paranikas (Leipzig: Teubner, 1871)


Cunliffe = R. J. Cunliffe, A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect (London: Blackie, 1924)

Davids = H. L. Davids, De gnomologieën van Sint Gregorius van Nazianze (diss., Nijmegen - Utrecht, 1940)


Dodds = see Abbreviations (b): Procl. Inst. Theol.

Dubedout = E. Dubedout, De D. Gregorii Nazianzeni Carminibus (thes. Paris, 1901)

Egan = J. Egan, 'The knowledge and vision of God according to Gregory Nazianzen. A study of the images of mirror and

Fernández = Marcos N. Fernández, 'Observaciones sobre los Himnos de Gregorio Nacianceno', Emerita, 36 (1968), 231-45

Funk = see above Abbreviations (d): Const. Apost.


Golega = J. Golega, *Der Homerische Psalter. Studien über die dem Apollinarios von Laodikeia zugeschriebene Psalmenparaphrase*, Studia Patristica et Byzantina, 6 (Ettal, 1960)


Hanssen = F. Hanssen, 'Über die unprosodischen Hymnen des Gregor von Nazianz', Philologus, 44 (1885), 228-35

Heitsch = see above Abbreviations (a)


Hüth = X. Hüth, 'De Gregorii Nazianzeni Orationibus Funebris', Dissertationes Philologicae Argentoratenses Selectae, 12 (Argentorati: C. I. Treubner, 1908), 1-160
Jahn = A.H. Jahn, 'Hymnus in Deum Platonicus vulgo Gregorio Nazi-
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