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Abstract

The thesis consists of a detailed commentary on the Homeric Hymn to Delian Apollo, and prolegomena. The subjects treated in the prolegomena are:

(i) the structure of hymns, and of the *Hymnic Hymns* in particular, with a discussion of the context in which the Hymns were performed, concluding that they were probably performed at festivals as preludes to recitations of epic poetry;

(ii) the narrative techniques of the Hymns, comparing them to Homer;

(iii) the treatment of the gods in the Hymns, discussing the ways the gods are presented in the narratives, and the similarities to and differences from the depiction of the gods in Homer;

(iv) the portrayal of Apollo and Delos in *DAp*, discussing the problems of depicting a god in literature, and the relationship between the myth told in the hymn and Delian cult;

(v) the language of the hymn, discussing the history of studies of the Hymns’ language, examples of unhomeric usage and the relationship of the Hymns to Homer and Hesiod;

(vi) the question of whether the hymn was orally composed, discussing the various criteria that have been used to attempt to determine this, and concluding that oral composition cannot be proved but is very likely;

(vii) the problem of the hymn’s unity, or lack of it, discussing the history of the various theories and concluding that the hymn is not an original unity, and that the Delian hymn was composed as an addition to the pre-existing Pythian hymn;

(viii) the date of *DAp*, concluding that it may have been composed in the second half of the sixth century, possibly for a festival held by Polycrates in 523/2 B.C.

The commentary deals with linguistic and literary points, and any religious, historical or geographical issues that are raised by particular passages.
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**ABBREVIATIONS**

*Ap.* stands for the Homeric Hymn to Apollo, *DAp* for its Delian part and *PAp* for its Pythian; *Dem.*, *Herm.* and *Aph.* for the long Homeric Hymns to Demeter, Hermes and Aphrodite; *Il.* and *Od.* for the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*; *Th.*, *Op.* and *Sc.* for Hesiod’s *Theogony* and *Works and Days* and the *Shield of Heracles*. 
Prolegomena to the Homeric Hymn to Apollo

(i) The development of hymn form

Poetry about the gods has a long history. In probably the earliest Greek poems we have, the Homeric epics, the narrative involves both gods and mortals. Though the Iliad and Odyssey are basically about men, and the gods are described only in so far as they are involved in the human story, they bear witness to a long tradition of poetry about the gods. This is clear from the picture they present of the divine society on Olympus: this is largely a poetic creation, a systematisation for artistic purposes of the chaos of local beliefs and cult practices. In Homer, this is clearly already a familiar picture, not something new.

References to other stories about the gods occur in Homer, e.g. Il. 1.396-406, where Achilles reminds Thetis of how she saved Zeus when Hera, Poseidon and Athena wanted to bind him. The epithets of the gods are among the most difficult words to interpret, suggesting that they are very archaic and hence that hexameter

---

1 On Greek hymns, see Wünsch 1914; Norden 1923; Keyssner 1932; Meyer 1933; Böhme 1937; Bremer 1981; Devlin 1994; Fröhder 1994, 17-35.

2 Parallels between Greek and Vedic hymns suggest that there was some form of Indo-European poetry about gods and heroes: see Schmitt 1967; Durante 1976; Nagy 1974; West 1988.

3 West (1966, 46ff.) argues that Hesiod is earlier than Homer; for the linguistic arguments against this, see Edwards 1971, 199ff.; Janko 1982.

4 See below, 45.

5 Cf. Il. 15.16-28, 187-211; and see Slatkin 1991.
poetry about the gods had been established for a long time.⁶

There are mentions of other types of song within the Homeric poems.⁷ Penelope says to Phemius in the Odyssey: πολλά γὰρ ἀλλα βροτῶν θελκήρια οίδας,/ ἔργ' ἄνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε (1.337f.); and Demodocus at the Phaeacian court sings two songs about the Trojan war (the quarrel of Odysseus and Achilles, 8.75-82; the Trojan horse and sack of Troy, 8.499-520) and one about the gods (the story of Ares and Aphrodite, 8.266-366); this last song is the earliest example of a song purely about the gods, and has been compared to the longer Homeric Hymns. So bards could sing about men or gods, or both. We find the same idea at Th. 99ff., where the bard is said to sing of both the κλέα προτέρων ἄνθρωπων, and μάκαρας τε θεοῦς τι "Ολυμπον ἔχουσιν. In Ap. the Muses on Olympus sing of θεῶν δῶρ' ἐμβροτά ἥδ' ἄνθρωπων / τλημοσμόνως (190f.); and the Delian maidens sing of Apollo, Leto and Artemis, and then of the men and women of the past (158-61).

So although the earliest hymns we possess are later than the earliest epics, there must have been poetry about the gods, and hymns to them, from a much earlier date.⁸ It is difficult to define the term "hymn" precisely, and to distinguish hymns from prayers. Bremer, for instance, defines a hymn as "a sung prayer", but hymns need neither be sung nor prayers.⁹ The term "hymn" means for us a song dedicated to a

---

⁶ Some obscure epithets are: Ἀργειφόντης and ἄκακητα (Hermes), δαισπλήτης (Erinys), Φοίβος (Apollo).
⁷ See e.g. Diehl 1940.
⁸ In some places, it seems likely that Homer has been influenced by hymn poetry, rather than vice versa: see e.g. Janko 1992, on Il. 16.179-92.
⁹ On the problems of defining the term "hymn", see Devlin 1994, 3-5. She defines a hymn as "a composition involving a degree of self-conscious artistic elaboration, the purpose of which is to praise and flatter a god, or some other person
god or gods, but this is not the meaning of the Greek ὄμνος, at least in its original sense; it did eventually come to mean a poem in praise of a god as opposed to one about humans. The earliest hymns were no doubt cultic, and performed in particular rituals. This is also true of many of the hymns that have survived or that we know of. Pollux (Onomasticon, 1.38) says that ὄμνος is the generic term, and that there are species of hymn such as paeans, dithyrambs and prosodia. The name prosodion indicates that this was a hymn sung in a religious procession, and the paean was also often performed in procession, as we can see from Ap. 514-18. In Athens dithyrambs were performed by choruses of men and boys at the Thargelia (for Apollo) and the Dionysia (for Dionysus).

Wünsch suggests that spells invoking a deity developed into prayers in which the god is requested, not commanded, to help. In an invocation it is important to name

or thing which the composer wishes to portray as god-like. It quite often also includes a prayer or prayers."

10 ὄμνος occurs in Homer only at Od. 8.429, in the difficult phrase ἀοιδῆς ὄμνον: In Hesiod it seems to refer to any type of song (Th. 48-51, 99-101; only the verb is used in Th., and only the noun in Op.). In the Homeric Hymns, the poets use ὄμνος both of their own song and of the one they are about to sing (μετοβήσομαι ἄλλοιν ἔς ὄμνον Aph. 293; 9.9; 18.11); this seems to equate it with ἀοιδή (καὶ σεῖο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομι' ἀοιδής Dem. 495; Ap. 546; Herm. 580, etc.). Findar too uses the term ὄμνος of songs in general (cf. Ol. 3.3; Pyth. 6.7). The restriction to songs about gods is first found in Plato, who says (Rep. 607a) ὄμνους θεοίς καὶ ἐγκώμια τοῖς ἄγνωστοῖς. On the etymology of ὄμνος, which is uncertain, see Wünsch 1914, 140-2; Càssola 1975, ix ff.; Chantraine 1968-80, Frisk 1960-70 s.v.

11 On the different contexts in which the paean could be performed, see Fairbanks 1900; Käppel 1992.


13 On the similar structures of hymns and prayers, see Wünsch 1914, 143ff.; Norden 1923, 143-77.
the correct deity, and so the name is amplified by epithets, cult titles, favourite residences, parentage etc. in order to be as precise as possible. This can be seen in the early hymns and prayers we know. For instance, the prayer of Chryses in II. 1.37-42 begins with the god’s name, then an epithet (ἀργοδετοῖς), then three of his sanctuaries (Chryse, Cilla and Tenedos), then a cult title (Σμυθέα). It continues in a typical way, with a reminder of his past sacrifices to the god and a request for help. This sort of structure, typical for hymns as well as prayers, is usually analysed as tripartite. Ausfeld suggested the scheme "invocatio-pars epica-precatio". This is unsatisfactory, as the description "pars epica" only fits one type of hymn, that with a narrative of the god’s past actions (like the long Homeric Hymns). Bremer’s terminology "Invocation, argument, petition" is preferable; he gives a neat summary of four types of argument used to persuade the god to help:

(i) da quia dedi (II. 1.39f.);
(ii) da ut dem (II. 10.292-4);
(iii) da quia dedisti (II. 16.236f.);
(iv) da quia hoc dare tuum est (Anacreon, PMG 357).

The last two can easily be expanded, into either a narrative of the god’s past or a description of his typical activities. The invocation is also prone to expansion, as a list of favourite haunts can become a typical description, or a mention of parentage can lead to a birth narrative. In many cases the middle section is better seen as an expansion of the invocation, to which it is frequently linked by a relative clause, since


15 Ausfeld 1903, 505ff.

16 Bremer 1981, 196.
it may not be particularly pertinent to the concluding request (if there is one).\textsuperscript{17}

\textbf{The Homeric Hymns}

There are thirty-three poems that are extant under this title, mostly extremely short, but four of some length (\textit{Dem., Ap., Herm., Aph.})\textsuperscript{18} and two of about fifty lines (7 to Dionysus and 19 to Pan). They are in hexameters, and their language and style is that of early epic, which for us means that of Homer and Hesiod. Only careful linguistic analysis reveals differences in the diction and style of these poems; on the surface there is little difference.\textsuperscript{19}

In structure the \textit{Homeric Hymns} largely fit the patterns discussed above.\textsuperscript{20} They begin with an invocation of the god who is to be the hymn’s subject. With very few exceptions, the first word (or words if epithets are attached - e.g. 6, 10) is the god’s name or an epithet of the god.\textsuperscript{21} The name is usually accompanied by at least one epithet, or other information about the god; this accords with the tendency of prayers to be precise about invoking the correct god, and is also a way of praising the god.

\textsuperscript{17} This is the structure described by Race 1990, 85ff.

\textsuperscript{18} Probably also the fragmentary h. 1 to Dionysus; its beginning and end, which survive, give the impression of a story treated at some length, and it is placed next to the other long hymns in M (the only Ms. which contains it). A new papyrus fragment has been published by A. Hurst, in Bülow-Jacobsen 1995.

\textsuperscript{19} See below, 60f.

\textsuperscript{20} There are various analyses of the structure of the \textit{Homeric Hymns}, though they tend to be in broad agreement: see Wünsch 1914; Friedländer 1966; Minton 1970; Lenz 1975, 9ff.; Janko 1981a; Race 1982b; Fröhder 1994, 37-60; Devlin 1994, 32-41.

\textsuperscript{21} 7, 19, 22 and 33 all start with φιλο plus the name; only Ap. and Aph. have a verb preceding the god’s name.
The description can mention cult places or favourite haunts (Herm., Aph., 10, 18), parentage (Herm., 7, 15, 16, 17, 19, 26, 31, 33), or functions (Herm. 3 ἀγγελον ἀθανάτων; 16.1 Ἰητήρα νόσσων Ἀσκληπιον; 22.2 γαής κινητήρα (Poseidon)); epithets of various types are the commonest form of description. Some hymns have a string of epithets (the longest, apart from the anomalous 8 to Ares, are in 27, which has six epithets, and 28, which has eight).

This is the form of the introductory section, described as everything before the relative clause that is used in almost every hymn (the exceptions are 8, 13, 21, 25). The Homeric Hymns are usually analysed as having a tripartite structure like that of other hymns discussed above. The relative clause leads to the central section, and in the conclusion the god is addressed directly, and often there is a request of some sort.

It is the central section that is hardest to define. Obviously there is a major difference between the long hymns, which are several hundred lines long, and the short hymns, the shortest of which (13) contains only three lines. Is it then meaningful to say that these hymns belong to the same genre? Is it possible to speak of a structure for the Homeric Hymns as a whole? Certainly they are all composed in hexameters, and in the same epic language as Homer and Hesiod. The structural similarities are also clear. They have standardised beginnings and endings. There are two main ways in which the poets announce the subject of the song. Either the Muse is told to sing (e.g. Herm. 1 Ἐρμην ἄλλη, Μοῦσα), as in ten of the hymns; or the poet uses a first person verb expressing the intention to sing. As Janko observes,

---

22 These two hymns are often linked because of their similarity of style (Gemoll 1886, 349f. says that they are clearly by the same author). They are also similar to the scenes on Olympus in Ap. (see commentary on 1-13).

23 Janko 1981a, 10.
"the form and length of the introduction does not relate to the rest of the hymn", i.e. one cannot draw any distinction between short and long hymns on these grounds.

Nor can the two types be separated on the basis of their endings. These too have a standard form, though different hymns have more or less of the standard elements. Only 12 has no ending. In every other case, the ending begins with the poet addressing the god directly, usually for the first time in the hymn. The god is usually addressed with χαίρε (in twenty-six of the thirty-three hymns); Bundy points out that this not a mere farewell, but a request for the god to rejoice, since if he is pleased he will bless the suppliant. In the hymns it is the song that is offered to please the god; in the common phrase καὶ σὺ μὲν οὖν χαίρε (11 hymns), the οὖν must refer to the preceding song. This is made explicit in h.9.7 (= 14.6) καὶ σὺ μὲν οὖν χαίρε, θεοί δ' ἡμι πάσαι ἡμῖν δόξα; cf. 16.5; 19.48; 21.5. References to song are frequent in the endings; either, as in the examples just given, the god is asked to respond with pleasure to the song, or he is asked to bless the song as a result of his pleasure. This latter category may look forward to another song, which is relevant to the hymns' probable function as prologues. The fragmentary h. 1 to Dionysus praises the god by saying οἱ δὲ σὺ ἁωιδοί ἔδομεν ἄρχομενοι λήγοντες τ', and goes on to stress the need for the poet to remember Dionysus if he is to remember a song, which is both a promise and a request looking to the future. It is similar to the common ending formula οὖν ἐγὼ καὶ σεῖο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ'
οὐδὴς (10 hymns).²⁶

This request for blessing on the song is one form of final prayer. Only twelve of the Homeric Hymns have a closing request, apart from the standard χαίρε or ἱλήθι,²⁷ and the requests fall into various categories. Dem. 494, 31.17 and 30.18 ask for βιοτον/βίον θυμήρε; 15 and 20 have δίδου δ’ ἀρετὴν τε καὶ δλβον; and 11 asks for τύχην εὐδοκιμονίην τε. Some request benefits for a household or city (13, 24 and 29); 11 and 26 have requests for "us", though this might be first-person plural for singular.

The endings also mostly have a transition to another song (17 hymns). The two commonest formulae for this are οὕτω εὖκα καὶ σεῖο καὶ θάλλης μνήσωσυ οὐδής, and σεῖ δ’ εὖκα ἄρξάμενος μεταβήσομαι θάλλον ες δμνον (eleven and three occurrences respectively).

So there are many standard elements in the hymns, particularly at the beginning and end. This is in favour of seeing them all as belonging to the same genre. More significant still is the fact that it is impossible to separate the hymns into groups by selecting particular criteria. For instance, some start with a request to the Muse and

²⁶ The request to bless in return for the song is also explicit in Dem. 494 πρὸφρονες ἄντ’ φδῆς βιοτον θυμήρε’ δπαξε. 6, 10, 24 and 25 ask the god to bless their song, 6 actually asking directly for victory in a contest. The ending of DAp is a special case (see commentary).

²⁷ Bundy (1972, 49ff.) shows that χαίρε and ἱλήθι are equivalent in the endings; he compares 22.8 and 15.9 (ἄλλ.' ἴληθ', Ἡφαιστε- δίδου δ’ ἀρετὴν τε καὶ δλβον and χαίρε, δανξε, Δίως υε- with the same request). ἦλμαξ is a subjective form of the same request. These and other words asking the god to rejoice and requesting his blessing recur throughout the tradition of Greek hymns, and in poems such as Pindar's odes which make use of hymnic structures. The Homeric Hymns themselves also use πρὸφρον/-ονες (Dem. 494, 30. 18 and 31. 19). For the imperative asking the god to rejoice in the song, cf. h. Zeus Dikt. ἔρπε καὶ γέχω τι μόλπη; Kaibel, Epigr. Gr. 1027. 6 ξρεο καὶ τεν δμνον ἢ με κεκλυθτι χαίρων.
some with a first-person verb; but this cannot be made to correlate with any other criterion such as type of ending, subject matter, length etc. Those that start with an invocation of the Muse do not necessarily end with a transition-formula, and so on. It is clear that there is a pool of standard elements and phrases from which the poets select and emphasise those that suit their purpose.

An obvious group to attempt to separate would be the long hymns, but this cannot be done using the sort of criteria I have been discussing. Of the four major hymns two invoke the Muse (Herm., Aph.) and two do not (Dem. has ἄρχομ' ἁειδείν, Ap. the unusual μνησομαί οὐδὲ λάθωμαί). Ap., Herm. and Aph. have brief endings, with just the address to the god and transition formula, whereas Dem. has a more elaborate ending, with the request βίοτον θυμήρε' ὀπάζειν in 494 (this links it to the short hymns 30 and 31, which have the same request, rather than the other long hymns). H. 1 to Dionysus, which clearly must have been a long hymn, also has a more complex ending.

Perhaps, then, there are differences in the central sections of these hymns that might enable us to distinguish different groups. Obviously, there is a major difference in the length of this section in the major hymns. Yet an analysis of the content and structure of these hymns’ central sections shows that the long hymns are dealing with the same sort of themes with many of the same techniques.

Janko draws a useful distinction between what he calls "mythic" and "attributive" hymns. "Myth" in this sense is "narrative in the past tense", while an attributive hymn describes the god's typical activities in the present tense. The longer hymns are

---

28 See above, n. 18.

predominantly mythic, though they have attributive sections (this is particularly true
of Ap.). However, mythic hymns tend to move to the present in the final section (e.g.
Dem. 485ff.; Ap. 140ff.; Herm. 576ff.; 15.7-8; 20.5ff.).

It is broadly true that the long hymns are mythic, while the shorter are attributive
and have little narrative. It is difficult to extend a typical description of the god’s
attributes for long; it is concentration on narrative that leads to the extension of the
longer hymns. Minton distinguishes between hymns that begin with a birth story, and
those that begin with an "initial description of typical activity or essential nature." This is
obviously similar to Janko’s distinction, but Minton emphasises one particular
type of narrative, the birth story, from which he believes the other types of narrative
derive. This is unlikely, since other types of narrative about the gods are equally
natural, but birth narratives do predominate among the mythic hymns (twelve of these
have a birth story, while seven do not) and the relative clause "whom x bore" lends
itself to an extension detailing the circumstances of the birth, and perhaps the god’s
activities after birth.

Minton states that the birth story type has "a natural pattern proceeding from the
birth of the god, through an account of his consequent nature or activities, his joining
of the other gods on Olympus and a concluding account of his timai or powers."

---

30 See commentary on 140ff.


32 This includes among those with a birth narrative 12, in which the birth story is
reduced to its minimal form ἤ ν τέκνε Πέτη, and 19, in which the birth story occurs in
a song within the song. 6 and 26 are virtual birth narratives, since they recount the
circumstances immediately following the births of Aphrodite and Dionysus
respectively.

Only *Herm.* fits this pattern perfectly, but other hymns have some of these elements.³⁴

All these classifications of the hymns into types are imperfect, as they vary their patterns too much to be divided neatly in this way. As with the beginnings and endings already discussed, there is too much overlapping in the use of different elements for the hymns to be divided into clear groups. The narrative, or mythic, hymns generally have timeless sections; the birth story followed by description of attributes is a common pattern. Hymns can also move from the timeless to the narrative, as do both sections of *Ap., Aph.*, 19, 22 and 32. In descriptions of the gods the distinction between past and present actions becomes blurred; some past narrative gives a description of typical events (e.g. 26, with its account in the past tense of Dionysus roaming the woods with the nymphs, is very similar to 19, where the account is mostly in the present tense). Even where the narratives are of once-for-all events like birth, they help to explain the god’s current nature and functions.³⁵

What really links all the narratives is their aetiological and theogonic character.³⁶

---

³⁴ *Herm.* has: 1-13 birth; 13-15 brief description of his nature; 16-573 activities leading to his acceptance in the Olympian pantheon and acquisition of powers; 573-578 return to typical description; 579-80 farewell and transition. The hymn to the Muses at the start of the *Theogony* also fits this scheme well, which is what Minton wishes to show. It was Friedländer (1966) who first showed that *Th.* 36-115 have the structure of a Homeric hymn, and Minton fits the opening lines too into this pattern. Friedländer’s analysis of this proem’s structure shows that it is more complex than most Homeric hymns, of which perhaps only h.19 to Pan contains all the same elements as Hesiod’s hymn.

³⁵ See Clay 1989, 28f. on this point, and commentary on 1-13 for more detailed discussion.

³⁶ Janko (1981a, 12f.) points out that the narratives almost all contain an epiphany, of which birth is a particular type; this is something they have in common, but is subordinate to the aetiological purpose of the narratives.
They relate the origins of things, either of the god himself, in the case of a birth narrative, or of cults and sanctuaries, in the case of the hymns that deal with the god’s actions among men.\textsuperscript{37} This is not a clear division. Hymns with a birth story can describe the god taking his place on Olympus and receiving his functions (Herm., 6, 12 15, 19, 28, and cf. the start of Ap.); but they can also describe his functions among men (16, 33, DAp. 29, 80ff., 132, 145ff.). Dem. deals with the founding of the Eleusinian mysteries and so is concerned with her role among humans; but framing the section in which Demeter visits Eleusis and mixes with mortals is a story of changes on the divine level and, in the words of Clay, "an irreversible alteration in the organisation of cosmic space."\textsuperscript{38} Similarly, Aph. tells of the goddess’s sexual encounter with a mortal, Anchises, and predicts the birth of Aeneas. Yet it too has significance on the divine plane. This is made clear in the opening, which explains how Zeus caused her to fall in love with Anchises so that she would no longer be able to boast of making other gods and goddesses fall in love with mortals. Both these hymns end with the goddess returning to Olympus, a theme more stressed in Dem., which moves to a timeless section describing Demeter and Persephone’s place among the gods and their benefits to mortals.

Ap. is also concerned with both spheres: the opening scene stresses Apollo’s importance among the gods, and the story of the Delian section is purely about gods; but this is followed by the description of the Delian festival, which shows his effect on men and the fulfilment of the prophecies made in 80-88. The Pythian section is

\textsuperscript{37} On this see Rudhardt 1978, 1-7; Clay 1989, 8-16; Parker 1991, 2-4.

\textsuperscript{38} Clay 1989, 208. Her whole discussion is enlightening on the hymn’s treatment of action in both divine and human spheres and their interconnection.
largely about Apollo's dealings with men; but it too starts with a timeless scene showing his role on Olympus (186-206).

So there is no sharp division between hymns about a god's relationship to other gods, and those about their benefits to humans and the honours received from them, though some (particularly shorter) hymns deal only with one or the other.\textsuperscript{39} On these grounds too, then, there is no reason to separate the hymns into distinct groups. Neither form nor content justifies us in denying that the hymns belong together as a genre. That said, we should not minimise the differences between the short and long hymns, since the disparity in length is so great. We should be cautious in making statements about "the Homeric Hymns" as a whole, even if they do have the unifying patterns that I have described.

In the longer hymns, the narratives become interesting in themselves, whereas the shorter hymns are mainly of interest for the light that they shed on the structure of the major hymns, at least from a purely literary standpoint. The disparity in length prompts us to ask how the long hymns originated, and what was their relationship to the shorter hymns. This has been much discussed, and is related to questions of the functions and performance-context of the hymns.

Hymns are frequently divided into two types, "rhapsodic" and "cultic".\textsuperscript{40} The

---

\textsuperscript{39} Of the long hymns \textit{Herm.} comes closest to being purely about gods, but it too refers to the oracular activity of both Apollo and Hermes, and its effect on mortals (541ff., 564ff.).

\textsuperscript{40} See Miller 1986, 1-5; Race 1990, 102ff. Wünsch (1914, 142) uses the terms "subjective" and "objective" for cult and rhapsodic hymns respectively. Similar is Norden's (1923, 43-66) distinction between "Du-Stil" and "Er-Stil". Devlin (1994, 108-111) rightly has reservations about this distinction as applied to all Greek hymns, but it is valid for the \textit{Homeric Hymns}, which are the only ones the term "rhapsodic" should strictly be used for.
*Homeric Hymns* are in the former class and in fact are its main exemplars (other examples are the hymns of Callimachus and Theocritus, which are largely modelled on the *Homeric Hymns*, though they experiment with the form in a typically Hellenistic fashion). Rhapsodic hymns speak of the god in the third person, except in their closing invocations: cultic hymns address the god directly.\(^{41}\) Rhapsodic hymns describe the god's nature or narrate particular exploits, and are more concerned with the narrative than with obtaining a specific request: cultic hymns, which are hardly, if at all, distinguishable from prayers,\(^ {42}\) are more concerned with a specific request, and also are likely to refer to the ritual they are part of.

Cultic hymns are probably the original type, and continue to predominate in Greek literature. Rhapsodic hymns are more "literary", both in their probable divorce from use in actual cult and in their concern with song.\(^ {43}\) As Miller points out, the use of the third person in speaking of the god "presupposes a human audience in addition to the divine."\(^ {44}\) The openings of the hymns, which mostly use a form of ἀειφόω, contrast with cultic hymns which use verbs like λιπομα and ἔφυσμα. In the *Homeric Hymns* the final request is often connected with singing, and there is usually a promise to move to another song. Their narratives, especially in the case of the longer hymns, are not devoted purely to the objective of persuading the god to grant

\(^{41}\) Ap's use of apostrophe in the narrative is exceptional. The other apostrophic hymns (8, 21, 24, 29) are in many respects more like cult hymns. In 29 the emphasis on the request and the prayer for the god to come near (1.9) are typical cultic features, though the ending is of the rhapsodic type.

\(^{42}\) See e.g. Race 1990, 103 n.50.

\(^{43}\) This needs caution: Devlin (1994, 132) has some good criticisms of the over-rigid classifications of hymns as "literary" or "cultic".

\(^{44}\) Miller 1986, 2.
a request, to which all else should be subordinated in a cultic hymn or prayer. They are too long and intricate for this, and the final requests are not always particularly relevant to the preceding story.\footnote{Only \textit{Dem.} of the long hymns has a request: this asks for βετον θυμήρε’, which is appropriate for Demeter, but for her usual function, not only the preceding story.}

Possibly the development of this type of long hymn using third person narrative was influenced by epics like Homer’s, though songs about the gods had a long history. The use of the term "rhapsodic" for these hymns implies that they were performed by the same rhapsodes who performed Homeric and other epic poetry. The very title \textit{Homeric Hymns} shows that these poems have been seen as related to the Homeric epics. Where might the rhapsodes have performed such hymns? The most likely answer is at religious festivals, which would provide a large audience and also a suitable context for hymnic poetry.\footnote{Supporters of this view include Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, xcv); Richardson (1974, 3f.); Fröhder (1994, 9f.), who argues that the long hymns and Homer were probably originally performed at the banquets of aristocrats, but came to be performed at large festivals because of the popularity of Homer. This has also often been seen as a suitable context for performances of Homer; cf. Wade-Gery 1952, 14-18; Murray 1934, 187-92; Whitman 1958, 81-3; Webster 1964, 267-72. Contra: Kirk 1962, 274-81; Notopoulos 1964, 12-18.} This is supported by some passages in the hymns: 6 has the request δδζ δ’ έν οργώνι νίκην τρέθε φέρεσθαι, suggesting performance in a contest at a religious festival.\footnote{The evidence for such contests is collected in Herington 1985, Appendix 1.} The ending of 26, δδζ δ’ ημδζ χαίροντας ές άρρας αότας ίκέσθαι, / εκ δ’ αθό’ ωράναν είς τούς πολλούς ένιαυτούς, suggests that it was performed at an annual religious festival. Most notable is the description of the Delian festival in \textit{Ap.} 146ff., which, with its direct address of the Delian maidens and references by the singer to himself, strongly
favours the idea that it was composed to be performed there.

31 and 32 contain explicit references to a following song on heroic themes. This shows that they are designed as preludes to epic recitation.\footnote{They are probably among the latest hymns: see Allen, Halliday and Sikes 1936, 431f.; Cássola 1975, 440.} It is a disputed question whether this is true of all the hymns. The earliest term used for them is προοίμιον, which suggests that they were preludes to something.\footnote{The most thorough survey of early uses of the word προοίμιον is Böhme 1937, 11-24. See also Bethe 1931, 28-37; Pfister 1933; Meyer 1933, 26-32. It is interpreted by Böhme and Pfister as πρὸ τῆς οἴμης, "before the song" (for οἴμη cf. Od. 8.74, 481; 22.347). οἴμη is probably related to οἶμος = "path"; at any rate, the connection was made early, as shown by Herm. 400 οἶμος οὐδῆς. Pi. Ol. 9.47 ἐπέων οἴμον. See Chantraine 1968-80, Frisk 1960-70, s.v. οἴμη. Meyer (op. cit. 30) disputes this, arguing that προοίμιον means "that spoken forth", on which see the criticisms of Lenz (1975, 282f.).} The first example of this usage is Pi. Nem. 2.1f., which says that the Homeridae began Διὸς ἐκ προοιμίου, and Thucydides (3.104) calls Ἀπ. a προοιμίον. The scholium to Od. 8.499 says ἔθος γὰρ ἦν αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ θεοῦ προοιμίαξεσθαι. Ps. Plut. de Mus. 1133c states τὰ γὰρ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς ὑπὸ βούλονται ἀφοσιωσόμενοι ἐξεβαινον εὐθὺς ἐπὶ τε τὴν Ὁμήρου καὶ τῶν άλλων ποίησιν; this refers to the νόμοι of Terpander,\footnote{The relationship of kitharodic nomoi and prooeia to the Homeric Hymns has often been discussed, though largely neglected by commentators on the hymns. Some have gone so far as to see the Homeric Hymns as kitharodic songs of the type attributed to Terpander, notably Crusius 1887; cf. Weil and Reinach 1900, 19; Meyer 1933, 32-35; Böhme 1937, 36-44; Thesleff 1949. Ps.-Plut. De Mus. ch. 4 says that Terpander composed νόμοι and προοίμια κιθαρωδικα ἐν ἔπεισιν, which sound similar to the Hymns. The same author also states (ch. 3) that he added melodies to verses of his own or of Homer, to sing in contests; and (ch. 6) that the early kitharodes started with a prelude to the gods, and then went on to poetry by Homer or someone else, as is clear from "τῶν Τερπάνδρου προοιμίων". It is not clear from this whether the προοίμια were separate compositions, or preludes to the νόμοι. It is clear, however, that our hymns do not belong to this genre, since they are never mentioned by writers on νόμοι nor quoted as Terpander's; they were associated with Homer, or at least the Homerids. Could they have been among the verses "of Homer" that Terpander set to music? Koller (1956) argues that the short hymns are kitharodic
that preludes to epic existed.

The Hymns themselves support this view: their closing formulae promise to move to another song; and the common opening ὅρχομεν ἐπείδειν is better translated "I begin by singing of" rather than "I begin to sing of" (this is supported by the closing σεῦ δ' ἔγω ὅρξημενος, e.g. Aph. 293). Perhaps it was normal for a rhapsode to preface his performance with a short hymn to the god whose festival it was (this is the implication of Pindar's statement, though he only mentions Zeus); cf. Od. 8.499 θεοῦ ἥρχετο.

It has been doubted whether the long hymns can have been genuine preludes of this sort.\(^{52}\) They are clearly carefully composed poems, whatever their function, and of interest on their own merits. They are often in this context compared to the songs preludes, which would have been followed by a νόμος not necessarily in hexameters; but that the longer hymns, which grew out of this form, were no longer preludes nor sung to the kithara. More likely is the view that these types of poetry, kitharodic and rhapsodic, exercised influence on each other or reflected the same poetic trends (see Van Groningen 1955, 191). For instance, in the structure of the kitharodic nomos as described by Pollux (Onomasticon 4.66) the penultimate section, followed only by the ἐπιλογος, is the σφραγις, which suggests a personal and programmatic section: this is supported by the one extant νόμος, the Persae of Timotheus, which has such a personal section at the end (215-48). This reminds us of DAp, with its closing personal section. DAp has been compared to a νόμος more than any other Homeric hymn (the νόμος was especially associated with Apollo). However, the νόμος was at least as much a musical as a poetic composition, as is shown by Terpander's singing verses by Homer to his own music. On the νόμος, see also Jüthner 1892; Wilamowitz 1903a; Smyth 1906, Ivii-lxviii; Vetter 1936; Grieser 1937; Lasserre 1954, 22-29; Fleming 1976-77.

\(^{51}\) For this point see West 1966, on Th. 1; Richardson 1974, on Dem. 1.

sung by Demodocus in *Od.* 8, in particular the story of Ares and Aphrodite (the only one of Demodocus' songs quoted directly) at 266-366. This is taken to show that typical performances of epic were not too long, perhaps a few hundred lines, and so one of the long hymns would be about the right length to be performed independently, not as a prelude.\(^{53}\)

The evidence supports the view that some at least of the hymns were performed as preludes. 31 and 32 explicitly state this, and it is clear from the regular transition-formulae. In any case, the short hymns can have had no other purpose; they are too short to be performed as independent compositions. Some attempt to escape this conclusion by arguing that the short hymns are merely "frames", beginnings and endings for whatever story the poet chose to tell.\(^{54}\) The obvious problem with this is that it overlooks the evidence of the transition-formulae (not to mention the other evidence already adduced -- the endings of 31 and 32, the use of ἄρχομαι, the external evidence of Pindar and others). Moreover, while it is easy to see h. 13, say, which has only a beginning and ending, as a frame of this type, this is more difficult for the hymns around twenty lines long (notably 26-33), which seem rather too specific for all-purpose frames, besides being complete in themselves in terms of the

\(^{53}\) Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, xciv) comment: "it is difficult to believe that the five greater hymns can have 'preluded' a rhapsody not necessarily longer than one of them."

\(^{54}\) Meyer (1933, 23f.) is the main advocate of this view, which is also supported by Böhme (1937, 6-10) and Wünsch (1914, 149f. - he thinks this is only true of the hymns with no transition formula). Pfister (1933, 938) also thinks some hymns are of this type. The best criticism of the theory is by Lenz (1975, 281ff.), to whose perceptive discussion of the relationship of the long and short hymns my own discussion is greatly indebted.
hymnic structures already analysed.\textsuperscript{55} Lenz argues that a rhapsode capable of supplying the central section of a hymn would hardly have needed to have recourse to a collection of beginnings and endings, the most stereotyped parts of the hymns.

Connected with this theory of "frames" is the idea that many, if not all, of the short hymns are excerpts from longer ones. The two ideas have no necessary connection, since such excerpts could equally be used as complete preludes, but have been linked by Wünsch and Böhme.\textsuperscript{56} H. 18 has the same opening nine lines (with slight variations) as \textit{Herm.}, and a similar ending. 13 has three lines also used in \textit{Dem.}; all the lines in 17 are also in 33; 25 is probably based on \textit{Th.} 1, 94-7 and 104. The introduction to 18 perhaps tells the birth story at greater length than is suitable for such a short piece; 25.4, a line that mentions kings, is inappropriate in the hymn but not in its context in the \textit{Theogony}. So in these two cases at least short hymns may consist of extracts from longer poems. Parker reasonably asserts that "it is a priori unlikely the only such instances of cutting down that occurred are the four we are able to detect", and he suggests other candidates.\textsuperscripts{57} Yet there does seem to be a tendency to associate particular phrases with hymns to particular gods (cf. the endings of 1 and 7; \textit{Aph.} 292 and 10.4; 11.1 and 28.1). 24 and 29 to Hestia are both apostrophic, and

\textsuperscript{55} In favour of Wünsch's hypothesis (see previous note), it is worth noting that these "medium length" hymns all have transition formulae (as do all the longer hymns except 7). The longest short hymn without a transition is 26 (13 lines). So one could argue that those designed to be independent preludes are longer and more elaborate, and those that are mere frames have the minimum necessary. But I would stress against this the basic coherence of the hymns as a genre with its own formal conventions, for which I have already argued.

\textsuperscript{56} Wünsch 1914, 150; Böhme 1937, 3-5, 8f. See also Allen, Halliday and Sikes 1936, 401; Parker 1991, 1 and 14 nn.2-3.

\textsuperscript{57} Parker 1991, 14 n.3.
summon the goddess to a house (not surprising for the goddess of the hearth), so parallels may be due to the use of stock phrases rather than poets excerpting particular long hymns (18 and 25, however, could not really be explained in this way). In the case of 17 and 33, why should a poet abbreviate the already brief 33?

In any case, this does not really affect the problem of the Hymns’ function, since excerpts could be used as complete preludes rather than "frames". There seems no reason to doubt that most of the Hymns were performed as preludes. It is commonly argued that the short hymns are derivative, largely because of the evidence of excerpting. Some of the short hymns in our collection may derive from longer hymns, but I would prefer to see the short hymn as the original type. This development of long hymns out of short preludes parallels the presumed development of Homeric epic; and it makes sense given the hymns’ original function as preludes. The short hymns are more clearly preludes than the longer; they are the sort of length one might expect of an introductory prayer to the god of whatever festival the poet was performing at. The short hymns are more typical of the length and structure of Greek hymns (particularly those used in cult), whereas in the long hymns the narrative has become disproportionately large, and the opening and closing lines are relatively unimportant. A narrative five hundred lines in length is not necessary either to lead up to a request or to preface another poem. The development of longer hymns may have been influenced by epic narrative, and its expansion in the Iliad and Odyssey. This is not to deny that particular short hymns in our collection may postdate particular long hymns.

So can we see the long hymns as genuine preludes? We have seen that in spite of the disparity in length it is reasonable to say that the short and long hymns belong
to the same genre, and so it is likely that their function was much the same. All the long hymns have a transition-formula, and Wünsch and Wilamowitz argue that these were added by whoever put the collection together.\textsuperscript{58} But, if so, why did he not add transitions to all the hymns that lack them, short or long?\textsuperscript{59} H. 1 and \textit{Dem.} have more complicated endings. It is more likely that these formulae had become traditional, and no longer meant that a hymn was a genuine prelude.\textsuperscript{60} Yet this idea too is open to the objection that some hymns have no transition, showing that it was not necessary to use the formula if it was not appropriate. The main objection to the long hymns being preludes is their length. However, this need not be a problem; preludes of different length might be suitable for different performances, depending on such factors as the importance of the occasion or the length of the following recitation. The performance of a prelude of five hundred lines is not more remarkable than that of an epic of fifteen thousand lines.\textsuperscript{61} Indeed, if these poems were used as preludes to Homer, then a prelude proportional to the size of the epic might be appropriate. Another possibility is that a long hymn could preface a contest or series of recitations. Pfister estimates that the longest hymn, \textit{Herm.}, would take about an hour to perform,\textsuperscript{62} not an excessive length if one considers the capacity of the Greeks for hearing performances at festivals displayed in the Athenian dramatic festivals and

\textsuperscript{58} Wünsch 1914, 151; Wilamowitz 1903a, 92 n.1.

\textsuperscript{59} I owe this point to Lenz (1975, 279).

\textsuperscript{60} So Meyer 1933, 23f.

\textsuperscript{61} We cannot know how or where Homer was performed, but it seems improbable that any poem composed at the time was not composed to be performed, in spite of the great length of the Homeric poems (see n.46 above).

\textsuperscript{62} Pfister 1933, 940.
Panathenaic recitations of Homer.

Thucydides (3.104) calls Ἄρ. a προοιμιον, but this does not prove it was a genuine prelude. The terms νόμος, δίμος and προοιμιον seem to have been used almost interchangeably. For Thucydides the term may not have meant an actual prelude, though this is clearly its original sense.63

So I see no reason to deny that the long hymns are genuine preludes, though they may also have been performed independently. It is possible that some shorter hymns without transitions were not preludes, and we do not have to assume that all the hymns were performed in the same way or in the same context, though I believe that festivals are the most likely context for performances of this type. In particular, it seems clear from the description of the festival that D Aph was composed for performance on Delos.

---

63 Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, xciiv) compare the use of the musical term prelude "of an independent composition which bore a technical resemblance to an actual prelude".
(ii) **Narrative Techniques of the Hymns**

So far I have been talking of the Hymns in terms of typical hymn structures, and comparing them with other Greek hymns. This sort of analysis is helpful for understanding the structures of both long and short hymns, and why they contain the elements they do. As far as the long hymns are concerned, the typically hymnic elements are mostly found at the beginning and end: their opening naming of the god with epithets etc.; the endings with their shift to the present and to a second-person address of the god; and the usual closing request. The typical descriptions in the basically narrative longer hymns also fit the pattern of the collection as a whole. *Ap.* is particularly notable for its typical, present-tense sections: the two scenes\(^1\) on Olympus (1-13, 188-206) and the description of the festival on Delos, with its famous reference to the blind bard from Chios (146-78).

This last passage introduces into the hymn a personal note alien to Homer, referring to the poet himself, to his audience and to the circumstances of performance.\(^2\) But apart from these typical descriptions and personal elements, in which *Ap.* is particularly rich, the narrative technique of the longer hymns is basically Homeric -- in this respect the usual title of the collection is appropriate. In these hymns, as noted above, the narrative element has come to predominate in a way untypical of hymns and prayers. For this reason, it is generally more helpful to compare the Hymns with Homer than with other hymns. This also goes for their style and diction, and so they are best seen as part of the corpus of early epic (as is usually

---

\(^1\) The first of these scenes is problematic: see commentary on 1-13.

\(^2\) For more detailed discussion of this, see commentary on 165-78.
done); they stand apart from other hymns, as the distinction made between rhapsodic and cultic hymns shows.\(^3\)

Recent studies have refined our understanding of Homeric narrative technique by applying the methods of narratology.\(^4\) This has helped clarify the relationship between narrator and audience, and some of the ways the narrative is slanted so as to direct the audience's reaction or engage their emotions.

The narratives of the longer hymns, like those of Homer, are third-person, past-tense narration (with occasional apostrophes, both in Homer and in Ap.\(^5\), and the "timeless" hymn passages already discussed). The narrator is omniscient, e.g. he can tell us Telphousa's motives at 254ff., when she deceives Apollo; he can describe events on earth and scenes on Olympus (as well as the two "typical" scenes, there is the journey of Iris to Olympus to fetch Eileithyia, 102ff.); he knows the future, e.g. he can tell us that the site where Apollo killed the dragon is now called Pytho (372-4) or that the Cretan sailors are now priests of Apollo's oracle (392-6).

Studies of oral poetry\(^6\) suggest that the audience and context of performance are important factors influencing a poet's choice of theme, topics to stress, length of composition and so on. So we can assume that the particular topics treated by the

---

\(^3\) See above, 18f.

\(^4\) The most important work is De Jong 1987; also useful is Richardson 1990. Briefer accounts are Edwards 1987, 29-41 and 1991, 1-10.

\(^5\) See commentary on 120.

\(^6\) Assuming that the Hymns, or for our purposes Ap. (for the Hymns need not all be the same in this respect), were oral compositions. This is discussed below, 74ff. Even if not oral in the sense of being orally composed, the hymns would certainly have been composed for performance, like all archaic Greek poetry: on the importance of performance context for all this poetry, see Gentili 1988, esp. chs. 1, 3, 8-9.
poet, and the way he deals with them, would be congenial to his hearers. This means that the narrative can tell us something about the audience it is aimed at, about their interests and the sort of knowledge the poem assumes in its hearers.

Different kinds of knowledge are clearly presupposed in the audience. They are familiar with the gods of epic and myths about them, and with their poetic epithets and apparatus. For instance, the opening scene refers to Apollo by one of his standard epithets, ἐκπροτος, and he is shown drawing his bow. Olympus is described without preamble as δόμω Διός (a Homeric phrase). Leto and Zeus are mentioned without introduction, and their parentage of Apollo is clearly familiar (8 πατριὸς ἔσω, 11 φίλον υἱόν, 12–13 Leto’s maternal joy). All this may seem obvious, but it is worth pointing out as it shows that the hearers were familiar not only with these gods but with poetry about them: with the picture of the divine family on Olympus (a largely poetic creation), with their poetic epithets and attributes. Examples of this could be multiplied in the hymns. In the rest of Δρ. we find: nectar and ambrosia as the food of the gods (124), Iris as the divine messenger (102ff.) and the second scene on Olympus (188–206), in which the Muses sing and Apollo appears as lyre-player rather than archer.

The first mention of Delphi is as "τὸ πρῶτον χρηστῆριον" in 214; both it and Delos are sanctuaries familiar to the audience -- indeed the first half, if not the whole hymn, was probably performed on Delos. The references to the future prosperity of both sanctuaries show they were flourishing at the time of the poet and his hearers.\footnote{See below, 45.}

\footnote{Delos: 56-60, 80-2, 87f., and the festival description, 146-78. Delphi: 247ff.—287ff., 393-6, 482-5, 520-3, 535-9.}
The flattering description of the crowds at the Delian festival and of the maidens obviously makes sense if it was composed to be performed in a similar context. Here the use of comparative material on oral poetry, with its illustrations of the ways in which poets change their songs to please their audience, can give us more insight into this description and lend support to the view that the hymn was actually performed in such a setting and does not merely create this illusion.\(^9\)

To return to the narratorial voice of the hymn, it is clear that the same sort of objectivity as is found in Homer is also characteristic of the Hymns' narrative style. The poet of Ap. intrudes more than those of the other hymns, as I have stated above; apart from the passages already noted, the "choice of theme" sections in both halves of the poem (19-28, 207-215) are more self-conscious than is usual in Homer or the other hymns.\(^10\) Yet in the actual narrative the poet does not express many opinions or judgements on the actions of characters. There is praise of the Ionians at the Delian festival and the chorus of maidens, but this is in a more personal, non-narrative section, where the poet speaks more directly. Even here the praise is partly "focalised"\(^11\) through an imaginary spectator (151ff.); similarly, praise of Apollo is focalised through Leto and Zeus several times (12f., 125f., 204ff.).

An interesting point is the contrast between the poet's own praise of the Ionians

---

\(^9\) Miller's (1986, 58f.) emphasis on the "encomiastic relevance" of this section to the poet's praise of Apollo is not in the least incompatible with its being designed for a real performance context.

\(^10\) Self-consciousness is also shown in h. 1 to Dionysus, with its mention of different beliefs about where Zues was born, and the proem to the Theogony, in which Hesiod describes how the Muses appeared to him and told him what to sing of; the closest Homeric parallel is the invocation of the Muses at the start of the catalogue of ships in Iliad 2.

\(^11\) For an explanation of this term, see De Jong 1987, 31ff.
at the festival as seeming "immortal and ageless" (151 - though this is, as I have said, assigned to an imaginary spectator) and the divine song about human helplessness (190ff.). This contrast has been noted by several critics, and often used to argue for a unitarian view of the hymn.\textsuperscript{12} Homer sometimes expresses a judgement on a character's actions, e.g. in the uses of νῆπιος or the view expressed that Zeus must have taken Glaucus' wits away when he exchanged gold armour for bronze with Diomedes (I. 6.234ff.).\textsuperscript{13} There is no direct judgement of this type in our hymn, though it seems reasonable to conclude that the poet views unfavourably the character of the Delphic snake (see 302f. κακὰ πολλὰ ... ἔρπεσκεν, 304 πήμα δοφοινόν, 354 κακῷ κακόν).

Both Homer and the Hymns largely present the thoughts and feelings of characters in speeches rather than in third-person narrative. The large proportion of direct speech in Homer has often been noticed: over half of the Iliad and Odyssey is direct speech (45% and 67% respectively; 55% of the whole).\textsuperscript{14} In the Hymns the proportion varies: Aph. (57%) and Herm. (48%) are similar to Homer, but Dem. (36%) and Ap. (32%: DA p 24%, PAp 36%) are noticeably lower, though still making up around a third of the total.\textsuperscript{15} That all these are high figures is stressed by a comparison with Hesiod, whose poems are not narrative in the same way, but do, particularly in the case of the Theogony, contain many narrative passages. 3% of the Theogony is direct

\textsuperscript{12} See commentary on 146ff.

\textsuperscript{13} See De Jong 1987, 136-45.

\textsuperscript{14} See Bassett 1938, 59ff.; De Jong 1987, 149ff.; Richardson 1990, 70f.

\textsuperscript{15} Griffin (1977) stresses the distinctiveness of Homer's use of direct speech. Though the hymns still have a lot of direct speech, they often omit it where Homer would not; see commentary on 102ff.
speech, and 1.3% of the *Works and Days*.16

The narrator does not tell us much about the characters’ feelings. The only occasion in *Ap.* when we are told something that could not be deduced from the speeches is at 275f., the real motive behind Telphousa’s speech. Generally only brief indicators of motives are given, e.g. that Leto was searching for somewhere to give birth (46) or that Delos rejoiced (61, 90), feelings amplified in the speeches they make. In the Pythian section we are not always told why Apollo does something, just that he decides to do it. This has led to speculation about e.g. why Apollo does not like the Lelantine plain as a site for his oracle (220f.), or how he knows that Telphousa has deceived him (375f.).

De Jong17 in particular has shown that the feelings of characters are often suggested indirectly, when something is seen from their perspective ("embedded focalisation"). This can be done over a few lines, or simply in the choice of an adjective that seems to reflect the character’s point of view (though it is often hard to tell whether it is the character’s or narrator’s point of view that an adjective reflects).

In *Ap.* too there are examples of this, some clearer than others. At 100 Hera is envious because Leto is going to bear a son who will be ἄμυμοντα τε κρατερόν τε. At 244 Apollo reaches Telphousa, and the poet says τόθι τοι ὦτε χώρος ἄπημον, implying that Apollo chose the spot because it was ἄπημον. At 286 Apollo resolves to build a νηὸν... ἐπηρατον at Delphi; 392 πολέες τε καὶ ἐσθλοὶ may suggest

16 The large difference between Hesiod and Homer in this respect suggests that it should perhaps be made more of in comparisons of their language and style. Statistical analyses usually ignore the differences between speech and narrative, on which (in Homer) see Griffin 1986.

17 De Jong 1987, 118-22
Apollo’s reasons for choosing the Cretans; 521f. ἐνθ’ ἀρ’ ἐμελλόν...κτλ. could be the Cretans’ point of view; 523f. ζῶσεν καὶ πλοῦνα might reflect Apollo’s pride in his temple.

In Ap. the speeches mostly occur in three dialogues, one in each of the narrative’s main sections. Each section has a similar pattern: there is a journey and catalogue of places (30-44, 216-44, 409-39); then the arrival at a destination (at 244 Apollo reaches Telphousa, which is not his final destination, but is the end of the main phase of his wanderings); and a debate which resolves the issues that arise. Delos makes Leto swear an oath that Apollo will honour her; Telphousa sends Apollo to Delphi, unwittingly bringing about the right outcome; and Apollo explains to the Cretan sailors what their future will be and how they are to live. These three debates make up most of the speeches in the poem. Through them we get some idea of the characters of those involved.¹⁸

The speeches also convey information which the narrative does not, mostly about the future. It is largely from the speeches that we learn of the future glories of Delos and Delphi (though also from the description of the Delian festival, 140ff). Leto in 51ff. promises that Apollo will have a rich temple on Delos, and that many will come and sacrifice there. Apollo in his speeches declares his intentions: he makes the same speech about building a temple on arriving at Telphousa and at Delphi (247-53 = 287-93; in the latter case there is nobody to address, which shows how it is the poet’s technique to convey this in direct speech). In Apollo’s speeches to the Cretan sailors, he stresses the honour they will have from keeping his temple, which will be rich and honoured by all men (475-501, 532-44).

¹⁸ See especially commentary on Leto’s dialogue with Delos (49ff.).
In speeches Apollo also sets up the three cults whose origins are explained in the Pythian hymn: Pythian (363ff.), Telphousian (379ff.) and Delphinian (490ff.). In the last case he also announces the etymology himself, whereas in the first two he only sets up the cult. These references to the futures of the shrines and the setting up of cults are important owing to the basically aetiological nature of this hymn, as of the others.\textsuperscript{19} The authoritative speeches in which Apollo announces his intention to punish Telphousa (379-81), gloats over the defeated snake (363-9) and orders the Cretans to build him an altar are matched by the speeches of Demeter and Aphrodite in the long hymns to them. Demeter founds the Eleusinian cult, and her speech is very dismissive of the mortals concerned (Dem. 256ff.; cf. Ap. 532ff.). Aphrodite also refers to the future and gives orders in her long speech to Anchises (Aph. 192-293). This last speech ends with a warning, as does Apollo’s to the Cretan sailors (Aph. 286ff., Ap. 540ff.).

Another aspect of the Hymns’ narratives, resulting from their theogonic/aetiological concerns and their divine protagonists, is that there sometimes seems to be a lack of logical connection between the parts of the story. Because of their aetiological nature, the course of events in them is in broad outline predetermined: Leto may wander over many islands seeking a place to give birth, but we know she will end up on Delos; Apollo may travel through many places seeking a site for his oracle, but he must eventually choose Delphi, even though the poet presents him as having a free choice and even at first choosing Telphousa. Since the purpose of the narrative is to tell how the god came to have some of his present functions, the structure is often determined by this rather than by what we would consider logically.

\textsuperscript{19} See above, 15f.
or psychologically motivated reasons. Hermes does a number of things in the hymn addressed to him, but these have for the most part no real narrative connection. The poet merely says: "And then Hermes decided to do so and so" -- the connection between the events is that they are all aetiologies for some function of the god or aspect of his nature. The same goes for the other major hymns, though it is least in evidence in Aph., where the action is more unified. In a recent article on Dem., R.Parker puts this well, while discussing analytical objections to the Hymn’s structure, which provides, for example, no explanation of why Demeter goes to Eleusis. He comments: "In a "theogonic" and aetiological poem, the reader can indeed make sense of the narrative, but in terms less of motives than of results . . . The "cause" of an event lies partly in the inscrutable mind of the god, more clearly in the consequence", and again: "The attentive reader of a poem such as this quickly realises that he is being led through a world of mysteries, because gods are gods, not men, because Olympus is hidden from mortal eyes. Demeter would cease to be Demeter if she had to explain herself to Wilamowitz."

Many scenes and narrative techniques fit into types that occur in Homer. The opening scene on Olympus is similar both to arrivals of gods on Olympus in Homer, and to arrival scenes in general. The standing up of the gods when Apollo enters

---


21 Ibid. 11.

22 Sowa (1984) discusses the use of typical themes and story patterns (e.g. Seduction, Withdrawal and Return, The Journey, Epiphany) in the Hymns and Homer.

23 See commentary on 1-13.
is like the entries of Zeus and Hera in the Iliad. The second scene on Olympus also has parallels in divine and human scenes. In ll.1 Apollo plays his lyre among the gods and the Muses sing; the closest human parallel is the picture of young people dancing on the shield of Achilles, and the two tumblers in Homer are paralleled by Ares and Hermes in the hymn. Another common Homeric type-scene, the sending of a messenger, occurs at Ap. 102ff.

So we can see that the Hymns’ narrative techniques are similar to those in Homer; but this should not mislead us into thinking they are the same type of poem. They are hymns in praise of particular gods, whereas the Iliad and Odyssey are long epics about heroes. We can see simple differences in style, e.g. there are none of the elaborate similes familiar in Homer, no addresses to the Muse in the narrative. More important, however, than these superficial differences are those related to the sort of stories the Hymns are telling, and what they aim to do. This can best be seen by discussing the Hymns’ treatment of the gods, and comparing it to Homer’s.

---

24 Zeus: 1.534; Hera: 15.84. See commentary on 1ff.


26 See commentary ad loc.

27 In Ap. the only similes are at 186, 441f. The longest similes in the Hymns are Herm. 43-5, Dem. 174-6.
(iii) **The treatment of the gods.**

The most obvious thing about the narratives of the major hymns, as compared with those of Homer, is that they are primarily about gods. Of course, the gods feature prominently in the Homeric epics, especially the *Iliad*, but the stories are basically about mortals. The gods are a background to these events, and are only portrayed in so far as they are involved in the human action. Even on Olympus, their discussions are mainly about events among mortals. Certainly there are pictures of them enjoying themselves and taking no interest in human affairs: at the end of *Iliad* 1 Hephaestus tells the gods not to quarrel over mortals, and they turn to feasting and song (1.573ff.); at *Il.* 13.1ff. Zeus turns away from the battle (though he still looks at mortals); the gods also go to feast with the Ethiopians (*Il.* 1.423ff.; *Od.* 1.22f.). But more often they take a keen interest in the goings-on on the earth.\(^{28}\)

In the Hymns, by contrast, it is the gods who are the main figures, and humans only come into the story as they are involved in their plans. I have already discussed the fact that there are Hymns dealing mainly with the gods and some that involve gods and mortals;\(^{29}\) *Dem.*, *Ap.* and *Aph.* are mixtures of the two. The hymns are either "theogonic", describing a god’s birth and/or acquiring of powers; or they explain the origin of a cult or sanctuary, which naturally tends to involve mortals.\(^{30}\) This reflects the fact that there are not many types of stories that one can tell about the

---

\(^{28}\) On all this see especially Griffin 1980, 179-204.

\(^{29}\) See above, 16f.

\(^{30}\) See above, 15f.
Olympian gods. Because they are immortal and ageless, nothing truly significant can happen in their lives, which lack the excitement and poignancy of human lives lived in the shadow of death. The only things that really happen to them are their birth and acquisition of functions, by which they take their place among the other gods. Herm. is a good example of this in our Hymns. The Theogony shows the same principle at work on a larger scale: it explains how the world and the rule of the Olympian gods under Zeus came about.

Once the Olympian pantheon is organised and settled, however, almost all the stories about them involve mortals. In the Hymns there are some conflicts between gods that have nothing to do with humans (most of Herm., the Typhaon episode in Ap.); some that do involve them (Dem., Aph.); and some cases where the god’s encounter with humans is not connected with divine conflicts (PAp). All, though, deal with origins of one sort or another. In the Homeric epics all this is in the past: the Olympian order is settled and stories about struggles among the gods (as opposed to petty squabbles) are only told as past events.

In the Hymns, then, we can see gods being born, making their first appearance on Olympus and gaining their functions and powers. Clay suggests that the Hymns fill a gap between the story of the gods’ origins found in the Theogony and the stable picture of the gods found in Homer. The Theogony tells how the Olympians came to power, and concentrates on Zeus. Of the other gods it merely states that: “Zeus divided their honours among them” (885).

---

31 Smith (1980, 108 n.1), comments: "Greek gods are in fact strikingly unepisodic in their present, adult forms. It is the heroes who have adventures, while the Olympians have generally fixed natures and spheres of influence."

32 Clay 1989, 15f.
The Hymns show this process happening. In them too it is stressed that Zeus is in charge (as also at the start of the Iliad).\footnote{Clay, however, probably goes too far in stressing the role of Zeus in the hymns, when she sees all the long hymns as parts of Zeus’ master plan for organising the cosmos. (Clay 1989, 268). Cf. the remarks of Sowa (1992, 94ff.).} In Ap. 132 Apollo states that he will declare to men “the unfailing will of Zeus” (Διός νημερτέα βουλήν). In Dem. we learn at the start that Zeus allowed or even planned the rape of Persephone (3 δὸκεν δὲ βαρύκτυπος εὐρύοπα Ζεῦς); and in the later part of the poem he sends messengers to bring Persephone back and to reconcile Demeter, finally decreeing what Persephone’s fate is to be. In Herm. it is Zeus who passes judgement on Hermes and Apollo; and in Aph. Zeus plans to make Aphrodite fall in love with a mortal so she will no longer be able to boast of her power over the other gods (Aph. 45ff.).

Hymns involving the god’s birth, such as Ap. and Herm., show how the god came to be who he is.\footnote{See Devlin 1994, 46-9 on birth stories in the Homeric Hymns.} In both cases the divine child matures at miraculous speed (see on 127ff.), and in Herm. this is a major theme. Immediately after his birth Apollo declares that the bow and lyre will be dear to him, and that he will prophesy to men the will of Zeus (131f.). In a hymn that narrates only the god’s birth (if we see the Delian section as a separate hymn), the god’s future roles need to be prophesied at his birth; the opening scene on Olympus also provides a picture of Apollo’s future power. In Herm., by contrast, the birth narrative is only a preliminary to the theme of the god’s acquisition of honours.

The Hymns are each in praise of a particular god, and this naturally affects the way in which they portray the gods. In Homer many gods intervene in the action, but each hymn tends to deal mainly with one, and others are only mentioned in passing.
When there is a scene on Olympus in the Hymns, it reflects this emphasis: a good example is the opening of *Ap.*, which stresses Apollo’s power even among the other gods. The second scene set there (187ff.) does the same in another way, showing how the gods start to sing and dance as soon as Apollo arrives on Olympus with his lyre (see on 189); he is also at the centre of the dance, and provides the culmination of the description (200ff.).

The Hymns are relatively short compositions and so focus on one incident, or series of incidents, in the life of a particular god. Hence the god who is the subject of the hymn dominates the narrative and is rarely out of the spotlight. In *Dem.* this is largely true, though there are sections that focus on Persephone, reflecting the hymn’s dual subject. *DAp* is unusual in that Leto is the centre of attention most of the time; but this is inevitable in a birth-narrative (see on 14ff.). Apollo is never out of the picture in *PAp*, nor is Aphrodite in *Aph.* In *Herm.* Apollo plays an important role, and his search for the thief of his cattle is described.

Within this story there is usually a strong emphasis on the god’s power. In *Ap.*, this is clear in the Olympus scenes, but it is a feature of the whole hymn. Delos fears that Apollo will scorn her once he is born, since she has heard he will be ὀπτασθαλος and "rule greatly over gods and men" (67ff.). In the Pythian section, his power is stressed in the punishment of Telphousa, the defeat of the Delphic snake and the hijacking of the Cretan sailors (375ff., 357ff., 387ff.). Throughout the hymn Apollo is in control and does everything himself: he builds the temple (or starts it), founds the oracle, kills the snake that would be a menace to pilgrims and gets the priests for the sanctuary.

The authority of the gods is particularly stressed in their dealings with mortals,
as one would expect. This occurs mainly in the stories about the founding of a particular cult or rite (Aphrodite’s encounter with Anchises describes the founding of a family, the Aeneadai). In both Dem. and Ap. the god is directly responsible for the founding of a cult and temple. Both are high-handed in their treatment of mortals and address them disdainfully (Dem. 257ff., Ap. 532ff.), but also give blessings to them through the cults they establish. Aphrodite makes an equally authoritative speech to Anchises, telling him how to bring up Aeneas and warning him not to reveal his parentage (192-290).

In all these narratives there is an epiphany of the god, and it has often been pointed out that this is a feature of the hymns.35 Demeter reveals herself to the Eleusinians (Dem. 275ff.), Apollo to the Cretan sailors (480ff., cf.also 444ff.) and Aphrodite to Anchises (177ff.). All first disguise themselves, and then reveal their true nature and purposes to the mortals concerned. As Lenz points out,36 there is a difference between these appearances and those of gods to men in Homer, as here the god is the main actor, whereas in Homer things are seen more from a human point of view. On the whole, humans in the Hymns are mere ciphers, used by the gods for their own purposes; the only one at all individualised is Anchises in Aph. The epiphanies in the hymns stress the gap between gods and men: there is nothing like the friendly banter of Athene and Odysseus in the Odyssey.37 The reaction to the gods is one of fear, yet also of joy at receiving blessings. Gods are the benefactors

35 See Pfister 1924; Richardson 1974, on Dem. 275ff.; Lenz 1975, 40-44.

36 Lenz 1975, 19-20.

37 There are Homeric passages more like the hymns in this respect. Apollo in particular reminds men that they are inferior to the gods (Il. 5.440ff.).
of humans, but can also destroy them, and an encounter with them is dangerous, uncanny. A good example of this is Anchises’ fear when he realises he has slept with Aphrodite (Aph. 185ff.), which the poet expresses in the powerful line 167 ὑθανότη παρέλεκτο θεῷ βροτός, οὐ σὺφα εἶδος; and cf. the reaction to Demeter’s self-revelation in Dem. (190f., 281ff.).

In Homer (at least in the Iliad) the gods often quarrel over humans; but in the Hymns the conflicts they have are to do with divine power struggles - humans are not worth quarrelling over. Dem. and Aph. both involve humans, but are rooted in power-struggles on Olympus. In Dem. the story of the founding of the mysteries is interwoven with a story on the divine and cosmic plane. As we have seen, Zeus is behind the abduction of Persephone, or allows it, and Clay sees the hymn as about the breaking down of barriers between Olympus, Earth and the underworld. Zeus also plans Aphrodite’s love for Anchises, to weaken her position among the gods. In Ap., the goddesses have to overcome Hera’s jealousy of Leto and her attempt to prevent Apollo’s birth. The Pythian section involves no other gods (unless the spring Telphousa is counted) and shows Apollo acting among men: even here his opponents, Telphousa and the snake, are not human. The Typhaon episode (305-55) is another example of a conflict over status on Olympus.

The gods as they appear in the Hymns are more closely linked than in Homer to particular cults and sanctuaries. In Homer the gods are usually depicted on Olympus, and rarely linked to particular cult places: the emphasis is on their interest in the heroes, especially their own favourites, rather than their famous sanctuaries. The

---

Homerian Olympians are panhellenic, transcending local cults.\textsuperscript{39} In the Hymns the gods are more closely linked to particular places. \textit{Ap.} is the best example, dealing as it does with the founding of the sanctuaries at Delos and Delphi, and also the setting up of altars to Apollo Telphousios and Delphinios. In Homer the gods are motivated to intervene in human affairs for various reasons: they take sides and have favourites either because the heroes are their children (Thetis is the prime example, but cf. also Zeus' sorrow at the death of Sarpedon, \textit{Il.} 16.430ff.), or because their natures are congenial (Athene and Odysseus), or because they have grudges against a group (Hera and Athene are against the Trojans because of the judgement of Paris).\textsuperscript{40} Apollo, though, in the hymn, is concerned with humans in general when he founds his oracle (247ff., 483); it will benefit all men, and their offerings will benefit him. The men he chooses for his priests are not heroes or demigods, but ordinary sailors, representative of humanity in general. Similarly the Eleusinian mysteries bring blessings to all who are initiates (480ff.) and Hermes' inventions of the lyre and of fire are beneficial to all humans (\textit{Herm.} 39ff., 111).

Various views have been taken about the role of the gods in Homer. Some see them as a "literary device", a divine machinery ("Götterapparat") used to advance the plot, since they can intervene and change things at will, e.g. by giving fresh strength to heroes or snatching their favourites from the battlefield.\textsuperscript{41}

\textsuperscript{39} See Clay 1989, 8ff.

\textsuperscript{40} \textit{Il.} 24.25-30; see Reinhardt 1960.

\textsuperscript{41} On any view this is clearly a role they play. The question is whether they are merely a technical device or have a deeper significance. Those who take the former view often think the poem would be better without the gods. So Nilsson (1967, 368) says: "der Götterapparat könnte gestrichen werden, die Handlung würde sich dann ebenso verständlich entwickeln." Cf. Schmid 1929, 111. A good recent discussion
On another view the gods are mainly explanations of human impulses or strange occurrences. To say that a god strengthened someone is merely a way of saying that he somehow found fresh strength. The gods on this view can be external representations of a character's thought processes: the locus classicus for this is Athene's appearance to Achilles in II. 1.193ff., when she tells him not to kill Agamemnon. 42

These ideas are linked to the belief that Homer's gods lack any serious religious value: they are frivolous and immoral, not really believed in by the poet or his audience. 43 In both the interpretations I have outlined the gods are seen as a way of conveying something else, either the structure of the poem or the psychology of its characters, not as real characters themselves with their own consistent motives and desires. This is misguided: the gods belong in the epic as much as the heroes, and though it is true that the primary story is human, the gods are real characters within it. So, for instance, when Athene appears to Achilles her action makes sense in terms of her own motivation, her desire for the Greeks to defeat the Trojans. 44

42 This is the view of Snell 1975, 18ff.; Redfield 1975, 78. For criticisms, see Russo and Simon 1968; Kirk 1974, 292; Griffin 1980, 158ff.; Clay 1983, 136ff; Erbse (1986) overstresses the power of the gods over humans, denying them free will; a better view is that of Lesky (1961), who argues that events have a double motivation, divine and human.

43 See e.g. Murray 1934, 265ff., who says that the Homeric religion "was not really religion at all"; Bowra 1930, 222f. An excellent counter to this, stressing the sublime and numinous aspects of Homer's gods, is the discussion of Griffin 1980, 144-78.

44 A good comment on the criticism that Homer's gods are purely literary is provided by Feeney (1991, 2) who says that: "criticizing the gods in epic as a literary device is like criticizing the carburettors or pistons in a car as an engineering device." However, this does perhaps rather skate over the issue of what people are saying when
It is also wrong to deny religious value to Homer's gods. They can be treated humorously, as in Demodocus' story about Ares and Aphrodite (Od. 8. 266-366), but have sublime qualities as well. A good illustration of this is the visit of Thetis to Zeus in II. 1 to ask him to give the Trojans success while Achilles is absent from the battle (1.493ff.). At first Zeus appears in the rather comic role of the hen-pecked husband; but when he nods his head in assent, the picture is one of great grandeur.45

That this sort of description had an effect on how people perceived the gods can be seen from the story that Pheidias based his statue of Zeus at Olympia on these lines.46 Our tendency to distinguish between "literary" gods and actual objects of belief and worship was probably not relevant for the Greeks. The poets played a large part in shaping conceptions of the gods. However, we should also bear in mind the differences between Homer's picture and everyday religion. The picture of the divine family on Olympus is a poetic one, and Homer ignores gods important in cult like Demeter and Dionysus. In Homer the gods are largely divorced from their local associations, whereas in the Hymns these are more prominent.

We have seen that the gods in the Hymns are portrayed using the same conventions and poetic apparatus as in Homer, but are more directly linked to actual cults. In the case of the Hymns, then, it is hard to deny that the gods had real religious significance, especially as they are directly addressed and prayed to at the end of the Hymns. So the god portrayed in the narrative and the god the singer and

---

45 See Griffin 1980, 198ff.

46 Macrobius, Saturnalia 5.13.
audience pray to are identified; and this should make us more careful about denying religious significance to Homer's gods, portrayed in a similar way. Likewise, since in the Hymns the gods are the primary characters, it is not possible to reduce them to a "divine apparatus"; and this argues against doing the same in Homer. Gods are fit subjects for epic poetry, and have their own characteristics and feelings. The idea of the divine apparatus does, however, rightly emphasise that there are advantages in narrating a story about gods, in that they can with some limitations do what they want and go where they want. So in Ap. there are no problems about how to get Apollo or Leto from one place to another; and when Apollo wants priests for his oracle the narrator simply has him jump on the ship, turn into a dolphin and take it where he wants to go.
(iv) **Apollo and Delos**

**The portrayal of Apollo**

I have already discussed the treatment of the gods in the *Homerica Hymns*, and some of the questions that the depiction of gods in literature raises. Burkert suggests that the picture of a god has at least four components:

(i) an established local cult;

(ii) a divine name;

(iii) myths about the god;

(iv) a traditional iconography.

It is always difficult, if not impossible, to trace the origins of a particular god, and the history of how he came to develop his various attributes. Often a major god is a combination of various local gods; and the names of gods, their myths and images are often easily transferred from place to place and cult to cult. The same myth can be told of different gods; or originally unrelated myths can become linked to one divine name. As the Greeks came to see themselves as a single people they also came to regard the gods of different cult centres, e.g. Delos and Delphi, as of the same god. The history and attributes of particular gods became relatively standardised, though variant traditions always persisted.

Poets played an important part in this creation of an organised pantheon. In order

---

1 See above, 37ff.

2 Burkert 1985, 119.
to present a god in poetry, some of his attributes need to be selected and emphasised. The gods are distinguished, in art as well as poetry, both by their own attributes and by their place in the system of gods who have complementary attributes. Standard ways of describing the actions of gods in poetry are developed: this "divine machinery" is basically the same in Homer and the Hymns. The depictions of the gods in Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns do not merely reflect Greek beliefs about the gods: they helped to order those beliefs, and create the standardised images of particular gods familiar from later Greek art and literature.

In the case of Apollo, Burkert suggests that poetry played a particularly important role in creating a unified figure out of the many cults and traditions. Apollo is a complex figure, whose origins have been much disputed. He has many functions, and his worship is spread throughout the Greek world. A popular theory has been that Apollo came from Asia Minor. This was first argued in detail by Wilamowitz, and for a time became the orthodox view, accepted by Nilsson in his history of Greek religion. The epithet Lykeios could mean Lycian, though Greeks preferred to explain it as "wolf-god". Similarly, in the Iliad the Lycian Pandaros prays to Apollo Lykegenes, and Apollo is a pro-Trojan god. The name of his mother, Leto, is often identified with that of the Lycian goddess Lada (the Lycian for "woman"), but there

---

3 See above, 29.

4 See above, 45.

5 Burkert 1985, 145.

6 For a good brief survey of Apollo’s functions, emphasising his role as ἀλεξικός, see Cassola 1975, 79-83.

7 Wilamowitz 1903b, 1908; Nilsson 1967, 559ff; cf. Cassola 1975, 83-6. There is a clear discussion of the various theories in Guthrie 1950, 73-87.
is no good evidence for this. The Delian trio of Leto, Apollo and Artemis may have
an Asiatic origin: Artemis of course was important at Ephesus, and there were many
cult centres of Apollo in Asia Minor, notably the famous oracles at Patara, Didyma
/Branchchidae/, Claros and Gryneion. Nilsson argued that Apollo’s connections with
the number seven (his festivals often fell on the seventh of a month) show the
influence of Babylonia, where seven was important in cult calendars.

The other popular theory about Apollo’s origins has been that he came from the
north, and the Greeks adopted him in the course of their southward migrations. His
connections with the Hyperboreans are cited in support of this. Everything about the
Hyperboreans is disputed, but they are certainly important in the myths and cult of
Apollo. Alcaeus described Apollo’s arrival at Delphi from the land of the
Hyperboreans, where he was believed to spend the winter months. In Delian myth
and cult the Hyperboreans are if anything more prominent. Herodotus tells us that
offerings brought to Delos each year were supposed to come from the
Hyperboreans. The young women and men of Delos made offerings at two tombs
which were said to be those of two Hyperborean maidens who died on the island.

---

8 See Bryce 1986, 175ff.

9 Nilsson 1967, 561f.

10 Some supporters of this are Farnell 1896-1909, 4.98ff.; Cook 1914-25, II. 1.453-501; Rose 1928, 134-6.


12 Alcaeus’ poem is not extant, but is summarised by Himerius (Or. 14.10). For
discussion, and comparison with PAp, see Page 1955, 244ff.

The importance of these myths on Delos casts into doubt the theory that the Hyperboreans came from the north with Apollo.\textsuperscript{14} The ancient interpretation of the word Υπερβόρεοι as "those who dwell beyond the north wind" has been questioned, probably rightly, by modern philologists; Ahrens suggested that it is a Macedonian form of περφερέες, "carriers-over", a reference to those who brought the offerings to Delos (there is a Macedonian month Υπερβερεταϊος).\textsuperscript{15} Guthrie argues that the Hyperboreans should be located in Asia rather than the Balkans.\textsuperscript{16}

The etymology of the name Apollo is uncertain. The identification with Hittite Apulanas is now rejected.\textsuperscript{17} Burkert and Graf support a derivation from the Dorian term ἀπέλλαοι, which is known through a gloss in Hesychius: ἀπέλλαοι, σηκοῖ, ἐκκλησία. They refer the latter meaning to Dorian tribal gatherings. The initiation of young men was one role of such gatherings, and may have been the province of the youthful god Apollon/ Apollon.\textsuperscript{18}

A lot of ingenuity is required to trace the many functions of Apollo to a single source, and the most sensible view is that expressed by Krappe: "Many of the most bitter controversies concerning the nature and origin of Apollo could have been avoided, had it been realised that the Apollo of the classical epoch is as much of a

\textsuperscript{14} Cássola (1975, 88f.) argues that the cult of the Hyperboreans on Delos was originally linked to a Mycenaean goddess who preceded Apollo and Artemis, and so is not relevant to the history of Apollo. He argues that Delphi's Hyperborean myths are secondary, created out of rivalry with Delos.

\textsuperscript{15} Ahrens 1862; this is supported by Windekens 1957.

\textsuperscript{16} Guthrie 1950, 73-80.

\textsuperscript{17} See Cássola 1975, 84f.

\textsuperscript{18} Burkert 1975; Graf 1979.
compound as was the Hellenic nation itself." Burkert's conclusion is that Apollo has at least three components: Dorian/NW Greek, Cretan/Minoan and Syro-hittiite.00

The disputes about Apollo's origin invite the questions: what does it mean to say that a god came from one place to another, for instance from Asia to Crete? Is he the same god in both places? What is the essence of a god? Divine names can easily be transferred from one god to another. Similarly, as I have already noted, a myth can be told of more than one god, or separate myths can become attached to the same god. Rituals, too, which were originally unconnected can come to be linked to one divine name. If we could prove that Apollo's name is Dorian, as Burkert proposes, this would not prove that Apollo, the developed Greek god, had this origin; other aspects of his nature had other sources. The important thing is that there came to be agreement among Greeks as to who Apollo was, and what his functions were. Even if it were possible to trace the development step by step, this would not necessarily help in discussing the Apollo portrayed in archaic and later Greece; he is more than the sum of his parts.

Poetry, as I have remarked, played an important part in creating the figure of Apollo. In Ap. he is portrayed as the founder of his two greatest shrines, Delos and Delphi. Cessi argued that DAp reflects Apollo's Asiatic component, and PAp his Northern.21 Although a unitarian, he saw a difference between the lyric excitement of DAp and the ceremonial epic style of PAp, which he attributed to a difference in religious ethos. The Pythian cult was solemn and ceremonial, while the Delian cult,

19 Krappe 1942, 366.
20 Burkert 1985, 144.
21 Cessi 1928.
with its origins in Asia and Crete, was joyful, lively and enthusiastic. This distinction is spurious; if there ever was such a difference, it is not apparent in Homer or the Hymns. Förstel calls this theory a hypostatisation in terms of religious history of a difference observed in the hymn.\textsuperscript{22} He too, however, believes that the portrayal of Apollo is different in the two parts, and I have indicated below my reasons for disagreeing with his views.\textsuperscript{23} Apollo is portrayed similarly in both halves; and this picture is consistent with Apollo in Homer.

Apollo's first appearance in \textit{Ap.} shows his power, as he comes to Olympus wielding his bow, and the other gods spring up in fear.\textsuperscript{24} His power is stressed throughout the poem, as one would expect in a hymn to him. Delos fears "that Apollo will be too \textalpha\tau\acute{o}\sigma\theta\omega\alpha\lambda\omicron\varsigma, and rule greatly over gods and mortals" (67-8), and that, despising her smallness and barrenness, he may push her to the bottom of the sea. This, I would argue, is how Apollo actually turns out, and how he is portrayed in this hymn and in Homer. It is true that he does not harm Delos, and in fact delights in her, but she has been careful to extort an oath from Leto to make sure he does not. In the \textit{Iliad} Apollo is a powerful and haughty god. It is he who afflicts the Achaeans with a plague at the start of the poem: he descends "like the night" and "terrible was the clash that arose from the bow of silver" (1.43-52). He tells Diomedes not to fight with gods: "Take care, son of Tydeus, draw back; measure yourself no longer against the gods, for not of the same breed are the immortal gods and men who walk on the earth" (5.440-2). In the battle of the gods he refuses to fight Poseidon over

\textsuperscript{22} Förstel 1979, 42.
\textsuperscript{23} See below, 113.
\textsuperscript{24} See commentary on 1-13.
insignificant mortals (21.461-7); he destroys the Achaean wall "with utter ease, as when a little boy knocks over sand-castles on the sea-shore" (15.361-6); he strikes Patroclus with his hand, and shatters his armour (16.788ff.).

Nor is it true that Apollo is portrayed differently in the Pythian half. Some see the god in this section as more moral: he establishes an oracle for men; punishes Telphousa for deceiving him; kills the snake that was a menace to men; and warns the Cretan sailors that they will be punished if they give way to hubris. (375-87; 300-304; 539-44). However, these actions can be seen differently: Apollo’s punishment of Telphousa is not the impartial chastisement of a sinner, but an act of personal revenge. She tried to deceive him and keep her glory, and so Apollo says she will have to share her glory with him (381). He is not more righteous than her, merely more powerful. He boasts over her as he does over the defeated snake. His foundation of the oracle does benefit humans, but also benefits him: he stresses that they will bring offerings to him (249ff.-289ff.). Similarly, his killing the snake suits his own interests by removing a menace to pilgrims. He hijacks the Cretans and makes them his servants, regardless of their own feelings; and his closing warning to them has the disdainful tone common in divine epiphanies to mortals.

Apollo’s behaviour is not to be condemned or defended; this is how a powerful god behaves. It is misguided to see a contradiction between Apollo the Delphic lawgiver, upholder of morality, and the arbitrary power he displays in the hymn.

---

25 On this picture of Apollo in Homer, see Otto 1954, 61-7.

26 Cf. Förstel 1979, 280f.

27 Such a contradiction is noted by Kroll 1956, 115; Miller 1986, 39; Clay 1989, 36f.
Gods are not judged by the same standards as men. This is not to say that Apollo in early epic has no moral aspect; the Delphic maxim "Know thyself", a reminder to mortals that they are not gods, is consistent with Apollo's warning to Diomedes in the *Iliad*, and his words to the Cretans about ὄβρις, ἥθεμις ἐστι καταγνητῶν ἄνθρωπων (541).

Apollo is a fearsome god, but also a bringer of joy. The two scenes on Olympus illustrate these two aspects: similarly in *II.* 1 he appears at the start as the frightening plague god, and at the end playing his lyre at the divine feast. In *Ap.* initial fear of Apollo is followed by rejoicing. This is the movement of the opening scene; Delos is afraid of how Apollo will treat her, but rejoices at his birth; the Cretan sailors fear Apollo when he appears as a dolphin on their ship, but their journey ends with a joyful procession to Delphi. However, the fates of Telphousa and the Delphic snake are less pleasant; and the Cretans too may have mixed feelings about their new honours. Only Apollo benefits from every encounter, as is fitting in a hymn to him; but this can entail benefits to others, to Delos and to mortals. The description of the Delian festival shows the joy that Apollo can bring to mortals; and of course they also benefit from the foundation of the Delphic oracle.

**Delos**

The Delian part of the hymn, like the Pythian, is aetiological: it explains how one of his sanctuaries (and the god himself) came into being. The birth of a god is a

---

28 *II.* 1.43-52, 601ff.
common theme in the *Homerica Hymns*. In this case the birth narrative is unusually extended: most of the Hymns' birth narratives are short, and in *Herm.*, the other long hymn that tells of the god's birth, it is merely a prelude to the main action. Apollo's birth narrative was especially important, as it was the major myth of one of the god's major sanctuaries. In no other case did the supposed site of a god's birth become a sanctuary of panhellenic importance.

The story, then, explains the Delian Apollo cult: or does it? The relationship between myth and cult is a complex one. In fact many elements of Delian cult have little or no connection with the story of Apollo's birth. It is likely that the cult of Artemis preceded that of Apollo on Delos. The story of the Hyperborean maidens and their tombs is only indirectly linked to Apollo. Delian girls made offerings of their hair at these tombs, and young men of their first beards. Here the rituals are to do with transitions to marriage and adulthood, and their original purpose had nothing to do with the Hyperborean maidens. The crane dance round the altar of horns was said to have been instituted by Theseus when he visited Delos while on his way back from Crete; he also brought with him a wooden statue of Aphrodite, and instituted the Delian games. Thus we can see that the various Delian rituals were explained by different myths; and that the myths often have little to do with the real origins and purposes of the rituals.

29 See above, 14f.

30 On the relationship between myth and cult on Delos, see Graf 1993, 101-20.

31 See below, 126f.


33 See below, 128.
So the story of Apollo's birth is only one, although the most important, of several strands of Delian aetiological myth. The most direct mention of Delian cult in the hymn is the description of the festival (140-78). This festival in itself need not have had much to do with Apollo's birth, at least in its origins. As I remarked above, the institution of the games, in one version at any rate, was ascribed to Theseus. Graf remarks (perhaps overstating his case): "The mood that is established in the myth of Apollo's birth on Delos . . . corresponds to the mood of the festival; and, just as, in the myth, the birth of the god is a joyful event, one that delights the personified island of Delos, so the festival is a cheerful occasion. Otherwise, however, the myth and the ritual have little in common."34 In the hymn, the festival is the result of Apollo's birth on the island, and is said to delight him; but it is not said that he directly founded the cult, as he does at Delphi in the hymn's second part. The festival is linked to the birth story by the singing of hymns about his birth, such as those the Delian maidens sing, and \textit{DAp} itself.

To quote Graf again: "myth and ritual are autonomous phenomena. Although they may come into contact here and there, each of them is governed by its own structural laws. Myths are narratives, and as such they obey the conventions of the literary genre in which they are told."35 Thus, although the \textit{Homer\textsc{ic} Hymns} have an obvious aetiological function, this is not the only purpose of the narratives. Telling the story in the best way is also a goal, and themes can be introduced that have no obvious bearing on the aetiology.

In the hymn's narrative of the birth of Apollo, the dominant figure is Leto. Her

\footnotesize{34 Graf 1993, 115f.}

\footnotesize{35 Ibid. 116.}
wanderings in search of a place to give birth, and the description of the birth itself, make up most of the narrative. At the end of the narrative Apollo announces that he will be the god of the bow, the lyre and prophecy. These are attributes that Apollo has everywhere: they have no special connection with Delos. This is a hymn to Apollo, not to Delos, and the origin of Apollo is more important in it than the origin of his Delian cult. Yet the foundation of a temple on Delos is an important theme in the hymn, and of course it ends with an impressive description of the festival. The hymn is concerned to glorify both Apollo and Delos, but primarily Apollo.

The hymn emphasises that Delos is small and barren; her fears of Apollo are based on this (63-82). The changes brought to her by his birth are shown first in the account of her gilding, and then in the description of the festival. The birth of so great a god on so small an island parallels the surprise of such a small island being such an important cult centre. The hymn provides a mythical explanation for this; it is Delos’ poverty and barrenness that make her eager to receive Apollo, in spite of her fears. In historical terms, the importance of Delos as a sanctuary can be explained by its size and position. Being small and barren, it was not coveted as territory by any state. Its sole importance lay in its cult of Apollo. For the Ionians, its position was marginal, an advantage for inter-state sanctuaries. Its position in the centre of the Aegean may have made it a suitable panhellenic sanctuary, and centre of the Delian league in the fifth century.

It is revealing to compare the hymn’s account of the birth with that of

---

[^36]: 131f.; see commentary ad loc.

Callimachus in his hymn to Delos. Callimachus clearly had $DAp$ in mind in this hymn: there are precise verbal parallels, and other striking similarities and contrasts. Indeed, the whole conception of a hymn to Delos, rather than Apollo, may have been inspired by the island’s personification in $DAp$. Addressing a hymn to Delos is the sort of unusual approach to the myth that one would expect from Callimachus, and his whole poem displays a search for striking ways of telling the story. In $Ap$ the islands are afraid of Apollo because he will be a powerful god: the motif of Hera’s jealousy only comes in later. In Callimachus the islands, and also places on mainland Greece, fear Hera from the start, and are depicted actually fleeing from Leto. Hera sets Ares to watch over the mainland, and Iris to watch over the Aegean. In $Ap$, Apollo speaks straight after his birth: in Callimachus he twice speaks from his mother’s womb, the second time telling Leto that Asteria (Delos) is the place where he will be born. In $Ap$, Delos is covered with gold when Apollo is born: Callimachus depicts this in a more extravagant form, in which the lake flows with gold, the olive-tree puts forth gold leaves, and the river Inopus turns to gold. Another fantastic element in Callimachus but not $Ap$ is the idea that Delos was originally a floating island called Asteria, and only became fixed after the birth of Apollo.

Thus we can see in Callimachus’ hymn a desire to outdo $DAp$, and to make his account fantastic and startling. There is also a striving for pathos in Callimachus that is lacking in $DAp$. Leto’s plight is depicted more forcibly, and the odds against her are made as great as possible: not only Hera, but Ares and Iris too, are working to prevent Apollo’s birth. The river Peneius, after some hesitation, heroically offers to receive Leto, in spite of the threats of Ares; but Leto, with equal nobility, refuses to

---

38 On this hymn see Mineur 1984; Hutchinson 1988, 36ff.
accept his self-sacrifice. Similarly Asteria/Delos offers herself voluntarily: "Hera, do
to me what you please; for I do not heed your threats. Cross, cross, Leto, to me."\(^{39}\)
This is very different from the calculating Delos of \(DAp\). In Callimachus, Leto gives
birth alone, again emphasising the pathos of her situation: in \(DAp\) she is surrounded
by other goddesses.

Callimachus' hymn accounts for many more details of Delian cult than does \(DAp\).
After the birth story, the poet tells of the current rituals on Delos and how they
originated: the offerings brought to the tomb of the Hyperborean maidens; the singing
of Olen's hymns; the statue of Aphrodite brought by Theseus; the institution of the
crane dance, again ascribed to Theseus; Apollo's construction of the altar of horns
from the horns of goats killed by Artemis.

This makes sense when we remember that Callimachus is composing a hymn to
Delos, not to Apollo. His hymn is not an account of Apollo's birth with
miscellaneous explanations of Delian rituals tacked on: the story of Apollo's birth and
the other aetiologies all explain features of Delian cult. The birth story is simply the
most important of these, and therefore told at greater length. \(DAp\), by contrast, has no
need to mention the Hyperborean maidens or Theseus: they are not relevant to the
story of how Apollo came to be worshipped on Delos. The poet of \(DAp\) shows how
Apollo's birth led to the current fame of Delos, vividly portrayed in the description
of the festival; and the depiction of the Delian maidens singing of Apollo, Leto and
Artemis (158ff.) shows that this festival is linked to the god's birth.

\(^{39}\) \textit{H. Del.} 203f.
(v) The language of the hymn

The most obvious fact about the diction and style of the Homeric Hymns is their similarity to those of Homer and Hesiod. The Hymns use the same artificial language, one which, as every introduction to Homer's language reminds us, was never actually spoken in any time or place; it contains forms from different dialects and different periods.¹ Study of the language of the Hymns has therefore always tended to consist largely of comparisons with Homer and (to a lesser extent) Hesiod and to follow the trends of Homeric philology.

There was a great deal of interest in the language of the Hymns in the second half of the last century, and several works were written comparing their style and diction to Homer's.² At this time it was generally assumed that the Hymns' similarity to Homer was due to imitation, and the differences due to a failure to imitate perfectly. Because of their imitative nature they were seen as the second-rate work of unoriginal poets, but there is really a circular argument here: they need only be regarded as derivative if one starts from the assumption that Homer is the model, and the more similarities to Homer are found, the more derivative they are shown to be. Hence Aph., today perhaps the most highly regarded of the Hymns,³ was criticised because


² See, in addition to the works cited in n.1, Kohn 1865; Fietkau 1866; Christensen 1876; Fick 1885; Eberhard 1874, 1886; Sterrett 1881.

³ See e.g. the comments quoted by Walcot (1991, 137f.).
it is the closest to Homer in diction and style.

Since Milman Parry's demonstration that the Homeric style is a traditional one, developed for oral composition, it has been hard to take such a simple view. Some followers of Parry, Notopoulos in particular, have claimed that it is not legitimate to see anything in the Hymns as an imitation of or borrowing from Homer. Rather, if both use the same formula, this is because they are drawing on the same stock of traditional themes and formulae. A typical statement of his is: "The presence of Homeric formulae in the hymns can now be better explained by the bards making direct use of the vast repository of formulaic diction."4 It is worth bearing in mind that the "vast repository of formulaic diction" is hypothetical, apart from what is clearly formulaic in the extant texts.

Notopoulos argues that this calls into question the hitherto universal assumption that the Hymns are post-Homeric, since this was largely based on their use of Homeric phrases, and the belief that they represent a degenerate stage of the tradition, composed by rhapsodes no longer fully in control of inherited techniques.5 But if the similarities in language and style are due to common use of an oral tradition, there is not necessarily a reason to assume that the Hymns or Hesiod are later than Homer.6

Zumbach, in his work on innovations in the Hymns' language,7 took a more old-

---

4 Notopoulos 1962, 360f.

5 The framework of growth and decline of the oral tradition, sketched out by e.g. Kirk (1962, 95ff.), can lead to a determinist view of the inferiority of the Hymns.

6 See also Porter 1949 and Forderer 1958 for this viewpoint. Porter concludes from a study of repetitions in Aph. that "there is no real evidence whatever for dating this hymn later than the Iliad and Odyssey" (op. cit. 250).

7 Zumbach 1955.
fashioned view, seeing any non-Homeric words or forms in the Hymns as innovations. This was rightly criticised in a review by Forderer,\textsuperscript{8} who objected to the assumption that Homer is earlier, since we do not really know the Hymns' relationship to Homer. Even if we accept that the Hymns are later, this does not mean that every difference from Homer is an innovation: it may be equally traditional, or even more archaic than a Homeric form. The view that the Hymns imitate Homer can still be found in Lesky,\textsuperscript{9} who states that the Hymns "are wholly in the rhapsodic tradition, borrowing their language from Homer even to complete phrases".

Notopoulos also suggested that there was a mainland school of oral poetry that developed separately from the Ionian after the migrations. This school, he argues, is represented by Hesiod, and probably also some of the Homeric Hymns (the most likely are Dem., Herm. and PAp.). This idea was worked out more fully by Pavese.\textsuperscript{10} He too claims that there was a tradition that survived on the mainland. The main obstacle to this view, the Ionic appearance of Hesiod's poems, he explains as due to their being "Ionicised" in the course of transmission, in order to bring them into line with Homer.\textsuperscript{11}

Attempts to determine the relationship of the diction of the Hymns to Homer's poems have been made by Hoekstra and Janko.\textsuperscript{12} Hoekstra shows that the Hymns

\textsuperscript{8} Forderer 1958. See also the remarks of Hoekstra (1969, 10f.) and Janko (1982, 10).

\textsuperscript{9} Lesky 1966, 84.

\textsuperscript{10} Pavese 1972, 1974.

\textsuperscript{11} This was first suggested by Fick (1887).

\textsuperscript{12} Hoekstra 1969; Janko 1982.
represent a more evolved stage of the epic diction than does Homeric verse. He draws on the methods of his work on formulaic modifications in Homer,¹³ in which he showed that the epic language underwent a continual process of modernisation in line with developments in the vernacular. In his book on the Hymns¹⁴ he denies that his conclusions as to the stage of development of the Hymns' diction are significant for dating. Janko carried out a thorough statistical analysis of various linguistic criteria in which one might look for an increase in the proportion of later forms; his results bear out the usual view that the Hymns and Hesiod are later than Homer. Of course it is difficult to apply statistical tests to the Hymns because of their shortness compared to Homer; but by using a number of criteria Janko does his best to guard against freak results, and the fact that a similar picture emerges from most of the criteria suggests that his conclusions are largely reliable (and it is also encouraging that they are largely in line with what we would expect to find).¹⁵

The researches of Hoekstra and Janko, then, support the traditional belief that the Hymns are later than Homer. This is more likely to be the main cause of linguistic differences between Homer and the Hymns than the geographical separation suggested by Notopoulos and Pavese. It is very unlikely that any extant poems represent a mainland tradition entirely separate from the Ionian one of Homer. As I stated above, the main argument against this is the Ionic appearance of Hesiod's poems, in which e.g. digamma is often neglected although this sound had not disappeared from

¹³ Hoekstra 1965.

¹⁴ Hoekstra 1969.

¹⁵ For some reservations about Janko's methods, see Hoekstra 1986.
Hesiod's native dialect, and η is regularly used for long α.\textsuperscript{16} Even apart from this, the \textit{Hymns}, Hesiod and Homer are far more similar than would be the case if, as the theories of Notopoulos and Pavese require, they had developed separately for around three hundred years. This applies at the levels of diction, formulae and type-scenes. The number of non-Homeric words in Hesiod and the \textit{Hymns} is small compared to the number they share with Homer.\textsuperscript{17} The same is true of their use of formulae; and this is a matter not just of their using the same formulae, but of the whole technique being the same.\textsuperscript{18} Even where the \textit{Hymns} use different formulae, they are created on the same principles and the poems all clearly belong to the same tradition. On the level of typical scenes also, the \textit{Hymns} are much closer to Homer than would be the case if they were from a wholly independent school or schools. I have discussed above\textsuperscript{19} some of the typical scenes the \textit{Hymns} share with Homer.

Postlethwaite,\textsuperscript{20} building on the work of Hainsworth,\textsuperscript{21} studied the mobility of some common noun-epithet systems, e.g. their separation by another word, expansion or movement to a different part of the line (the original position is defined as the one that occurs most frequently). He showed that there is more flexibility in the \textit{Hymns},

\textsuperscript{16} See e.g. Edwards 1971, 201f., who criticises Notopoulos' theory of an independent mainland school (this was written before the publication of Pavese's books); also Hoekstra 1965, 25f.

\textsuperscript{17} Edwards (1971, 28ff.) calculates that 78.9% of the word-forms in the \textit{Theogony}, and 75.6% of those in the \textit{Works and Days}, also occur in the \textit{Iliad}. For \textit{Ap}. the figure is 76.7%, which is consistent with Hesiod.

\textsuperscript{18} On formulae, see now Hainsworth 1993, 1-31.

\textsuperscript{19} See above, 35f.

\textsuperscript{20} Postlethwaite 1979.

\textsuperscript{21} Hainsworth 1968.
and also that the types of modification follow very closely those in Homer. This is the sort of similarity that is too subtle to be likely to be the result of imitation, and so further supports the view that the Hymns and Homer are parts of a unified tradition of poetry, of which the Hymns probably represent a later phase. The homogeneity of this tradition is stressed by Janko, who states that "linguistic differences between these poems are barely discernible save by subtle statistical tests; the striking fact of the tradition's unity constitutes an impressive testimony to its panhellenic appeal and to the pre-eminence of that Ionic branch of it represented by Homer."^{22}

So it seems reasonable to assume that the Ionic appearance of mainland poems such as Hesiod's and probably some of the Hymns is due to the influence of Ionic epic. The broad unity of the tradition supports the idea that if some hymns show more recent linguistic forms they are later in date, rather than simply from a different school. Some examples of the statistical evidence adduced by Janko are:


---

^{22} Janko 1992, 8.
Herm. 15.5, Aph. 47.8.²³

Some of these criteria are more complex than others, in terms of whether or not they are valid chronological indicators. Geographical and dialectal factors also come into play: in the case of n-mobile, Janko comments: "the results accord convincingly with what we might have predicted from our knowledge of the dialects and the areas in which, from internal evidence, the poems appear to have originated."²⁴ N-mobile seems to be a feature largely of Attic-Ionic from an early period.²⁵ In this case, then, the difference between Homer and Hesiod does not reveal anything about chronology. This is one respect in which Hesiod's language is not Ionicised, unlike most features of his language. N-mobile may therefore be more reliable than most criteria as an indicator of geographical origin.²⁶ As Janko points out,²⁷ it is also an indicator of chronology within the Ionian tradition rather than across dialectal boundaries, since DAp has a much higher figure than Homer.

In the case of digamma the situation is rather different. Digamma was lost early in Attic-Ionic, but persisted for several centuries in some dialects, including Boeotian.²⁸ Cases of "neglect" of initial digamma are commoner in the Hymns and Hesiod than in Homer, so in this respect Hesiod is more Ionic than Homer, as also in

²³ Janko 1982, 47 (digamma); 53 (genitives in -oto); 57 (o- and a-stem dative plurals); 66 (n-mobile before consonants).


²⁵ See Smyth 1894, 287-9; Buck 1955, 84.

²⁶ PAp and Herm., usually seen as mainland poems, have noticeably low figures. Aph. and DAp, which are probably Ionian, have higher figures than Homer. Dem.'s high figure may support the view that it has an Attic origin.

²⁷ Janko 1982, 68.

²⁸ See Buck 1955, 46ff.
his use of masculine a-stem genitives in -εω, -εων. This makes sense in terms of a unified tradition, of which Hesiod and the Hymns represent a later phase than Homer. Of the Hymns, all except Aph. follow Hesiod in neglecting digamma more than Homer; in the case of masculine a-stem genitives, the samples are too small to be of much significance, but as far as they go they suggest that in this respect DAp, PAp. and Herm. are more Ionic than Homer, while Dem. and Aph. have figures similar to Homer’s.  

Of course the Hymns differ in their language, and they may vary widely in their dates and places of origin; so we should be careful about talking of “the language of the Hymns” as if they were linguistically homogeneous. In the case of Ap., DAp shows, as might be expected, very little affinity with the Hesiodic poems in its vocabulary. It also has a high incidence of n-mobile making position, again something one would expect in an Ionian poet. (PAp has a markedly lower figure for the same criterion). This is suggestive for the question of the poem’s unity, especially as this criterion appears to be a reasonably reliable indicator of geographical origin. In his tentative dating of the Hymns, Janko puts DAp in the mid-seventh century, PAp in the early sixth century.

Hoekstra’s discussion of post-Homeric features concentrates more on formular

29 On digamma in Hesiod, see Edwards 1971, 132ff. Janko’s figures for the a-stem genitives (pp.49-51) are: (εω) Il. 77.9, Od. 72.7, Th. 41.7, Op. 55.5; (εων) Il. 83.9, Od. 80.2, Th. 61.5, Op. 54.5.


31 Janko 1982, 27.

32 Janko 1982, 93f.

33 Hoekstra 1969.
modification. There are non-Homeric formulae in the Hymns, and also modifications of some Homeric formulae: this can take the form of non-Homeric declension of a Homeric formula, movement to a different part of the verse, separation of the parts, reversal of order, or various combinations of these. All these things can already be found in Homer, but are more frequent in the Hymns. Let us consider some instances of various types of modification and non-Homeric features in Ap. (the list is not exhaustive). An asterisk indicates that more information can be found in the commentary on the relevant line(s).

Non-Homeric declension of a Homeric formula:

15 'Απόλλωνα τ’ ἄνακτα (cf. 'Απόλλωνι ἄνακτι I. 1.36, Th. 347). Here there is neglect of digamma (with τε to avoid hiatus) as well as modification.

*Ἀρτέμιν ἰοχέωραν: only the nominative in Homer (8x), but the accusative also occurs at 159, Th. 14, 918.

52 πίονα νήσον: Homer has πίονι νησώ (I. 2.549.).

95, 105 λευκωλένου Ἡρῆς: this is usually in the nominative in Homer (22x II.), but there is one case of the accusative at II. 20.112 (also h. 1.7, Herm. 8 = h. 18.8) and one of the dative at II. 1.572.

*99 Ἡρῆς φαραδομοσύνης λευκωλένου at the start of the line: this involves inversion, separation and movement of the formula from its normal position as well as declension.

Separation of a formula:

*6 βιῶν . . . καὶ . . . φαρέτρην: βιῶν ἡδὲ φαρέτρην occurs at II. 10.260; Od. 21.233, 22.2 (cf. 6.270).

Also 99 cited above.
Neglect of digamma:

71 πρῶτον ἵδη φῶς ἥλιοιο (also at Aph. 256). This is probably based on the Homeric ὀψι φῶς ἥλιοιο (2x Il., 3x Od.)

*163 μμείσσθ' ἵσασιν: φατη δὲ κεν αὐτός ἐκκαστος. This has n-mobile making position and two neglects of digamma.  

*181 μὲγ' ἀνώσσεις.

Uses of n-mobile to avoid hiatus:

*113 θυμὸν ἐπεθεν ἐνι στῆθεσι φίλοισι.

133 ὡς εἰπὼν ἐβιβάσκεν ὁπό χθονὸς εὐρυοδετής.

Non-Homeric usages:

*31 ναυσικλετή: in Homer this is used of people, here of a place.

*42 πόλεις Μερόπων ἀνθρώπων: Homer never uses the name of a race followed by ἀνθρώπων (this is based on the formula πόλεις-εις μερόπων ἀνθρώπων, 3x Il.)

*87 ἢ μην: not used in oaths in early epic, but perhaps ἢ μέν should be read.

*90 γόνος = "birth" rather than "offspring" (if that is its meaning here) is otherwise first attested at Aesch. Supp. 173.

*125 ἐπήρξατο: in Homer this is always used of pouring libations to the gods at a meal, and never means "serve".

Miscellaneous:

*8 πρὸς κίονα πατρὸς ἑοίο: this seems to be an awkward conflation of two formulae, πρὸς κίονα μακρῆν/ἐδν (5x Od.) and πατρὸς ἑοίο (Il. 2.662, Od. 14.177).

*20 βεβλήστατα φθής: this is possibly the first occurrence of the contracted form,

---


35 See Hoekstra 1969, 24 on both these lines.
though it can easily be emended to βεβληκτ’ ἀοιδής.

*30 Ἀθηνών: this has the contracted form of the genitive.

*46 εἴ τις οἱ γατέων ὑλεῖ θέλοι οἶκια θέσθωμ: This has the innovative genitive γατέων, irresolvable -ει in υλεῖ, θέλω and neglect of digamma in οἶκια.

*63 πρυτανεύσειν: this verb is not otherwise attested in verse before the Hellenistic period. The name Πρυτανις occurs at Il. 5.678.

Some of these phenomena are of more significance than others. Isolated words and usages not found in Homer are not necessarily post-Homeric, nor are different declensions of formulae if they involve no awkwardness. Yet when words occur in a later form than in Homer, e.g. φοέης at 20, this is at least suggestive; and when formulae are adapted in ways that involve the introduction of more recent linguistic features, e.g. neglect of digamma, genitives in -ου, use of n-mobile, contraction) this may be significant for chronology. As I have said, most of these features can be paralleled in Homer, as has been best demonstrated by Hoekstra.36

Sometimes an awkward use of the traditional language suggests the poet is not fully in control of the medium, as with the difficulties in 7-10. These lines almost give the impression of a pastiche of several Homeric lines,37 giving rise to the suspicion that we have here an awkward imitation. The question of how far we can detect possible imitations or echoes of particular Homeric passages is an interesting one; it seems clear that the last section of Ap., Apollo’s hijacking of the Cretan sailors to be his priests (387-546) shows knowledge of the Odyssey.38 If so, this suggests

36 Hoekstra 1965.

37 See commentary ad loc.

that it is legitimate to see some passages of the Hymns as echoes of Homeric passages, supporting the view argued above\textsuperscript{39} that Ionian epic, and possibly the \textit{Iliad} and \textit{Odyssey} in roughly the form we know them, influenced the other early epic we have and were known on the mainland at an early date. Of course, this only shows that one hymn imitates Homer; but this proves that it is possible for poems of this type to have done so, and it is interesting that it should be a poem generally regarded as a mainland, "Hesiodic" composition that provides the best evidence for the hymns’ composers being familiar with Homer.

There are two extremes of opinion that should be avoided here. The first is the position adopted by Notopoulos,\textsuperscript{40} that similarities are always due to use of a common tradition and that we can never speak of the Hymns or Hesiod imitating Homer. The other extreme, that of seeing all similarities as (inferior) imitations of Homer, was the position almost universally adopted before Parry, and still often persists even in those who accept the basics of Parry’s theories, as can be seen in an essay by Kirk.\textsuperscript{41}

This latter attitude is what one might call "Homerocentric" -- the assumption that Homer is the norm and that any deviation from Homeric usage must be a fault, that the "sub-epic" poets are trying, and failing, to match the standard of poetry set by Homer, and that similarities to Homer are likely to be due to imitation (probably literary), not the common tradition. There is a built-in mind-set, implicit in the very term "sub-epic" used of the Hymns, that Homer is good, the Hymns bad. Now I am

\textsuperscript{39} See above, 63ff.

\textsuperscript{40} Notopoulos 1962.

\textsuperscript{41} Kirk 1981.
not trying to maintain that the Hymns are consistently equal to Homer in quality, but it is easy to be led astray by the massive pre-eminence of Homer into seeing other early epic in his shadow.

An example will make the point clearer. Kirk dislikes both the scenes on Olympus (1-13 and 182-206). The first of these scenes, in which Apollo enters drawing his bow and the other gods spring up in fear, has excited very varying responses from critics.\(^{42}\) Some see this as inappropriate for a scene among the gods, and Kirk calls it "a post-Homeric exaggeration", "well outside the limits of Homeric ethos."\(^{43}\) Perhaps it is, but this is not Homer. To say something is not Homeric is not to criticise it (or should not be); it is merely a statement of fact. It is valuable to compare the Hymns with Homer, and this is the most helpful comparison for understanding them better; but we must remember that what is suitable for a fifteen-thousand line epic about heroes is not necessarily so for a five-hundred line hymn to a particular god. When the Hymns differ from Homer, this may not be because they are poor imitations, but because they have different aims.

So a scene like the opening of Ap. should be judged on its own merits, in the context for which it was composed; and as the opening of a hymn in praise of Apollo, magnifying his power, I find it very effective, as do many others.\(^{44}\) We cannot even know for certain that Homer does represent the normal usage. A great deal of early

---

\(^{42}\) See commentary ad loc.

\(^{43}\) Kirk 1981, 166f.

\(^{44}\) E.g. Clay (1989) calls it "a violent and dramatic scene that vividly portrays the terrifying power of Apollo through his effect on the gods on Olympus"; Jacoby (1933a, 727) speaks of "eine geschlossene Szene von höchster Kraft und Anschaulichkeit"; cf. also van Groningen 1958, 305n.2.
hexameter poetry has been lost to us, and we should be cautious of completely identifying Homer’s usage with what was traditional. Admittedly, there are many conventions observed throughout the Iliad and Odyssey which must be the result of their being products of a long tradition of poetry (and this is more striking if the two epics are by different poets, or each is the work of more than one poet); but other schools or other poets may have had their own conventions or favourite formulae that were equally traditional. I have argued in favour of the unity of the epic tradition, but this does not mean there were no differences from poet to poet or region to region. Some writers on Homeric formulae give the impression that the language he uses was all created before him; but the process of creating and discarding formulae must have been a continual one, and there seems no reason to doubt that Homer was at least as creative in this respect as earlier poets. There was no set of rules carved on stone which Homer observed perfectly but the Hymns often break; the situation must have been far more fluid, and the poets of the Hymns may not have shared Kirk’s belief that what was untraditional or unhomeric was necessarily inferior.

Both the Ionic influence on the tradition and the echoes of the Odyssey that I have pointed out in Ap. suggest that the Iliad and Odyssey were widely known from an early date, and so we should keep an open mind on the possibility of imitations of Homer in the Hymns.

45 See Hoekstra (1965) on recent rapid developments around Homer’s time.
(vi) **Orality**

So far, in discussing the language of the Hymns, I have avoided the question of whether or not they were composed orally. In Milman Parry's first works on Homeric formulae,\(^1\) he concluded that the systems of formulae were traditional, since they were too complex and refined to be the work of one man. When he became acquainted with the songs of the Yugoslav guslari, he came to believe that the formulae were the mark of a language that was not only traditional, but developed for oral composition, i.e. to help poets who improvised their songs, composing as they performed.

This theory has led to a vast growth of interest in the study of oral poetry, and of orality and oral societies. Parry's theories were developed by his followers, most notably Lord and Notopoulos.\(^2\) Scholars of other literatures also began to apply these theories to the poems they studied, and often decided that these poems too had the characteristics of oral poetry.\(^3\) In the case of ancient Greece, scholars became more aware of the importance of the fact that their society was a largely oral one until at least the late fifth century, and possible implications of this were worked out, notably by Havelock.\(^4\)

---

1 Parry's writings are most easily accessible in the collection edited by A. Parry (Parry 1971). The Introduction is an excellent account of his work and its significance.

2 See especially Lord 1960.

3 E.g. Magoun 1953 on Anglo-Saxon poetry; Webber 1951 on Spanish ballads; Duggan 1973 on the Chanson de Roland. See Foley 1988 for a survey.

By a natural extension, the sort of analysis applied by Parry to Homer was used by Notopoulos in an attempt to show that Hesiod and the Homeric Hymns are also oral poetry.\(^5\) His criterion for determining this was the number of formulae occurring in the Hymns.

In recent years there has been criticism of what is often termed the "Parry-Lord" theory of oral composition.\(^6\) According to this model, as set out most clearly by Lord, the composition is identical with the performance, and no two performances of the "same" song are ever identical. The song is "re-created" every time it is sung. The systems of formulae help poets improvise, providing them with ready-made building-blocks of verse they do not have to think about.

This picture, however, was largely based on study of the Yugoslav singers, and study of many other traditions of oral poetry around the world has revealed a much more complex reality, in which oral poetry can take many forms.\(^7\) The strict Parry-Lord theory rules out memorisation or pre-meditated composition;\(^8\) yet in many societies oral poems are composed carefully in the poet's head before performance. There are examples of poets being able to repeat a poem with very little variation after an interval of several years.\(^9\) With regard to Homer, it certainly seems improbable

\(^5\) Notopoulos 1962.

\(^6\) A good discussion of the whole problem, which has the advantage of being by an expert on literacy and orality rather than on Homer, is Thomas 1992, 29-51.

\(^7\) The most important work is Finnegan 1977. Jensen (1980) also has some interesting discussion of comparative material.

\(^8\) In fact Lord does not deny that poets could think about a song between performances; see e.g. Lord 1960, 100.

\(^9\) There are examples in Finnegan 1977; see also Young 1967.
that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* can have been composed in one performance, even if this was split up into sessions. The length, complexity and above all sheer quality of the Homeric poems are against such a view. This is not to say that a poem composed in this way could not be of great literary merit; but both poems have a planned structure with many parallels and balances between different parts that suggest they were composed over a period of time. And, if we accept that oral poetry can take many different forms, there is no obstacle to such a picture of their composition. The *Iliad*, say, or parts of it, could have been performed many times and gradually revised and added to. In fact on any view memorisation must have played a part in the composition of the Homeric poems. For a start, some formulae and the elements of typical scenes had to be remembered. Moreover, there are instances in Homer where a passage is repeated verbatim after an interval of several books;\(^\text{10}\) and so exact memorisation was not something foreign to Homer.\(^\text{11}\)

For Parry and Lord, the touchstone of oral style is the formula; but this concept has its problems. There is no perfect agreement over what constitutes a formula, though the most widely accepted definition seems to be that of Parry, "a group of words which is regularly employed under the same metrical conditions to express a given essential idea."\(^\text{12}\) Following some suggestions made by Parry, Lord and Notopoulos have attempted to widen the area of what is termed formulaic by counting

---

\(^\text{10}\) However, such passages have often been standardised by the Alexandrians; see Janko 1990, 332f.

\(^\text{11}\) On this point see Jensen 1980, 22-7; Thomas 1992, 36f.

\(^\text{12}\) Parry 1971, 272; for discussion see Hoekstra 1965, 7-30; Hainsworth 1968, esp. chs. 1-3; Russo 1966; Shive 1987; Hainsworth 1993, 1-31. For a broader discussion see Finnegan 1977.
what have been called "formulae by analogy" and "structural formulae". These ideas allow a phrase to be termed formulaic if it only shares one word with another formula, or even if it merely has the same metrical and syntactical pattern.\(^\text{13}\)

These views have come in for much justified criticism: it has been pointed out that by such a standard all poetry, and even all language, must seem formulaic; and it is by counting such "formulae" that Lord and Notopoulos obtained their extremely high figures for the percentages of Homer and the Homeric Hymns that are formulaic.\(^\text{14}\) Moreover, the whole idea of equating oral poetry with formulaic poetry has been shown to be flawed. There is formulaic poetry that is not oral, and oral poetry that is not formulaic. Some analyses that purported to show that particular poems were oral because of their high proportion of formulae have been refuted, as in the case of e.g. Beowulf and other Old English poems.\(^\text{15}\)

Another important question concerns the impact of literacy on an oral tradition. Lord maintained, on the basis of the Yugoslav evidence, that true oral poetry was killed by literacy, which introduced the concept of a fixed text and so destroyed the tradition of improvisation. He therefore argued that Homer must have been illiterate, but he also believed that in a living oral tradition a poem will not be memorised and accurately transmitted but re-created for every performance. So if Homer was a true

---

\(^\text{13}\) Parry (1971, 308f.) was willing to count as a formula an expression that shared a term with a regular formula, and also (ib. 313) suggested that analogous formulae need not share any words, comparing τευχὲ κόνεσσιν το δῶκεν ἔταιρῳ. The latter idea has been taken up by Notopoulos in particular (1960, 1962, 1964). Lord (1960, 292) compares οἰωνοῖς τε πάσιν in II. 1.5 with ἀντιβοῖς ἐπέεσσιν and ἄνδρας πυρμακότις. Russo (1963) makes similar claims.

\(^\text{14}\) See Hainsworth 1964; Minton 1965; Silk 1987, 21f.

oral poet, and hence unable to write, how could his poems have been preserved with any accuracy? Lord’s solution was to say that Homer must have dictated to a scribe. Dictation might allow a poet to sing at a slower pace, and perform his poem in a number of sessions, so producing a more polished end result.  

This theory of the impact of literacy is questionable on various grounds. Finnegans showed that literacy and orality can interact in many different ways, and need not be mutually exclusive. No strict dividing line between oral and written poetry can be drawn. Moreover, Lord’s theory assumes that literacy has the same impact wherever it is introduced, a concept that many scholars have extended to theories of its impact on societies beyond the sphere of poetry; but students of orality and literacy now generally prefer to see literacy as a tool that can be used in many ways depending on the nature of the society into which it is introduced. Rather than literacy forming the society, it is the pre-existing form of the society that determines the use it makes of writing, e.g. a strongly religious society may see it mainly as a means of recording and propagating religious texts. In the case of Homer, Adam Parry stressed the differences between the situations of ancient Greece and twentieth-century Yugoslavia. In the latter case literacy was imposed by the state’s educational system and came with associations of superior culture, breeding a reverence for the written word. In archaic Greece none of these factors applied: a written text would not necessarily have been seen as especially authoritative in a society that relied on

---

16 Lord 1953. Some have even suggested that the Greek alphabet was developed for writing down poetry, most recently Powell (1991).


18 A. Parry 1966.
oral communication.

We need not then accept the argument that literacy kills oral poetry and that Homer cannot have been literate. Can we reach any conclusions on the orality of Homer and other early Greek epic? We have seen that merely counting the number of formulae cannot settle the question. The first need is to define more accurately than I have so far done exactly what question we are asking. What does it mean to say a poem is an oral poem?

Finnegan\textsuperscript{19} distinguished three ways in which a poem can be oral: composition, performance and transmission. A poem may be oral in all three respects, or only one or two of them. With regard to performance, there is no real doubt that Homer was orally performed, as indeed was all archaic Greek poetry. The debate about Homer is mainly concerned with composition, though transmission has also been much discussed. Indeed, the two questions are not always clearly distinguished: scholars sometimes argue as if proving that Homer must have been transmitted in written form would prove he was not an oral poet, or vice versa. But we could imagine an oral poem that was dictated or written down soon after composition, and a poem that existed in writing but was largely orally transmitted. The Parry-Lord theory says that oral composition is identical with performance, but this is unlikely to be true of the \textit{Iliad} and \textit{Odyssey}, as I have said. There is no reason to rule out premeditation and memorisation. In a sense all composition is oral composition, for something is composed in the head before being written down or performed; but this is not what is normally meant by the term. There is no strict dividing line, but rather a continuum, separating the fully literate from the fully oral poet.

\textsuperscript{19} Finnegan 1977.
Perhaps it is best to narrow the question somewhat. Although oral poetry can take many forms, and it is wrong to say the oral style must be a formulaic one developed for composition in performance, this is a reasonable description of a particular category of oral poetry; and so we can limit the question to whether Homer and the Hymns have the characteristics of such poetry. Some criteria put forward to establish this are: a formulaic system characterised by extension and economy, a low frequency of necessary enjambement and consistent use of a traditional diction. There is a danger of a circular argument here, since these criteria are largely derived from Homer; but if we accept that the best explanation of these features of Homer is that they are characteristic of oral poetry composed in performance, we still cannot prove that his poetry was orally composed, merely that it has the characteristics of an oral poem of a particular type.

With regard to the Hymns, Notopoulos\textsuperscript{20} concluded that they were oral compositions on the basis of their high quantity of formulae; but, as I have said above, poetry can have a high number of formulae without being orally composed. Moreover, Notopoulos counts as formulae many words or phrases which are so only if you have a very broad definition of a formula; and in his analysis of Ap. 1-18 he underlines as formulae such items at the start of a line as Ἀρτῶν, Ἕρας and κοτ ότ.\textsuperscript{21}

Kirk, in an article criticising Notopoulos’ methods, tried to suggest more sophisticated criteria. Rejecting mere counting of formulae and a simple dichotomy between oral and literate poetry, he prefers an antithesis between "natural composition in a formular tradition" and "deliberate, self-conscious composition in a formular

\textsuperscript{20} Notopoulos 1962.

\textsuperscript{21} Kirk 1966.
style." The true oral poem will observe formular economy, and display "naturalness of formular extension and articulation, preservation of traditional details of rhythm and enjambement."

One problem with this is the subjective nature of the criteria, based as they are on formular quality rather than quantity. Kirk's essay on Ap.,22 in which he attempts an analysis using such criteria, I have already criticised above,23 for its tendency too easily to equate what was traditional (and so oral) with Homer's usage, and to censure the Hymns when their usage is merely different from Homer's, and not necessarily inferior. Admittedly there are passages that suggest an awkwardness in handling the epic language, but so there are in Homer to a lesser degree. Kirk believes there is some literate element in the composition of the Hymns, but their handling of formulae is generally fluent, and there is little on this level to suggest they are not orally composed, if we eliminate from consideration cases where they merely differ from Homer.

Do the Hymns display the criteria of extension and economy? This is hard to answer, given their relative shortness. The terms "extension" and "economy" can strictly only be applied within a single poem: a metrical doublet in a Hymn of a phrase in Homer is not necessarily a violation of economy, since different poets might have had their own phrases that were equally traditional. It can only be called a violation if we believe that the tradition possessed only one formula for each metrical position, and equate the tradition with Homer. Still, if the Hymns regularly used doublets and showed an unrestricted number of epithets for e.g. particular gods, this

22 Kirk 1981.

23 See above, 71ff.
might suggest that they had lost touch with the tradition, and were not orally composed.

But this is not the case. The Hymns’ use of formulaic systems is largely similar to Homer’s, and they use more "ornamental" epithets than Homer, perhaps because as hymns they apply many epithets to the gods they are praising.\textsuperscript{24} Janko offers an analysis of the noun-epithet system for Apollo in Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns. He concludes that "the system appears fairly homogeneous throughout: the doublets found in Homer persist in the Hymns."\textsuperscript{25} \textit{PAp} is very Homeric in its use of epithets for Apollo: in the nominative, all its phrases occur also in the \textit{Iliad}. \textit{DAp} only has one case of Apollo with an epithet in the nominative, and that is \textit{Φοίβος Ἄπολλων}, the most common of all Apollo’s epithets.

As I noted above,\textsuperscript{26} Postlethwaite\textsuperscript{27} found an increase in formulaic modification and mobility of formulae in the Hymns; but this modification mostly follows the same patterns as modification in Homer. This is true of most adaptions of formulae in the Hymns, though there are occasional cases where a formula seems to be misused or misunderstood. So it seems that the Hymns are part of a living tradition, not mere imitations of Homer, and this is consistent with their being fully oral compositions in so far as Homer is fully oral.

Parry\textsuperscript{28} noted that Homer has a low frequency of necessary enjambement, i.e.

\textsuperscript{24} Cf. Hainsworth 1981, 13f.

\textsuperscript{25} Janko 1982, 20ff.

\textsuperscript{26} See above, 64.

\textsuperscript{27} Postlethwaite 1979.

\textsuperscript{28} Parry 1971, 251-65.
lines where the sense is incomplete at the end. Edwards showed that Hesiod is similar to Homer in this respect, and the Hymns have been analysed by Richardson, Clayman and Van Nortwick, and Barnes. A summary of their results is provided by Janko; he points out that many undoubtedly literate poets write verse with equally low levels of enjambement, e.g. the Batrachomyomachia and some idylls of Theocritus. So low enjambement does not prove anything about orality; a high level of necessary enjambement perhaps suggests literacy, but this is not relevant to the Hymns, as they all have levels consistent with Homer and Hesiod.

Edwards, in his work on Hesiod, suggested that "parallels of sound" might be an indication of oral composition, suggesting that the traditional sounds and rhythms were firmly ingrained in a poet's mind. Janko offers as examples in Ap. 21 and 410, but also points out that we should be cautious about using this as a test of orality, since "the importance of the voice and ear in selecting words applies to all poets concerned with the aural properties of poetry. Most, probably all, ancient verse was intended for oral performance, and it is possible to find such parallels in literary poets."

Another approach, particularly relevant in the case of Ap., is the evidence of variants and doublets in the text of the Hymns. Hunting for hypothetical doublets in

---

29 On enjambement in Homer, see now Higbie 1990.


31 Janko 1982, 30-33.

32 Edwards 1971, 74-84.

Ap. has been a popular sport among the hymn’s analytical critics\textsuperscript{34}; but there are two cases in which we have solid evidence for different versions of a passage: 136-8 are marked as a variant of 139 in the MSS, and Thucydides (3.104) quotes 146-50 and 165-72 with several differences from the version in the MSS of the Hymns. In my commentary on the lines quoted by Thucydides, I have argued that these variants are best explained as the result of a period of oral transmission, and that two differing versions of the poem may have been written down.\textsuperscript{35} Oral transmission does not prove oral composition, but perhaps makes it more likely.

I have argued above that the last section of Ap. shows a close knowledge of, and deliberately echoes, the Odyssey. Some would see the idea of imitating another poem as an essentially literary one, which presupposes that the imitated poem exists as a fixed text, familiar to the poet and probably also his audience.\textsuperscript{36} This view, though, is too heavily dependent on the Parry-Lord model of oral composition, and the distinction drawn between creative bards and rhapsodes who merely memorised the Homeric poems. According to Notopoulos,\textsuperscript{37} a poet cannot be both of these, and therefore the imitator of a fixed text must be a literate poet. I feel these distinctions are too rigid: we have seen that the ideas of a fixed text and of memorisation are not

\textsuperscript{34} Hermann (1806) was the first to suggest that the text of Ap. we find in the MSS is actually a combination of several versions, united by a scribe who wished to save the trouble of writing them out separately. This theory influenced several studies of the hymn, of which the most notable is Jacoby 1933a. Jacoby believed that there were two versions of DAp, which our MSS. combine, the original and one with changes made by the poet who added the Pythian section. For further discussion of these theories, see below, 89ff.

\textsuperscript{35} See commentary ad locc.

\textsuperscript{36} On the problems of detecting imitations in early epic, see Janko 1982, 225ff.

\textsuperscript{37} Notopoulos 1962, 343f.
necessarily alien to creative oral poetry; and there is no need to rule out imitation either. Here again, there are no good grounds for supposing that the Hymns cannot be oral compositions.

As Janko\textsuperscript{38} comments, "it is easier to disprove oral composition than to prove it." The most that can be shown is that poems have a style that is compatible with orality. In the case of the Homeric Hymns, this has usually meant comparisons with Homer, whose style is assumed to be fully oral. There are problems with this assumption, and with the Parry-Lord theory of oral composition. As I argued above,\textsuperscript{39} a problem with saying that Homer meets the criteria of formulaic systems marked by extension and economy, low necessary enjambement etc. is that these criteria themselves are largely derived from studies of Homer; but even if we accept that there is a type of oral poetry marked by these characteristics, as seems likely, we can only say that Homer is composed in this style, not that the epics were definitely oral compositions.

So it is impossible to say whether the \textit{Homeric Hymns} were orally composed; their differences from Homer's style are not so great as to prove that they are not poets of the same type. The evidence of the quotations from Thucydides suggests a period of oral transmission for \textit{Ap.}, and I am inclined to favour the theory of oral composition in this case; but this must remain uncertain. Does it matter? What difference does it make to our views of the Hymns, or the way in which we criticise them, if we believe they are oral poems?

The aesthetic implications of Parry's theories have been much debated.\textsuperscript{40} Parry

\textsuperscript{38} Janko 1982, 40.

\textsuperscript{39} See above, 80.

\textsuperscript{40} For a good survey of the issues, see the introduction to Parry 1971.
himself believed that all of Homer was traditional, and that the idea of originality meant nothing to him.⁴¹ But if this were taken to its logical extreme, we should have to believe that the entire Iliad was handed down to Homer. Someone must have been original at some stage, and one would expect the creator(s) of the Iliad and Odyssey to have been at least as creative as others.⁴²

Many of the ideas that have been drawn from Parry's work set limits on criticism, mainly setting down what we should not expect to find in oral poetry of this type. We should not expect apt use of epithets, for the choice of epithet is determined purely by metrical factors; nor connections between different parts of a poem, since the oral poet concentrates on one episode at a time and treats each in accordance with traditional patterns; nor a coherent overall structure, since such poetry is paratactic, adding sections as the poet's fancy takes him, not organic and carefully planned.⁴³ Notopoulos⁴⁴ in particular argued the need for a special "oral poetics" to criticise oral poetry; but this notion has proved chimerical. Not only has it been shown that oral poetry can take many different forms, but all those things which the theory forbids us

---

⁴¹ He says e.g. "At no time is he [Homer] seeking words for an idea which has never before found expression, so that the question of originality in style means nothing to him" (1971, 324).

⁴² Cf. Hoekstra 1965, 16.

⁴³ Austin (1966, 295) comments: "The suggestion implicit in the oral approach is that we must recognise that there is after all no artistic unity in Homer, just as many analysts claimed; moreover, we must learn not to look for any." A good statement of this "oral approach" is that of Page (1955a, 142): "Delicate and subtle preparation now for what will follow in five hundred lines; veiled and indirect allusions now to what happened five hundred lines ago - such artifice lies beyond his power, even supposing that it lay within the bounds of his imagination."

⁴⁴ See particularly Notopoulos 1949.
to find in oral poetry clearly can be found in Homer, as many have shown.\textsuperscript{45} This need not mean that Homer is not an oral poet, but rather that it is legitimate to criticise his poetry using basically the same techniques as for other poems.

Much the same goes for the Hymns. I have argued above that they are not paratactic or incoherent in structure; and they make use of e.g. repetitions that echo other parts of a hymn. So I have felt no need in the commentary to rule out interpretations on the grounds that they are not possible for an oral poem -- e.g. where a formulaic epithet seems to be used in an apt way I have pointed this out. We cannot know what processes went on in the poet's mind; we can see what is there in the text. Yet criticism of these poems should not ignore Parry's theory; some of the best literary work on Homer in recent years has tended to do so, and this is to go to the other extreme from e.g. Notopoulos. I feel that criticism of Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns should combine an awareness of the importance of Parry's work (and its limitations) with literary sensitivity.\textsuperscript{46}

\textsuperscript{45} See for instance Schadewaldt 1944; Griffin 1980; Macleod 1982.

\textsuperscript{46} In my view model examples of this are the articles of A. Parry (1956, 1966, 1971).
(vii) The Unity of the Hymn to Apollo

Ap. has attracted more attention from scholars than any other Homeric Hymn, and most of this work has been concerned with the unity, or lack thereof, of the hymn. Is it really one poem, or two or more joined together? And if it is not a unified work, how did it attain its present form? These questions have been endlessly debated, and there is still no consensus on the right answers.¹

It is unfortunate that the problem has so dominated discussion of the hymn at the expense of many other interesting aspects of it, but the question of unity must be faced by anyone writing on the hymn. It would require a book in itself to discuss in detail every facet of the question, so I shall merely discuss the main problems and lines of argument, and indicate what I feel are the most reasonable conclusions.

I shall begin by briefly reviewing the theories that have been put forward. The first scholar to suggest the division of the hymn was Ruhnken in 1782.² He based

¹ The most detailed study of work on the problem of unity is Förstel 1979, 20-62. There is also a good survey of earlier work in Drerup 1937. The most important works are:
   a) Separatists: Ruhnken 1782; Groddeck 1786; Ilgen 1796; Hermann 1806; Baumeister 1860; Hignard 1864; Kirchhoff 1893; Allen and Sikes 1904; Wilamowitz 1916, 440-62 and 1922, 74 n.1; Altheim 1924; Bethe 1931; Jacoby 1933a; Pfister 1934; Humbert 1936; Wade-Gery 1936; Drerup 1937; Deubner 1938; Van Groningen 1958; Frolikova 1963; Unte 1968; Cäsola 1975; West 1975; Förstel 1979; Kirk 1981; Janko 1982.
   c) Undecided: Gemoll 1886; Sowa 1984.

² I use the commonest form of Ruhnken’s name. According to Pol 1953, he was originally named Ruhnke, but preferred the Latinised form Ruhnkenius.
his argument mainly on 165-78, asserting that the lines are a typical hymnic ending. He also argued that the first hymn praises the Delian, and the second the Pythian Apollo; and that the independence of DAp is confirmed by the evidence of Thucydides and Aristides, to which I shall return.

Scholarship on the Hymns tends to follow the trends of Homeric scholarship, and this is true of the many theories about the genesis of Ap. that proliferated in the nineteenth century. The same analytical methods were applied to both Homer and Ap., with similar results: their dissection into a number of parts. As in Homer’s case, the number of parts suggested and the divisions of the hymn were never agreed on by any two analysts. Some Homeric analysts saw Ap. as an interesting test-case; analysing it successfully would show that their theories were applicable to poems other than the Iliad and Odyssey.

Ruhnken’s division into two parts was not sufficient for many; as early as 1786, Groddeck suggested that the hymn was made up of five fragments of hymns. These had been placed next to one another in the collection, and joined in the course of transmission. An influential theory was that of Gottfried Hermann. Like Groddeck, he believed that the hymn in its current form results from the scribal mixing together of different versions, but in a rather more subtle way. Let us imagine that there was a version of DAp consisting of 1-178, and another, attached to PAp, that omitted the passage on the Delian festival (140-78); it would thus consist of 1-139 and 179-546. A scribe faced with the task of writing out both versions might simply combine them rather than write out 1-139 twice. This is basically what Hermann suggests, though his theory is slightly more complicated; he believed that the two versions of DAp had various differences other than the omission of 140-178, and these show up in our text
as doublets, places where two versions are placed side by side. The prime example is 136-8 next to 139; 139, according to Hermann, is the original version, and 136-8 are designed as an ending for the version of $D Ap$ omitting 140-178.\(^3\) This was an influential theory, and it crops up again in various forms in the twentieth-century studies of Altheim, Jacoby and Deubner, among others.

Nineteenth-century writers on the hymn followed either Ruhnken in dividing the hymn into two parts, or Groddeck in suggesting several parts. An idea of these latter theories can be gained from Förstel, whq lists in a footnote\(^4\) the various schemata suggested by these radical analysts: no two of them agree, and the number of parts posited varies from three to eight. Some of these theories followed Hermann's suggestion of a combination of different versions of the hymn.

In 1916, in his *Die Ilias und Homer*, Wilamowitz suggested a development of Ruhnken's theory (foreshadowed by Ilgen in 1796);\(^5\) he argued that the Pythian hymn was composed as an addition to, and imitation of, an originally independent Delian hymn. This differed from previous theories in explaining the joining of the two parts as a poetic design rather than an accident of transmission. Wilamowitz advanced a theory of Ap.'s composition: others had offered theories of its transmission. The theory also had the benefit of explaining the fact that $PAp$ has no proper beginning; for while Ruhnken may be right to say that 165ff. show "solitum hymni epilogum et finem", 179ff. are clearly not satisfactory as "alterius hymni initium".\(^6\) Wilamowitz'

\(^3\) See commentary on 136-9.

\(^4\) Förstel 1979, 295 n.15.

\(^5\) Wilamowitz 1916, 440ff.; also id. 1922, 74 n.3.

\(^6\) See commentary on 179ff.
explanation has the advantage of not needing to posit a different version of the hymn; it has remained the most widely held theory among those who agree with Ruhmken’s division.\(^7\)

The 1930s saw a spate of works on the hymn, the most important being that of Jacoby, whose essay combined the theories of Hermann and Wilamowitz. He agreed with Wilamowitz’ suggestion that the Pythian hymn was composed as an addition to the Delian; however, he believed that the author of the Pythian addition had not only added his own hymn to the other, but had also reworked the Delian hymn in order to make it fit better with the Pythian. Like Hermann, he thought that the signs of this were visible in the form of doublets in \(DAp\), and suggested there were more of these than had previously been pointed out.\(^8\)

Wade-Gery\(^9\) accepted Jacoby’s conclusions but suggested that there were doublets in \(PAp\) as well as \(DAp\), which he tried to explain in the context of early Delphic history. On his view the author of \(PAp\) and hence of the combined poem was

\(^7\) The wide acceptance of this theory can be seen in the use of the title "Suite Pythique" for \(PAp\) by French scholars, e.g. Humbert 1936; Defradas 1954; Guillon 1963. The theory is accepted in some form by Jacoby 1933a; Wade-Gery 1936; Van Groningen 1958, 318-23; Humbert 1936, 67-72; Lesky 1966, 827; Cassola 1975, 97-102. Förstel (1979, 282ff. and 293n.14) and Janko (1982, 109-115) reject the theory of West (1975) that \(PAp\) predates \(DAp\). See below, 116ff.

\(^8\) Jacoby 1933. In addition to 136-8 next to 139, he suggested the following doublets: 6 and 7-9; 10-13 and 14-18; 72 and 73-8; 96 and 98; 128 and 129; 136-8 and 139. The version including \(PAp\) would have left out the festival scene, 140-178. So his conception can be summarised thus (D is the original Delian poem, P the version including \(PAp\):

\[\begin{align*}
\text{D:} & \quad 1-6, 10-13, 19-71, 73-95, 97-128, 130-5, 139-78. \\
\text{P:} & \quad 1-5, 7-9, 14-72, 79-95, 97, 96, 99-127, 129-38, 179-546.
\end{align*}\]

\(^9\) Wade-Gery 1936. He only suggests one doublet in \(PAp\), 299 next to 297-8, so his reconstructed version of \(P\) (see n.8) is the same as Jacoby’s apart from lacking 299.
Cynaethus of Chios, of whom I shall have more to say below.\textsuperscript{10} This essay is noteworthy for making an attempt to place the hymn in the context of early Greek history and explain its genesis in historical terms.

Another from the same "family" of theories as all these is that of van Groningen.\textsuperscript{11} This is a modification of the addition-theory of Wilamowitz. \textit{DAp}, he argued, was originally independent; \textit{PAp}'s obvious similarities to it and lack of a beginning fit the addition-theory best. Since the passage about the Delian festival and the poet could not be recited elsewhere, 182ff. are designed to follow 139.

The theories of Jacoby, Deubner, Wade-Gery and van Groningen all show the influence of Hermann in seeing our hymn as a combination of versions. Wilamowitz' theory has the advantage of being simpler and hence more plausible than all these reconstructions, and remains the most popular separatist theory. However, in recent years a belief that \textit{DAp} is the addition and \textit{PAp} the original has been gaining ground. This was first argued by West in an important article in which he also suggested that Cynaethus of Chios was the author of the Delian hymn.\textsuperscript{12}

His arguments for the priority of \textit{PAp} are based on showing that where the two parts resemble each other it is \textit{DAp} that seems to be the imitator. Some of these arguments are stronger than others (I shall discuss them further below), but he did show that the assumption of \textit{DAp}'s priority was based on flimsy arguments; and his methodology for determining which part is prior must be essentially the right one, whether or not one accepts his conclusions.

\textsuperscript{10} See below, 130ff.

\textsuperscript{11} Van Groningen 1958, 304-23.

\textsuperscript{12} West 1975.
 Förstel\textsuperscript{13} produced the most thorough discussion so far of the question, with a perceptive study of the previous work. He decides in favour of a separatist position, though with several caveats, and rejects West’s theory of the priority of \textit{PAp}.

These are the major contributions to the separatist argument, but naturally there have also been defenders of a unitarian view of the poem. As one might expect, there was little or no defence of unity in the nineteenth century, but in the course of this century support has steadily increased. Ruhnken’s division was at first so widely accepted that editors printed the two parts of \textit{Ap}. as separate hymns, with their own line numbers. The first editor to criticise the prevailing view was Gemoll, but he did not adopt a unitarian position; he merely pointed out problems with Ruhnken’s argument, and refrained from analysis on the grounds of our limited knowledge. A truly unitarian position was adopted by Ludwich,\textsuperscript{14} but unfortunately his theories about the hymn are mostly implausible.

Cessi\textsuperscript{15} followed Gemoll in arguing that 165-76 could be the end of a section, and 177f. an indication of a return to the main theme after a digression. He suggested, unconvincingly, that the differences between the two parts in style could be accounted for by the different religious ethos of Delos and Delphi: the Delian cult is joyful and spontaneous, the Pythian more earnest and reverent.\textsuperscript{16} Dornseiff\textsuperscript{17} argued vigorously in favour of unity in a rather idiosyncratic monograph. He

\textsuperscript{13} Förstel 1979, 20-160, 272-82.

\textsuperscript{14} Ludwich 1908.

\textsuperscript{15} Cessi 1928.

\textsuperscript{16} For more on this, see above, 51ff.

\textsuperscript{17} Dornseiff 1933.
explained many difficulties as intended jokes, particularly parodies of Stesichorean lyric. He also advanced what has become a standard unitarian argument, that Apollo's statement of his future powers in 131f. is fulfilled in PAp: the lyre-playing by 182-206, 514-6; the archery by the dragon-slaying in 300ff.; and the giving of oracles by the whole theme of PAp.\textsuperscript{18}

Kakridis in 1937 added that in 131f. the promise to give oracles is the most prominent because it is to be the main theme of the second part of the hymn. He also suggested that the second scene on Olympus is intended to be a divine counterpart of, and contrast to, the depiction of the human festival on Delos.\textsuperscript{19}

Allen and Halliday\textsuperscript{20} argue against ideas that there was a religious rivalry between Delos and Delphi, and that our hymn cannot therefore be unified but rather reflects this rivalry in each half's stress on the glory of its shrine. They prefer to stress that the hymn glorifies Apollo by narrating the origins of his two most famous shrines, and that it has a clear and comprehensible structure.

Forderer\textsuperscript{21} adopted a unitarian position, but only wrote in detail on DAp. Like Drerup he saw 1-206 as a unified section, with 182-206 picking up the narrative from 139; but the Pythian poem is for him not a new poem, merely a shift to a new theme.

The most important works on the unitarian side are the most recent studies of the hymn, by Miller and Clay.\textsuperscript{22} Miller's article on 165-78 is a major contribution to the

\textsuperscript{18} See commentary on 131f.
\textsuperscript{19} See commentary on 146ff.
\textsuperscript{20} Allen, Halliday and Sikes 1936, 186ff.
\textsuperscript{21} Forderer 1971.
\textsuperscript{22} Miller 1979, 1985; Clay 1989.
debate, since it attacks the heart of the separatist position in a more detailed way than had previously been attempted. His study of the whole hymn offers some further arguments on this section, and attempts to show that the hymn is coherent thematically, largely by comparing it with the structure for an encomium recommended by ancient rhetoricians. Clay also tries to show thematic connections between the two parts; I shall discuss her arguments fully below. The works of Miller and Clay are valuable in that they attempt a literary analysis of the hymn as a coherent whole; previous unitarian works had been better at criticising the arguments for separation than offering strong reasons to believe in the hymn’s unity.

In this brief survey of work on the problem I have mostly only indicated people’s general positions without going into much detail about the particular arguments they use. I shall now examine more fully the different arguments and their strengths and weaknesses. Much the strongest argument for unity, though it is rarely stressed, is the fact that the hymn is unified in all of our MSS, with no suggestion that it is anything other than one poem. The onus of proof is on those who do not believe it is a unity, though due to the prevailing weight of opinion it has sometimes seemed as if the opposite were the case.23

The MSS, as I say, give no indication that the hymn is not a unity; but there have been various attempts to show that there is external evidence that DAp once existed as a separate poem. Ruhnken argued for the hymn’s division not only from internal evidence, but also from "veterum scriptorum auctoritas", citing Thuc. 3.104 and Aristides Or. 34.35 Keil. The first of these is the most famous ancient mention of the

23 This point is stressed by Miller 1986, xi.
hymn. It comes in a section about the purification of Delos in 426 B.C. Thucydides says that after the purification the Athenians celebrated the Delian games for the first time, and that there had been a great Ionian festival there in the past. In support of this he cites 146-50 of Ap., and then, to show there was a musical contest, also 165-72, which he introduces thus: ὁτι δὲ καὶ μουσικῆς ἄγων ἦν καὶ ἀγωνιούμενοι ἐφοίτων, ἐν τοῖσδ' αὖ δηλοῖ, καὶ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ προοίμιον. τὸν γὰρ Δηλιακὸν χορὸν τῶν γυναικῶν ὑμνήσας ἐτελεύτα τοῦ ἐπαίνου ἐς τάδε τὰ ἔπη, ἐν οἷς καὶ ἑαυτοῦ ἐπεμνήσθη. The key question here is whether τοῦ ἐπαίνου refers to the whole hymn, or just the praise of the Delian maidens. In the nineteenth century many followed Ruhnken in seeing this passage as confirmation of the separate existence of DAp, but the problems with this were already pointed out by Hermann, and are stressed by Gemoll. The two most important contributions this century have been those of Jacoby, who tried to reassert Ruhnken’s view, and Heubeck, who criticised Jacoby’s arguments. Among other arguments, Heubeck points out that ἐπαίνος on its own never means "hymn" in praise of a god, but simply "praise". Moreover, these lines are not the actual end of DAp, which finishes at 178.

The passage in Aristides at first sight seems to support the belief that ἐπαίνος in Thucydides means the whole hymn, for he introduces a quotation of the hymn thus: διαλεγόμενος γὰρ τοῖς Δηλιάστιν καὶ καταλύων τὸ προοίμιον "εἰ τις ἔροιθ’ ύμᾶς" φησιν (169-72 follow). There are three possible views of this passage:

---


25 Gemoll 1886, 114.

26 On this passage see Förstel 1979, 65-9.
a) Aristides provides independent confirmation of the separate existence of DAp;
b) Aristides is dependent on Thucydides here and interprets him correctly;
c) Aristides has misinterpreted Thucydides.

Most have believed either b) or c). It seems extremely probable that Aristides is quoting from Thucydides rather than firsthand. He quotes the lines in order to show that Homer knew he was the most popular of poets; but for this purpose it would be strange to omit 173, in which the poet says that his songs will always be the best. There is nothing Aristides says that could not be taken from Thucydides. We also know that he was a keen Atticist, and often quotes from Thucydides, who was one of his models. Against this, since he was a writer of prose hymns, he is likely to have been familiar with the Homeric Hymns; and he has a couple of close verbal parallels with Ap. Yet it is hardly plausible that at his date there existed a version of DAp independent of PAp; other authors of the period quote from both parts of Ap., which they refer to as "the hymn to Apollo".

So it is impossible to say for certain what is meant by τοῦ ἐποχνοῦ in Thucydides, or whether Aristides' phrase κατολύων τὸ προοβλοιν is based on a misinterpretation of Thucydides. What we can say is that neither of these passages should be used to support the theory of the separate existence of DAp, and so they do

---


28 In his speech εἰς Δία (Or. 43.25 Keil) Aristides seems to echo Ap. 132 when he says καὶ Ἀπόλλων υπερόποις χρησιμοδεῖ Δίῳ νημερτέα βουλήν. See Förstel 1979, 67f. and 318, n.105.

29 See Allen, Halliday and Sikes 1936, lxix ff. for the relevant passages.
not help to solve the problem of the hymn's unity.

No other ancient citation or reference provides any support for the division of the hymn. Another passage that has been thought to provide such support comes from the "Contest of Homer and Hesiod". It tells how Homer recited our hymn to Apollo (its first line is given) on the altar of horns on Delos; the Ionians honoured him by making him a citizen of all their states, and the Delians wrote the hymn on a whitened tablet which they dedicated in the temple of Artemis. On one view the hymn written on the tablet must have been DaP alone, since this is the part that honours Delos.31 Yet the story does not say this, and it is perfectly possible that the Delians inscribed the whole hymn, or the Delian part of a longer hymn. This, of course, is assuming that there is any truth in the story, which is doubtful. It is part of a series of stories in the Contest that describe Homer's travels through Greece. At each place he recites some lines which please the inhabitants, who give him a reward. For Midas he composes an epitaph; at Delphi he dedicates a bowl with a verse inscription; the Argives set up a statue to him, again with a verse inscription. So a story of Homer reciting some lines that please the locals, being honoured by them and having a poem inscribed in some way is a pattern that occurs several times in this section.

It is clear that the basic inspiration for the story is the hymn itself, with its evocation of a performance on Delos. The statement that Homer went εἰς Δήλον, εἰς τὴν πανήγυριν is clearly based on the hymn's depiction of the Ionian festival, as is


31 So Kirchhoff 1893, 916f.; Wilamowitz 1916, 440; Jacoby 1933, 694. Van Groningen 1958, 315 also suggests that a tablet containing the whole hymn would be improbably large.
the reference to the Ionians' honouring him. It is a feature of this work, and of the lives of Homer generally, that they draw as much material as possible from poems ascribed to Homer, and invent contexts in which particular poems might have been recited.

These reasons are sufficient to explain the story of Homer reciting the hymn on Delos and being honoured for it. Yet there may still be some truth in the story, in that there may have existed such a tablet with the hymn written on it. There are other stories of poems being inscribed and dedicated in temples, 32 so this is not implausible. Moreover, Van Groningen 33 pointed out that the detail of the tablet's dedication in the temple of Artemis has a ring of truth, since a purely invented story would say it was placed in Apollo's temple. It is likely that there was a temple of Artemis at Delos before there was one of Apollo, 34 so this part of the story may reflect a historical reality.

The date of this story is not known. The Certamen as we have it dates from soon after the reign of Hadrian, but it almost certainly takes a lot of its material from the fourth century Museum of Alcidamas. Whether the section that contains this story goes back to Alcidamas or not is debatable, but it seems probable. 35 If so, the story can at any rate be traced back to a reasonably early tradition. As I have said, however, this does not help with the problem of unity, since we do not know what exactly was written on the whitened tablet; so again we have here no reliable evidence

32 The evidence for this is collected in Herington 1985, Appendix VI, 201ff.
33 Van Groningen 1958, 315.
34 See below, 126f.
35 For discussion of this see West 1967; on Alcidamas, see O'Sullivan 1992.
for the separate existence of \textit{DAp}.

The other most relevant piece of external evidence is the scholium to Pindar's second Nemean, which I discuss more fully below.\textsuperscript{36}

The external evidence, then, is inconclusive as regards the question of unity. What can we tell from the poem itself? There are three main types of theory about it: that it is a patchwork of fragments, loosely joined together; that it is a fusion of two hymns, a Delian and a Pythian; and that it is a unity. I feel that we can rule out any theory that posits more than two original parts (though this does not exclude the possibility of interpolations within the two parts). A glance at the different analyses of the hymn shows that none of them agrees with another. It is easy to look at, say, the awkward links in the opening section of \textit{Ap.} and split it into separate fragments; but these reconstructions are purely speculative, and generally based on the critic's own presuppositions about what constitutes a coherent poem.\textsuperscript{37}

The best argument against the more radical analysts is to look at the structure of the hymn, particularly bearing in mind the conventions of hymnic form discussed earlier.\textsuperscript{38} It is clear that each part is a coherent whole in this respect, except that \textit{PAp} lacks a proper beginning (it has a prologue but lacks an opening line or lines). As is usual with the Hymns, the typical or present-tense sections come at the start and finish; and these are also the sections in which the poet may mention himself and the circumstances of performance, a feature which is unusually prominent in \textit{DAp}. The

\textsuperscript{36} See below, 129ff.

\textsuperscript{37} Baumeister (1860, 109) comments on the more complex analytical theories that "\textit{si revera ita confusus et permixtus esset ordo singularum partium, desperandum potius erat nos unquam verum restituros, non quantumvis scite hariolandum.}"

\textsuperscript{38} See above, 8ff.
self-conscious "choice of theme" sections in each half are unusual, but clearly belong in the prologue of a poem. In spite of these untypical features, both halves follow the common hymnic pattern of a narrative framed by timeless or present-tense sections. Each is also coherent in theme, choosing a subject and bringing it to a satisfactory conclusion. The pattern of DApol, whereby the reversion to the present at the end is used to describe a current cult of the god which results from the action of the narrative, is paralleled by Dem. 478ff., Herm. 568ff. So both parts have a beginning, middle and end which match the structure of other Homeric Hymns.

This shows why it is wrong to try and split the hymn into more than two parts. It has a clear bipartite structure; and while there may be odd passages that are awkward or possible interpolations, both parts are essentially coherent in themselves. If PAp had a line or two at its start, saying "I shall sing of Apollo, who..." each hymn could stand by itself without seeming incomplete. Particularly awkward for a unitarian view is the second "choice of theme" section at 207ff. Here the poet asks "How shall I sing of you?" as if he were just starting, with no hint that he has been singing of the god for two hundred lines already.

Not everyone has accepted the division after 178, even among those who do not believe in the hymn's unity. Deubner argued for a division after 206, on the grounds that the second scene on Olympus rounds off DApol by describing Apollo's first appearance on Olympus. However, there are several obstacles to this view. As we have seen, 1-178 fit the expected structure of a hymn, and the move from the narrative past to the present festival is natural at the end of the poem. Besides, this theory involves denying that 165-78 are really an ending; and if so, the main reason

---

39 Deubner 1938.
for dividing the hymn at all is removed. It seems odd to place the division at a point where there is no apparent ending, rather than where there is. The theory also involves assuming that: a) 182-206 describe a unique past action, and b) they continue the narrative from 139. Both assumptions are unfounded. The present tenses throughout the passage indicate that it is a typical description, and cannot be the narrative of Apollo’s first visit to Olympus. Thus there cannot be a direct link with the birth narrative. Moreover, the mention of Apollo going to Pytho makes no sense if we see this as part of a continuous narrative. How can Apollo visit Pytho before he visits his oracle there, before he even knows where it will be? This mention of Pytho shows clearly that 182-206 belong with PAp, not DAp; they are a prologue, not an epilogue. The description of Apollo playing his lyre, parallel to 514ff., points in the same direction.

The same objection applies to a theory like van Groningen’s; he suggests that there were two versions of the poem, 1-178 and 1-139, 182-546.\textsuperscript{40} He too sees 182ff. as a continuation of the narrative from 139. This idea uses the theories of Hermann and Jacoby about our hymn being a combination of two or more versions. Jacoby’s is the most ingenious of such theories;\textsuperscript{41} it combines Hermann’s ideas with the "addition-theory" of Wilamowitz. However, the doublets Jacoby finds in DAp to support his theory of two recensions are mostly very dubious. The only variant marked by the MSS is 136-8 next to 139. The quotations from the hymn in Thucydides do suggest that there may have been a slightly different version of DAp in circulation; but the differences can be better explained in terms of the vagaries of

\textsuperscript{40} Van Groningen 1958, 304-23.

\textsuperscript{41} For the details of Jacoby’s theory, see above, n.8.
oral transmission, rather than a revision of the hymn of the type proposed by Jacoby. There is no need for such a hypothesis: Wilamowitz' is a more economical explanation of how the two hymns came to be joined; and, as I have argued, there are not sufficient signs of incoherence in either part to require the positing of a revision or editing of one part or both.

I said above that the two parts of the hymn are complete in themselves; but unitarians would dispute this, denying that DAp has a proper end or PAp a proper beginning. The crucial passage is 165-78, the last part of DAp, and since Ruhnken the heart of the separatist case has been that these lines are clearly an ending. Ruhnken claimed that they show "solitum hymni epilogum et finem". I discuss the passage in detail in the commentary, but I shall outline the main points here. The features typical of a hymn ending are:

a) ἀλλα' ἁγεθ' in 165; cf. Dem. 490, 20.8.

b) Ἕλθα· requesting the god's favour. Such a prayer is a regular feature, and forms of Ἕλθα· are common (cf. 1.17; 19.48; 20.8; 21.5; 23.4).

c) the χαίρε(τε), which occurs in twenty-seven of the thirty-three Hymns.

d) the promise to continue singing of the god.

Moreover, as I have already argued, this passage contains material appropriate to the end of a Homeric Hymn: the shift to the present tense, the description of a festival whose origins the narrative has explained, the references to the circumstances of performance, and the mention of the poet himself.

---

42 See commentary on 146-50.

43 So e.g. Dornseiff 1935, 11f.; Allen, Halliday and Sikes 1936, 190; Miller 1979 and 1985, 111ff.
Against this, it has been pointed out that this passage is in some respects not a typical ending. The best statement of this point of view is an article by Miller,\textsuperscript{44} in which he argues that these lines are a transition, marking the end of a section of the poem, not of the whole. He points out that the χαίρετε is addressed to the Delian maidens, not Apollo; in fact the god is not addressed at all, which has no parallel among the endings of the other Hymns. The god is mentioned at the start and finish, but the focus of attention is the maidens. The address to them itself takes the form of a hymnic ending; the χαίρετε is followed by a request for their favour and a promise to sing of them in the future. 177-8 differ from the normal closing formulae in making no mention of another song. Rather than promising to remember the god while singing of another topic, they promise to continue singing of him, which the poet then does.\textsuperscript{45}

This is the outline of Miller's case, and it does show that if this is an ending it is not a wholly typical one. The most unusual feature is the absence of the direct address to the god. In spite of this, I still prefer to see 165-78 as the end of a hymn. If 1-178 existed on their own, I do not think that anyone would claim the poem was incomplete or lacked a proper ending. The passage has a strong sense of closure, and the last two lines are better taken as a promise for the future rather than of an immediate continuation. The festival scene is an apt conclusion to the Delian poem, and ἔλλοι' ἔρεθ' at 165 certainly suggests that we have reached the final prayer and promise for the future. The whole of the passage looks to the future, with the poet's request for the maidens to remember him, and promise to sing of them wherever he

\textsuperscript{44} Miller 1979.

\textsuperscript{45} See commentary on 177-8.
goes. If we see 177-8 as also a promise for the future, then 174ff. say "I will sing of you... but I will not stop singing of Apollo." This is surely the most natural way to read the lines: the promise to sing of Apollo balances the promise to sing of the maidens, and all the futures have the same reference.

Yet there may not be so much difference between my view and Miller's. I argue below for the theory that DAp was composed to precede PAp, and if this is right 165-78 could be both an epilogue and a transition. Miller suggests that the poet ingeniously makes use of elements of typical endings in composing a transition from one theme to another; it might be that a poet did much the same who wanted to add his poem to another and at the same time give it a fitting conclusion, with a reference to himself and the circumstances of performance as his own "signature".

It is not only the fact that DAp seems to end at 178 that suggests the hymn is not a coherent whole, but also the awkwardness of the link to the next section. 179-81 revert to the theme of Apollo's preference for Delos, and then suddenly, with no preparation, there is a description of the god going to Pytho. The shift from direct address to third person narration is also sudden, though admittedly not without parallel in the hymn.

The arguments I have so far discussed have been largely concerned with the hymn's structure. We also need to consider its themes and content. Is there any continuity in these respects between DAp and PAp? The most basic link is that both are about Apollo, and it should be borne in mind that the god, not the sanctuary is the subject of each part. Hence it is not necessarily fatal to a unitarian view that the two parts deal with different sanctuaries of Apollo. The two stories can be seen as a sequence from the god's life -- his birth is followed by his founding of the oracle.
In later versions of the story, his killing of Pytho and founding (or taking over) the oracle come directly after his birth, and he kills the snake in his mother’s arms.\textsuperscript{46} The link is made still closer in versions that have Leto fleeing from Python when she is pregnant with Apollo, and returning for vengeance once her powerful son is born. This shows that there arose at some point a tendency to link these two stories, the god’s birth and his greatest exploit, and so link his two most famous shrines.

Clay suggests that the motivation for composing a hymn about Delos and Delphi is the promotion of panhellenism.\textsuperscript{47} The gods of the Hymns, in her view, transcend local cults and rivalries, and so there is every reason for a poet to compose a hymn that praises Apollo in relation to his panhellenic shrines at Delos and Delphi. This is a rejection of the view that the shrines’ rivalry would have stopped a poet composing a hymn in honour of both shrines, that could not be performed at either. There are two related issues here: could a hymn celebrating both Delos and Delphi have been performed anywhere, and does Ap. show the panhellenic tendencies that Clay attributes to it?

We need not postulate a religious rivalry or attribute to archaic Greeks “a nineteenth-century parochialism”\textsuperscript{48} in order to say there are difficulties with a hymn celebrating two sanctuaries of the god. In archaic Greece, poems were composed to be performed, and often with performance at a particular festival in mind. It is natural to compose a hymn appropriate to the festival: at Delos one would sing of Apollo’s

\textsuperscript{46} First in Eur. \textit{I.T.} 1239-51. On the different versions of the story see Fontenrose 1959, 13-22. This is how the combat is often depicted in art: see \textit{LIMC} II.1 s.v. Apollon, 988-997.

\textsuperscript{47} Clay 1989, 9ff. and 92ff.

\textsuperscript{48} Clay 1989, 48.
birth, at Delphi of his founding of the oracle and defeat of Python. We know that at both Delos and Delphi cult hymns were sung from an early period, and it is unlikely that these said much about the other shrine. There are no other examples of such a combined hymn that we possess. I am not saying that such a combined hymn could not have been composed and performed, but it is more problematic than some unitarians suggest. A unitarian might respond "but the combined hymn was created by someone, so what performance did he have in mind?" A possible answer to this has been suggested by Burkert and Janko, which I consider below.\(^{49}\)

In the case of \textit{DAp} we can say with some confidence that it was composed to be performed on Delos. This is the obvious conclusion to draw from the description of the festival and praise of the maidens. I have already looked at this question above, where I discuss in more detail the reasons for taking this view.\(^{50}\) This increases all the more the problem of such a hymn being merely the prelude to a longer account of the founding of the Delphic oracle; hence unitarians, e.g. Miller, are eager to deny that the hymn was composed for a Delian festival.

Clay wishes to see the hymn as an example of panhellenism because this is a theme that she believes is important in all the major \textit{Homeric Hymns}.\(^{51}\) But her enthusiasm for this idea leads her to some odd conclusions. It is fair enough to cite Röhde's view that Homer's gods are "Panhellenic, Olympian" and little reference is made to their local cults and shrines; but \textit{Ap.} is a different matter, for it tells of the

\(^{49}\) See below, 133f.

\(^{50}\) See above, 19f.

\(^{51}\) The most forceful proponent of the importance of panhellenism in archaic Greek poetry is Nagy; see Nagy 1990, 52-115.
origins of two specific cults of Apollo, those of Delos and Delphi (and also of the 
more local titles Telphousios and Delphinios).

Clay’s evidence for panhellenism in Ap. is almost all indirect, based on what the 
poet does not mention. In each half the emphasis is on particular local traditions and 
cults, and the glory of a specific sanctuary. The praise of the Ionians is praise of 
Ionians: it is not panhellenic. I have already discussed the different geographical 
worlds of the two halves. The only lines in the hymn that show any sign of a 
panhellenic outlook are 80ff., where Delos asks Leto to swear that ἐνθὰ δὲ μὴν 
πρῶτον τεῦξειν περικαλλὰ πην / ἐμεναι ἄνθρωπων χρηστήριον, αὖτὰς 
ἐπείτα / πάντας ἐπ’ ἄνθρωπους, ἐπεὶ ἂ πολυάνυμος ἔστατ — and even here the 
primacy of Delos is stressed.

As I noted in my review of theories about the hymn, it has been suggested, first 
by Dornseiff, that the three powers Apollo claims in 131f. — the bow, the lyre and 
oracular prophecy — he comes into full possession of in PAp.52

Clay believes that 69f. point to an important theme that is completed in PAp. In 
these lines Delos states that she fears Apollo because "they say that he will rule 
greatly over gods and men". This, Clay suggests, is the prerogative of Zeus alone, 
and so "the nations dread nothing less than that the newborn Apollo will depose the 
Olympians and succeed to the kingship of heaven."53 The first scene also presents 
this theme: Apollo appears in a threatening posture, but then allows Leto to hang up 
his bow and accepts a drink from Zeus. Indeed the hymn as a whole shows that this 
threat does not materialise; Apollo turns out to be an orderly god, the loyal son of

---

52 On this see commentary on 131f.
53 Clay 1989, 37f. See 92ff. for her summary of this theme in the poem.
Zeus. The Typhaon episode (305-55) depicts an attempt to overthrow Zeus. Typhaon is linked in the hymn to the Delphic snake killed by Apollo, and so Apollo is seen as an enemy of the chaotic forces that might overthrow Zeus and the Olympian order. So *PAp*, on this view, is thematically bound up with *DAp* because it depicts the defeat of the snake by Apollo and his foundation of an oracle that will announce to mortals Διὸς νημερτέα βουλήν.

This theory is ingenious, but in my opinion misguided. It builds too much on the reference to Apollo "ruling greatly over gods and men" in 69f.\(^\text{54}\) I cannot believe that this is meant to suggest that he might overthrow Zeus. This would be a startling thing to suggest of Apollo, the most Olympian of gods; and neither poet nor audience would have associated Apollo with such a possibility. To threaten the rule of Zeus was the province of chaotic creatures like the Titans or Typhaon, not of Apollo. If the poet wished to introduce such a novel idea, he would surely have spelt it out more clearly. This is a hymn in praise of Apollo, and the line merely stresses the god’s power. The description of him as haughty and powerful is surely justified. This is how he acts in *PAp*, killing the snake and boasting over her corpse, punishing Telphousa for deceiving him, hijacking the Cretan sailors for his sanctuary.\(^\text{55}\)

Even if we accepted Clay’s view of 69f., it would not prove the hymn’s unity. We could see *DAp* as complete in terms of this theme, with its opening scene and

\(^\text{54}\) Thalmann (1991, 145f.) is also critical of Clay’s argument. Clay attempts to link the jealousy of Hera in *DAp* to her role in the Typhaon episode (305-55) as an enemy of the Olympian order; but, as Thalmann says, there is not a shred of evidence for her claim that "the source of the malicious rumour [that Apollo will be haughty and rule over men and gods] turns out to be none other than Leto’s persecutor, Hera, no mere jealous wife, but an avowed enemy of Zeus’ cosmos".

\(^\text{55}\) See above, 52f.
closing promise to prophesy the will of Zeus constituting an adequate refutation of Delos' fears. The link with the story of Typhaon requires us to make a number of connections that have no basis in the text.

None of these attempts to demonstrate thematic links between the two parts is convincing. It is true that the stories form a chronological sequence, but it is not unified; it is a sequence that could easily be the result of the joining of two separate hymns, or the composition of one part as an addition to the other. They present two stories that have no direct connection. There is nothing in either part that explicitly refers to anything in the other; there are similarities of structure and parallel phrases, but that is another matter.

The geographical separation of the two parts has also been used as a separatist argument. The world of DAP is the Aegean and its shores, whereas PAP only mentions places on the Greek mainland. There is no overlap between the two. Miller explains this as simply the result of the different themes of the two parts; but this still leaves the question, "Why compose a poem with two such separate stories?" The geographical differences merely emphasise once again the lack of connection between the two halves.

Various attempts have been made to show differences of style or language between the two parts. Linguistic criteria hold out the possibility of a more objective basis for deciding the question. I have discussed above Janko's data for

---

56 See e.g. West 1975, 161; he comments that "the poets of D and P inhabit two separate worlds which barely overlap. The difference in their geographical outlook is so marked and so complete that on this ground alone we can feel sure they are different people." Cf. Janko 1982, 99.

57 See e.g. Huibregste 1940; Frolíková 1963; Janko 1982, 99-132.
various linguistic criteria in the Hymns. The most striking difference between the two parts is in their use of n-mobile before consonants: DAp has 60.8 occurrences per thousand lines, PAp only 13.7. As I noted above, this criterion seems to be a reasonable indicator of the place of origin of the hymns, since usage in this respect does not cut across dialectal differences in the way that e.g. the treatment of pre-vocalic digamma does. This supports the belief that PAp is a mainland composition, and DAp an Ionian one, which is what the content of the parts suggests. DAp is also the most isolated hymn in terms of (non-Homeric) phrases shared between poems: in particular, "the evidence suggests that DAp alone had no knowledge of him [Hesiod], which accords with the Ionic origins of the poem." It is hard to draw any conclusions from the remaining criteria, since PAp in particular varies a great deal in its results relative to other hymns. The fact that this pattern is different from that of DAp is, however, another indication of disunity. So we can see that linguistic criteria provide some evidence against unity; but we should treat the figures with caution, given the shortness of the parts, and of DAp in particular.

The styles of DAp and PAp have been described as "lyric" and "epic" respectively, and most critics have thought DAp the superior composition. The narrative of DAp is compared to lyric in its swift movement, its rapid transitions from one topic to another, and its vivid vignettes, e.g. Apollo appearing on Olympus with his bow, the second picture of his birth (25-8), the main narrative of his birth and

---

58 See above, 65ff.


60 See below, n.72.
rapid growth (115-32), the Ionians at the festival.\textsuperscript{61} The use of apostrophe is another "lyric" feature (though it continues until 282, well into \textit{PAp}).\textsuperscript{62} The poet's references to himself and his audience also seem more characteristic of lyric than epic poetry, and several specific themes and ideas of this passage can best be paralleled in lyric poets (see commentary on 165ff. for the details). The smooth, unhurried style of Homer is more apparent in \textit{PAp}, which in spite of its probably mainland provenance is in some ways more Homeric than \textit{DAp}, as I have pointed out in my discussion of language in the hymn.\textsuperscript{63} The differences between the two styles should not be exaggerated; both poems are basically Homeric in their narrative technique, and if \textit{DAp} is thought to have a lyric feel, then it is epic narrative with a lyric colouring, not vice versa.

Of course differences in style can always be explained by assuming that they are deliberate variations on the part of the poet. Miller, for instance, is critical of "the assumption that stylistic differences within a literary work can be accounted for only by positing multiple authorship."\textsuperscript{64} This is clearly untrue as a general assumption, but much depends on the type and extent of the differences, and the nature of the

\textsuperscript{61} Cf. Ludwich 1908, 162 (though he is talking about the whole hymn, not just \textit{DAp}): "The bold jumps in thought, the harsh transitions, the constantly changing themes, the short, even obscure allusions, the frequent change between apostrophe and narrative, between direct and indirect address, the numerous repetitions that sound like refrains... all this and other features as well find their only true analogy in lyric, not the epos of the Greeks." (I take the translation from Clay 1989, 31). Gemoll (1886, 111) says that the first part of the hymn has a lyric style, and the second an epic, but he places the change at around 246, not at the end of \textit{DAp}. See also commentary on 165-78.

\textsuperscript{62} On apostrophe, see commentary on 120.

\textsuperscript{63} See above, 70.

\textsuperscript{64} Miller 1986, 115.
work. One can always say the poet is simply adapting his style, but a point must be reached when multiple authorship becomes at least as plausible an explanation.

Other suggested differences might be roughly classified as arguments from the ethos of the two parts. Förstel argues that their conception of Apollo is different.\textsuperscript{65} In \textit{DAp}, he says, Apollo is ambivalent: as the opening scene shows, he is both frightening and a bringer of joy. Delos fears him, but then rejoices in his birth. In \textit{PAp} the god is more moral: he founds his oracle to benefit humans; kills a monster that menaces them; punishes the deceit of Telphousa; cares for his priests and warns them against hubris. I have already briefly discussed the depiction of Apollo in \textit{PAp},\textsuperscript{66} and disagree with Förstel’s view. Apollo in \textit{PAp} is a haughty and powerful god: he kills the snake that is an obstacle to his plans and boasts over it; he punishes Telphousa, not for the sake of any abstract justice but because she has tried to deceive him, and boasts over her; he hijacks the Cretan sailors for his own purposes - their own wishes are irrelevant. He addresses them haughtily, as the gods regularly address mortals. I cannot see any inconsistency in the two parts’ portrayal of the god. In both parts he is frightening but also brings benefits -- to Delos and to mortals.

Both parts are aetiological, as are most of the Hymns;\textsuperscript{67} but \textit{PAp}’s author shows in his explanations of cult titles (Pythios, Telphousios, Delphinios) a fondness for etymology that is not found in \textit{DAp} or the other Hymns.\textsuperscript{68}

The balance of probability, then, seems to me to support the case against unity.

\textsuperscript{65} Förstel 1979, 272-82.

\textsuperscript{66} See above, 53.

\textsuperscript{67} See above, 15f.

\textsuperscript{68} See e.g. Kolk 1963.
This being so, there is still a choice to be made between separatist theories. I have already rejected theories that posit more than two original parts of the hymn. This leaves three main possibilities:

a) Someone formed our hymn by joining two originally independent hymns.

b) \textit{PAp} was composed as an addition to the pre-existing \textit{DAp}.

c) \textit{DAp} was composed as an addition to the pre-existing \textit{PAp}.

The first of these has problems, because it is clear that the two hymns can never have been wholly independent. There are parallels between them, both in structure and in particular phrases, that are too close to be coincidental.\textsuperscript{69} Both open with a scene on Olympus in which Apollo arrives and has an effect on the other gods; both of these scenes end with the rejoicing of one or both of his parents in their son. Both have a "choice of theme" section, introduced by the line \textit{πώς τ’ ἄρ σ’ ὑμνήσω πάντως εὐθυμον ἑόντα;} (19, 208). In \textit{DAp} Leto wanders in search of a site to give birth; in \textit{PAp} Apollo wanders in search of a site for his oracle. Both journeys are followed by an encounter and dialogue with the goddess of a place (Delos, Telphousa). In both there are promises to build a temple and oracle on the site.

There are also various verbal parallels:

75f. ... ἢ κεν ἄδη οἱ τεῦξασθαι νηὸν τε καὶ ἄλσεα δενδρήντα.

143 πολλοὶ τοι νηὸι τε καὶ ἄλσεα δενδρήντα.

220f. τὸ τοι οὐχ ὧς θυμῷ τεῦξασθαι νηὸν τε καὶ ἄλσεα δενδρήντα.

244f. τόθι τοι ὧς χῶρος ἀπῆμων / τεῦξασθαί νηὸν τε καὶ ἄλσεα δενδρήντα.

\textsuperscript{69} On the parallels see Baumeister 1860, 106f.; Sowa 1984, 179ff., who sets out the parallels clearly in a table.
384 καὶ βομίδν ποιήσατ' ἐν ὁλοῖ δενδρήντι.

57 ἀνθρώποι τοι πάντες ἀγνήσουσα' ἐκατόμβας.

249 ἐνθάδε ἀγνήσουσα τελέσας ἐκατόμβας (= 260, 289, 366).

80f. ἐνθάδε μὲν πρώτον τεῦξειν περικαλλέα νηδν / ἐξεμενει ἀνθρώπων χρηστήριον.

247f. ἐνθάδε δὴ φρονέω περικαλλέα νηδν / ἀνθρώπων τεῦξεις χρηστήριον.

258f. ἐνθάδε ἐπεὶ φρονέεις τεῦξαι περικαλλέα νηδν, / ἐξεμενει ἀνθρώπως χρηστήριον.

287f. ἐνθάδε δὴ φρονέω τεῦξειν περικαλλέα νηδν, / ἐξεμενει ἀνθρώπως χρηστήριον.

These are not standard formulaic phrases, so the parallels are most unlikely to be independent. The closest verbal parallels are in the passages predicting the future founding of a temple and oracle. There is also a thematic parallel in the idea that the inhabitants of the shrine will feed on the sacrifices brought by worshippers (59-60, 528-36). All these parallels are, I think, sufficient to show that the hymns are in some way related. Unitarians naturally see the parallels as a mark of unified design; but to me they suggest the conscious following of a model in a way more appropriate for someone adding to or imitating an existing poem than a poet writing a different part of a unified poem.

If the hymn is not a unity, it seems more economical to assume that one part is composed as an addition to the other rather than that one poet wrote a hymn imitating another’s and these were later united by someone else. If we believe Jacoby, then
\[DAp\] was revised by whoever put the whole hymn together, and the parallels might have been introduced at this stage. However, this is unlikely, since the parallels with \[\textit{PAp}\] affect the whole structure and could not be the result of simply tampering with an earlier version.

So the "addition-theory" seems the most likely, but this still leaves the question of which part is prior. As I noted above,\(^70\) most scholars have agreed with Wilamowitz in seeing \[\textit{PAp}\] as the addition. Only West has seriously argued the opposite.\(^71\) The reasons scholars have given for believing in the priority of \[DAp\] are, I feel, not very convincing. The fact that \[\textit{PAp}\] lacks a beginning is a weak argument, as I have already pointed out. I feel that part of the explanation for the popularity of Wilamowitz' view is simply that \[\textit{PAp}\] is the second part, and the idea of a continuation comes more naturally than that of an addition at the beginning. The supposedly superior quality of \[DAp\] is also a major factor, because a good poem is more likely to be imitated. But this quality is a subjective judgement, and not all agree that \[DAp\] is better.\(^72\)

---

\(^70\) See above, 91.


\(^72\) Van Groningen 1958, 320 argues that the poet of \[\textit{PAp}\] wished to join his own work to a famous one; "il a voulu présenter sa contribution à lui sous l’égide d’un prédécesseur glorieux." On the superior quality of \[DAp\], see Wilamowitz 1916, 455 (author of \[\textit{PAp}\] was "ein Stümper"); id. 1922, 74n.2 (\[\textit{PAp}\] is "die Fortsetzung eines talentlosen delphischen Rhapsoden"); Jacoby 1933, 751; van Groningen 1958, 319f. (he sees "une difference sensible entre le génie poétique de l’un et le talent facile de l’autre"); Wade-Gery 1936, 56 ("the first 178 lines of the hymn contain poetry of the first water, full of wilful beauty, unmatched in the hymns."); Cassola 1975, 98 ("a me sembra che l’autore dell’inno delio sia un grande maestro e il secondo rapsodo un volenteroso mestierante"); Kirk 1981, 180f. ("The author of the Delian hymn develops his main theme . . . with tact and charm . . . By contrast, the whole Pythian piece is a bit of a bore."). For a denial of this superiority see Allen, Halliday and Sikes 1936,
As I noted above, the main advocate of the theory that DAp is the addition is West. I shall follow West in arguing for the priority of PAp, but I freely confess that I am very uncertain about this. In the discussion so far, I have come down firmly on the side of the separatists; but how exactly the hymn reached its current form is not a question that can receive a definite answer, and my conclusions on this are only tentative. It is largely external evidence that offers the best support for West's view; I shall discuss this fully in the next section of the introduction, but here I shall cover the arguments from internal evidence.

West's approach is to compare the parallel passages, and see in each case whether one part seems inappropriate or a poor imitation of the other. He argues that:

a) The scene on Olympus in PAp (182-206) "is a wholly harmonious conception", whereas that in DAp (1-13) "is a peculiar business", which seems to be a mixture of a typical scene and a one-off narrative, and is not clearly thought out. This is the result of a desire to "outdo" PAp's opening.

b) After the question in 207, there are real alternatives, but not after 19, which has a "perfunctory treatment of the scheme".

c) The catalogue of places in DAp seems to start as a list of places ruled over by Apollo, and end as one of places passed through by Leto: this is awkward.

d) In 56-60, Leto tells Delos that she will be able to support her inhabitants with the sacrifices brought by worshippers; in 526-37 the Cretan priests ask how they are to live, and Apollo replies that they will have a supply of animals from the worshippers. This makes more sense in PAp, where "The purpose of the lines is to

192. My own view is that DAp is superior, but that the difference is not so marked as the above comments suggest.
show that the priests’ right to a share of the sacrificial meat, and the surrounding peoples’ duty to provide it, are guaranteed by divine ordinance.” Delos is more concerned with the honour promised to herself (64f.) and her inhabitants are not really a factor in the poem.

e) In 80ff. Leto asks Delos to swear

ένθάδε μιν πρώτον τεύξειν περικαλλέα νηόν
ξημενοι ἀνθρώπων χρηστήριον κτλ.

The phrase about founding a temple and oracle is borrowed by one poet from the other; and the mention of an oracle clearly fits PAp rather than DAp.

I discuss all these passages in the commentary. The best arguments are (d) and (e). The motif of living off sacrifices is better motivated in PAp, where the priests are the focus of attention, not the place, and it is a natural question for them to ask. The best arguments to win over Delos are the promise of fame and honour for herself, as West says. We find other references to the priests living off the sacrifices at Delphi, but the topic is never mentioned elsewhere in connection with Delos.

I also agree with West’s view of the start of PAp, 182ff., as being from a hymn that has lost its beginning. As he points out, this does not seem to be designed as a

---

73 Förstel (1979, 295) misses the point when he argues against West that Delos’ poverty and barrenness are an important theme of the hymn; West does not deny this, but says that “it would have been enough just to hold out fame and honour as the rewards; these are what in fact excite Delos” (West 1975, 164).

74 It seems to have been a common criticism of the Delphic priesthood that they lived off the offerings. Cf. Eur. Ion 323 βομμοί μ’ ἔθερβον ο’ νετάρας δι’ ἐκ ξένος, and the scholium to Ar. Wasps 1446, which tells the story of how Aesop insulted the Delphians (ἀποσκόψας οὐτούς δὴ μὴ ἔχουσιν γῆν ὡς ἦς ἐργαζόμενοι διατρήσοντο, ἀλλὰ περιμένουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ θυμάτων διαζήματ). The references to the story of Aesop in Delphi are collected in Perry 1952. See Allen, Halliday and Sikes 1936, on Ap. 536; Burkert 1983, 118ff.
continuation of anything in *DAp*, "nor has any scene been set upon which ἐνειρομένη ἐπέα περιένειστα προσημένα, with 525, τὸν καὶ ἐνειρομένος Κρητῶν ὁδὸς ἀντίλον ηὔδα, he sees the latter as a "violation of economy" since we would expect φωνήσας; 525 is therefore influenced by 463, τὸν καὶ ἐμειβόμενος κτλ., and by 50. Yet it is not a violation, since ἐνειρομένος is

---

75 West 1975, 162.

76 Janko 1982, 110f.
not synonymous with φωνήσω; the latter means simply "saying", the former "asking". The poet of PAp may simply have adapted the phrase he used in 463; there is no need to suggest imitation of DAp here. It is true that DAp's line preserves the digamma of ἐπέα, but it could be based on 525, since if 51f. is not a question ἀνέφρομαι is misused.\textsuperscript{77} Also unconvincing is his comment on 81, ἐμεναὶ ἀνθρώπων χρηστήριον, beside 259 (=288), ἐμεναὶ ἀνθρώποις χρηστήριον, that "a shift to the dative seems more natural than vice versa" (the point being that -οῖς is an innovative ending).\textsuperscript{78}

The parallel passages offer no convincing linguistic arguments that I can see for the priority of one part or the other. So this approach does not suggest anything that would show the theory of PAp's priority to be wrong. I have argued in favour of this theory but, as I commented above, it is difficult to ascertain the relationship between the two parts, and I would not assert any opinion on the question too confidently.

The adoption of a separatist position has been criticised by unitarians who either see the methodology as flawed or the whole question as a misguided one. Clay states: "to discover a meaningless digression demands that we reconsider our notion of what constitutes meaning in a hymnic narrative; to spot a narrative inconsequence requires us to reexamine our understanding of narrative and mythic causality; and to apprehend a "lack of motivation" means to rethink the possible intentions of the poet".\textsuperscript{79} This is in many ways a helpful approach, and can lead to an improvement in our understanding of the type of narrative which the hymns are, and what we may expect

\textsuperscript{77} On all this, see commentary on 50 and 51f.

\textsuperscript{78} Janko 1982, 110f.

\textsuperscript{79} Clay 1989, 206f.
in them. Yet we must still keep in mind the possibility of exceptions, cases in which
the balance of probability suggests that the narrative is not wholly unified, that there
is an interpolation or fusion of originally distinct elements. Thalmann argues that
separatist views of the hymn stem from misunderstandings of archaic narrative
patterns.\(^{80}\) I have argued rather that study of the hymn in terms of typical hymn
forms, and comparison with the other *Homeric Hymns*, supports the division into two
parts. Thalmann speaks (rightly) of the "complex, though wonderfully ingenious,
Analytical theories"; but I would suggest that the same description could apply to
analyses like his own, that try to show the hymn as a unified structure. Nor can we
evade the issue of the difficulties in the hymn by simply talking of the complexity of
Apollo's nature or "the extremely high artistry seen ... in the presentation of the two
styles in the different sections".\(^{81}\)

Another view is that the whole question of unity is a waste of time. The poem
exists as a unity in our MSS, and the question of its history can never be perfectly
answered, so why not just look at it as it stands? I have nothing against such an
approach; and the studies of Miller and Clay, which treat the hymn as a unified artistic
whole, are probably the best literary discussions of it. I agree with Richardson's
statement, in his review of Miller's book, "that it is refreshing to read a study which
accepts the poem as it is, and attempts to do justice to its qualities."\(^{82}\) And it is true

---

\(^{80}\) Thalmann 1984, 73.

\(^{81}\) Penglase 1994, 124. His whole discussion of the unity problem is weak: he
acknowledges differences between the two parts, but simply sees these as evidence of
the poet's skill in varying his style. No doubt if the style were homogeneous he
would see this too as evidence of unity.

\(^{82}\) Richardson 1988, 5.
that excessive concentration on the question of unity has hindered the discussion of important issues -- not only the hymn’s literary qualities, but also the religious and historical interest of both its parts. Yet since the hymn presents a problem about its unity it seems reasonable to attempt to resolve it. Perhaps we can never settle the question definitively, but this is true of many literary questions; and intensive study of the problem has produced many insights from both separatists and unitarians, who have had to think more deeply about the poem in order to defend their respective viewpoints.

As Miller and Thalmann say, somebody at some point put the hymn into its present form, and it is legitimate to criticise it as it stands. Although I have defended the separatist view of the hymn, I do not in my commentary on particular passages rule out interpretations that assume the unity of the hymn. I feel this is right both for pragmatic reasons, since the problem cannot be definitely resolved, and for theoretical ones. To take an example, Apollo’s statement of his future roles in 131f. has, as I noted above, been used to argue in favour of unity -- on the ground that these three claims are shown to be fulfilled in PAp. I do not find this a persuasive argument for unity, but it is true that Apollo does claim he will prophecy the will of Zeus, and that this is the theme of the Pythian section. The link is there in the text, so it is valid to point it out. To reject such interpretations out of hand would assume more certainty than we can have about the disunity of Ap., and lead to the dangerous area of basing judgements on the criterion of the author’s (reconstructed) intention rather than the text as it stands.
(viii) **The date of the Hymn to Delian Apollo**

*PAp* has many references to places and cults in Boeotia, as well as its cryptic closing prophecy, and thus lends itself to attempts at dating and historical reconstruction. *DAp* offers no such information. True, it has a catalogue of places that Leto passes through (30-44); but this is a mere list of place names with epithets, and lacks the sort of comments the poet of *PAp* makes on Thebes or Onchestus (225ff., 229ff). Thus *DAp* offers fewer possibilities of dating it by internal evidence. On the basis of linguistic evidence Janko tentatively dates *DAp* to around 655, as we have seen.\(^1\) However, at 178 lines the hymn is too short for us to have much confidence in statistical studies of its language.

The description of the festival cannot be used to date the hymn, for the only real proof that there was a great festival on Delos in the archaic period is this very description. Apart from the hymn, the main evidence for this festival is Thucydides 3.104.\(^2\) Here Thucydides is discussing the Athenian purification of Delos in 426/5. At this time they also established, or re-established, a quadrennial festival, the Delia; and this leads Thucydides to mention that in the past (*τὸ πόλεμος*) also there was a great Ionian festival on Delos. However, all the information Thucydides gives about this -- that the Ionians went there with their wives and children, that there were athletic and musical contests, and that the cities brought choruses -- is clearly taken

---

\(^1\) See above, 67.

\(^2\) For discussion of this chapter with reference to the unity problem, see above, 95ff. Aloni (1989, 37ff.) and Hornblower (1991, 517ff.) discuss it from a historical point of view.
from the hymn; and it is only the hymn that he cites as evidence for the existence of this festival.\(^3\) Thucydides believes in the antiquity of this description because he believes it is by Homer. If he agreed with Herodotus in his dating of Homer, then he would have dated the description to around 800.\(^4\) In any case it is clear that if we suspend judgement on the date of the hymn, Thucydides provides no evidence for the existence of a festival before the middle of the sixth century.

\(D\text{Ap}\) has generally been thought to be one of the oldest hymns, dated by some as early as the eighth century.\(^5\) However, this often seems to be linked to a belief in the antiquity of the festival described, for which there is little evidence beyond this description. To take one example, R. Martin\(^6\) asserts that it is from the end of the eighth century that Delos becomes a prominent Hellenic sanctuary, citing the assembly of Ionians described in \(Ap.,\) of which he says "la date de cette première partie de l'Hymne ne peut être de beaucoup postérieure aux débuts du septième siècle av. J.-C.". This information is doubtless taken from the standard works on the hymn, but

---

\(^3\) See commentary on 146ff. for discussion of Thucydides’ quotations from the hymn.

\(^4\) Herodotus (2.53.2) states that in his opinion Homer and Hesiod lived not more than four hundred years before his own time. Thucydides only states that Homer was born well after the Trojan war (1.3), to which he does not assign a date.

\(^5\) Jacoby (1933, 717n.3) believes that the hymn and festival predate the sixth century; Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, 183ff.) state that "the hymn to Apollo [they defend its unity] is the oldest in the collection." Their early dating of the Delian part rests largely on the description of the festival, and they conclude that the hymn can be no later than 600; Humbert (1936, 74-7) dates the hymn to around the start of the seventh century or the end of the eighth; Drerup (1937, 107ff.) thinks a seventh-century date the most probable; Altheim (1924, 449) thinks that the original form of \(D\text{Ap}\) dates from the seventh century; Defradas (1954, 57) says that \(D\text{Ap}\) "remonte au moins au septième siècle"; Cassola (1975, 87 and 100) states that it is eighth or early seventh century, and could be contemporary with Homer.

\(^6\) Martin 1951, 439 and n.3.
their datings, at least in part, rest on the opinions of archaeologists and historians about the date of the festival.

What other evidence is there for a major festival on Delos in the seventh or eighth century? Pausanias\(^7\) says that the Messenians sent a sacrifice and choir of men to Apollo at Delos, with a prosodium written by Eumelus of Corinth, of which he quotes two lines. Eumelus is usually dated to the last part of the eighth century.\(^8\) This is a late piece of evidence, and the lines may not really be by Eumelus. The participation of Messenians does not fit the panionic nature of the festival described in the hymn. Even if the story is true, it describes an action of the Messenians on a particular occasion, probably during the first Messenian war. This would suggest that Delos was already a panhellenic sanctuary, but proves nothing about the date of the festival described in Ap.\(^9\)

Athenaeus mentions a law of Solon regarding Athenian participation in the Delian festivals.\(^10\) Yet it is likely that this law is in fact from the time of Pisistratus, who we know was interested in Delos. It is well known that there was a tendency to attribute the laws of the tyrants to Solon.\(^11\)

---

\(^7\) Paus.4.4.1., 4.33.2.

\(^8\) On this see Bowra 1963, 145-53; he believes that the lines are by Eumelus, and that the story is basically true. He dates the event to about 730. Janko (1982, 231ff.) believes these may be the only genuine lines of Eumelus.

\(^9\) There are additional arguments against the reliability of this story in De Schöffer 1889, 7-8.

\(^10\) Athenaeus VI, 234,e-f. Solon is not named but the expression ἐν τοῖς κόρμεσι must refer to his laws. On the problem of the kyrbeis and axones see Robertson 1986.

\(^11\) For more detailed arguments in favour of dating this law to the time of Pisistratus see Aloni 1989, 43-5. On attribution of laws to Solon, see e.g. Hansen 1989.
So although there may have been an Ionian panegyris on Delos in the eighth or seventh centuries, there is little evidence for it. Given that Delos is already a famous sanctuary at the time of Homer,\textsuperscript{12} we can be fairly confident there were festivals there from an early date. However, it is clear that Delos and its Apollo cult grew in importance in the sixth century, and Aloni has recently argued that the description fits a sixth-century context better.\textsuperscript{13} Not until the early years of the sixth century was a proper temenos marked out and separated from secular buildings.\textsuperscript{14} This was the work of the Naxians, who dominated Delos in the late seventh and early sixth centuries.\textsuperscript{15} The work was continued by Pisistratus, who seems to have been active on Delos soon after 550. His purification of Delos, mentioned by Herodotus and Thucydides,\textsuperscript{16} is the earliest reliably attested event in Delian history.\textsuperscript{17} Pisistratus was almost certainly responsible for the building of the first temple of Apollo on Delos, the \textit{porinos naos}. This has been dated to about 540, and is considered Attic in its architectural form.\textsuperscript{18} It seems clear that the cult of Artemis, probably taking

\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Od.} 6.162ff.

\textsuperscript{13} Aloni 1989. His book is largely an elaboration of the thesis of Burkert (1979) and Janko (1982, 112ff.) that the hymn was performed at the Polycratean festival of 523. I return to this below.

\textsuperscript{14} Gallet de Santerre 1958, 294ff; Roux 1984, 100; Aloni 1989, 47.

\textsuperscript{15} On Naxian influence, see Gallet de Santerre 1958, 289-96; Durrbach 1921, 1-3. The latter discusses the earliest inscriptions found on Delos, which are Naxian dedications from the late seventh century.

\textsuperscript{16} Hdt.1.64.2; Thuc.3.104.

\textsuperscript{17} On the Athenian influence in the sixth century, see Gallet de Santerre 1958, 297-307; Shapiro 1989, 48f.

the place of a Mycenaean goddess, predated that of Apollo on Delos. Her earliest temple has been dated to around 700;\(^{19}\) this suggests that at the time she was still more important than Apollo, who had no temple until 540.\(^{20}\) Burkert points out that Apollo’s temple is prominent in the hymn (see 52, 56, 80); if the earliest temple is the one built in 540, the hymn must be later than this.\(^{21}\)

After the death of Pisistratus in 528/7, the island was briefly dominated by Polycrates of Samos. According to Thucydides, he consecrated the neighbouring island of Rheneia to Apollo by joining it to Delos with a chain;\(^{22}\) and he probably held a festival there in 523, shortly before his death.\(^{23}\) I shall discuss this festival further below.

In the hymn the festival is described as one to which all the Ionians come; it is an important religious centre for them. The oldest Ionian religious centre was not Delos, but the panionion at Mycale. Burkert suggests that the festival on Delos may have become more important after the mainland had come under Persian domination in the mid-sixth century.\(^{24}\) The idea of Delos as an Ionian centre was something that would have been stressed by the Athenians in the time of Pisistratus. They wished

---

\(^{19}\) On the Delian cult of Artemis, see Gallet de Santerre 1958, 127-34, 252-7.

\(^{20}\) At least, no temple earlier than this has been found. Gallet de Santerre 1958, 91-3; 138-40 suggests the Mycenaean "edifice Ι"; contra, Bergquist 1967, 28f. Janko (1982, 256ff. n.68) argues that Apollo shared Artemis’ temple at first; this is possible, but it is Apollo’s temple that is important in the hymn.

\(^{21}\) Burkert 1979, 62.

\(^{22}\) Thuc.3.104.

\(^{23}\) See Gallet de Santerre 1958, 306-11; Parke 1946.

\(^{24}\) Burkert 1979, 62. On the panionion, see e.g. Nilsson 1906, 74-9; Wade-Gery 1952, 2-6; Roebuck 1955, 26-40.
to promote the idea of themselves as ancestors of the Ionians, and Pisistratus' interest in Delos was linked to this.\textsuperscript{25} The Athenians were eager to link themselves with Delos through myth, and it is at this period that they developed the stories of Erichthonius' construction of the first temple, and Theseus' visit to Delos on his way back from Crete, linking him to various Delian rituals.\textsuperscript{26}

Shapiro shows that soon after 550 Delian scenes start to appear on Attic vases, several dating to around 540.\textsuperscript{27} He also suggests that some of these paintings were influenced by \textit{Ap}. "The sudden appearance of Leto on Delos, on vases of about 540 and after, certainly recalls the early sections of the hymn, where she plays the central role." \textsuperscript{28} One picture in particular he believes shows knowledge of \textit{Ap}: this is a neck-amphora in the Louvre, dated 540-530.\textsuperscript{29} It combines various elements that occur in \textit{Ap}. It shows Apollo holding a lyre and seated in a huge tripod, under which is his bow and quiver. There are two dolphins beneath this, and a female figure on each side, probably Leto and Artemis. This recalls Apollo claiming the bow, the lyre and oracular power while still a baby (131f.); the presence of Artemis and Leto alludes to the birth on Delos; the tripod symbolises the founding of the oracle; the

\textsuperscript{25} Shapiro (1989, 49) comments: "The primary purpose of Pisistratus’ activity on Delos is evident: to assert Athens’ position as the leading city among the Ionian Greeks." His promotion of the cult of Apollo fits into this context, Apollo in the Athenian version being the father of Ion, eponym of the Ionians, by the Athenian Creusa.

\textsuperscript{26} On these myths see Gallet de Santerre 1958, 177-88; Parker 1987, esp. 205-7. On their connection with Pisistratean propaganda, ib.303ff. On Theseus and Delos, see also Calame 1990, esp.116-21.

\textsuperscript{27} Shapiro 1989, 56ff.

\textsuperscript{28} Ib. 58.

\textsuperscript{29} Ib. 58ff. The amphora: CP10619; ABV 685,8; LIMC II s.v. Apollon no. 381.
bow recalls Apollo’s slaying of the snake, and the dolphins his appearance to the Cretan sailors in the form of a dolphin. If this picture is influenced by Ap., it shows that the whole hymn (DAp and PAp) was known at this time, and the painter’s interest in it might suggest that it was a new composition, or at any rate had only recently become known in Athens.

The picture of the festival in the hymn is difficult to date. I have tried to show that there are reasons to believe a sixth-century context is plausible: the rise in activity on Delos in the course of the sixth century; the fostering of the Apollo cult and building of probably the first temple of Apollo around 540; the interest of Pisistratus and Polycrates; the Athenian emphasis on Delos as an Ionian centre, matching the hymn’s description; the possible appearance of vase paintings influenced by Ap. soon after 540. So far I have not discussed a piece of evidence that explicitly dates Ap. to the sixth century: this is the much debated scholium to Pin. Nem. 2.1, to which I shall now turn.

This scholium is as follows.

'Oμηρίδας ἔλεγον τὸ μὲν ἄρχαίον τούς ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὠμήρου γένους, οἱ καὶ τὴν ποίησιν αὐτοῦ ἐκ διωδοχῆς ξίδου· μετὰ δὲ ταύτα καὶ οἱ ραψῳδοὶ οὐκέτι τὸ γένος εἰς Ὠμήρον ἀνάγοντες. ἐπιφανεῖς δὲ ἐγένοντο οἱ περὶ Κύναιθον, οὗς φασί πολλὰ τῶν ἐπών ποιησαντας ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν Ὠμήρου ποίησιν. ἢν δὲ ὁ Κύναιθος Χῖος, δὲ καὶ τῶν ἐπίγραφομένων Ὠμήρου ποιημάτων τὸν εἰς Ἀπόλλωνα γεγραφές δὴμον ἀνατέθεικεν αὐτῷ. οὕτως οὖν ὁ Κύναιθος πρώτος ἐν Συρακοσίσσαις ἔραψάς τε Ὠμήρου ἔπη κατὰ τὴν ἐξακοστὴν ἐννάτην Ὁλυμπιάδα, ὡς Ἰππόστρατῶς φησιν (= FrGrHist 568 F 5).
This has provoked much discussion. The scholiast states that the Homeridai were originally descendants of Homer, but later they were rhapsodes who did not claim descent from him. Among these was Cynaethus of Chios, who was responsible for many interpolations in Homer, and also composed the Hymn to Apollo, which he attributed to Homer. He was also the first to recite Homer in Syracuse, in the sixty-ninth Olympiad (504-1). Many have rejected the date given as much too late, both for the composition of the hymn and the first performance of Homer in Syracuse. It is usually argued that knowledge of Homer is shown by the Sicilian Stesichorus, who is usually dated around 600. However, all we can be sure of is that Stesichorus was familiar with epic poems on Homeric subjects, not that he knew our Iliad and Odyssey. Even if he did (and there is a fragment of his that is very close

---


31 Wade-Gery (1952, 73 and n.53) argues that the rhapsodes were not called Homeridai. The text says μετὰ δὲ τάντα κατ’ οίροφροδί κτλ. Something has to be supplied here, and Wade-Gery says that it must be "sang Homer's poetry", since "were called Homeridai" would require the accusative, τούς ῥαψῳδοὺς ἀνάγοντας. Grammatically this seems right, but the sense is weak. It seems better to follow Förstel 1979, 96f. and n.214 in assuming that the phrasing is loose, and that we should understand "Later, rhapsodes (sang his poetry and were called Homerids) who were no longer", etc. The scholiast is explaining how the term Homeridai came to have the wider meaning it has in Pindar. This interpretation is supported by a shorter version of the scholium, which says "Ομηρίδαι πρώτερον μὲν οί Ὄμηρος ποιήσεις, δεύτερον δὲ οἱ περὶ Κύναθον ῥαψῳδοῖ οὕτοι γὰρ τὴν Ὄμηρος ποίησιν σκεπασθέισαι εμνημόνευσαν καὶ ἀπήγγελον· ἐλομήνατο δὲ αὐτῇ πάνω."

to a passage in the *Odyssey* the scholiast does not actually state that Homer was unknown in Sicily before this date. The information about Cynaethus’ recitation is attributed to Hippostratus, a third-century B.C. Sicilian historian. It is likely that he got his information from some official list, perhaps of victors in musical contests. The event that took place in 504-1, then, may have been the first of a series of official public recitations or rhapsodic contests at some festival. A parallel case supports this view. In the pseudo-Platonic dialogue *Hipparchus*, we are told that Hipparchus, the son of Pisistratus, first introduced Homer to Athens and made a law about the recitations at the Panathenaic festival. Cynaethus’ recitation at Syracuse fits well into this picture. The new type of Homeric recitation might be expected to reach the West a few years after Athens, and Cynaethus may well have moved on there after being involved in the recitations at Athens.

It is around this time that the name Homer is first attested, in the remarks of Heraclitus and Xenophanes (the former, it is worth noting, refers to performances of Homer in contests). Friis Johansen showed that it is only in the last quarter of the sixth century that clearly Iliadic subjects appear on Athenian vases in any quantity. There are signs of an interest in Homer in the Greek West around 500; Theagenes of

---


34 Hipp. 228b.

35 Heraclitus B42, 56; Xenophanes B10, 11 Diels-Kranz.

36 Johansen 1967 (This is an updated English version of the Danish original, published in 1934). His findings are still largely accepted. For a recent appraisal, see Shapiro 1989, 44ff., who has some reservations.
Rhegium, traditionally one of the first Homeric scholars, was active in this period.\textsuperscript{37} So we can see that there is nothing improbable about the date the scholiast gives for Cynaethus’ recitation. If this date is correct, and we accept the attribution to Cynaethus, then this would date the hymn to the second half of the sixth century. One option would be to accept the date but deny that the hymn could be by Cynaethus. Janko believes that neither part of the hymn can be this late, and he therefore argues that his role was that of putting the hymn into its current form.\textsuperscript{38} The problem with this, as I have argued in detail above, is that the two parts are too similar for them ever to have been completely independent, and it is therefore more likely that one hymn was composed as an addition to the other than that one hymn should imitate another, and then these two be joined by someone at a later date. I have already suggested that the linguistic arguments against a late date for \textit{DAp} are not conclusive, and that there are some reasons to believe that the description of the Delian festival would fit a sixth-century context.

So perhaps the scholiast is right to say that Cynaethus composed \textit{Ap.} in the second half of the sixth century; but does this mean that he composed all of it, or only part? And if part, which part? The obvious answer is that it was \textit{DAp} that he composed. Wade-Gery argued for \textit{PAp}, but this is surely very unlikely.\textsuperscript{39} Wade-Gery took this view because he accepted the theory of Wilamowitz and Jacoby that \textit{PAp} was composed as an addition to \textit{DAp}. However, given that Cynaethus was a Homerid from

\textsuperscript{37} Theagenes’ floruit is given as "in the time of Cambyses". For the testimonia on Theagenes, see Diels-Kranz 1951, i.51f.

\textsuperscript{38} Janko 1982, 112ff.

\textsuperscript{39} Wade-Gery 1936.
Chios, it is surely ΔAp., with its Ionian background and praise of the blind bard of Chios, that he composed. Why should Cynaethus have wished to compose such a Delian hymn as an addition to a pre-existing Pythian one? I have argued above that archaic poems were composed to be performed, and that there are problems in imagining a suitable context for the performance of a combined Delian and Pythian hymn. Burkert and Janko have suggested an ingenious solution to this problem. The argument is based on a story that Polycrates asked the Delphic oracle whether he should call the festival he intended to hold on Delos Delian or Pythian, and received the answer "ταῦτα σοι καὶ Πυθιά καὶ Δήλια". Such a combined Delian and Pythian festival would be a suitable context for the performance of ΔAp., and Polycrates might have commissioned a well-known rhapsode like Cynaethus to perform such a hymn. Polycrates' Delian festival should probably be dated to 523/2, shortly before his death. The scholiast tells us that Cynaethus attributed his hymn to Homer, and this fits the reference to the blind man of Chios in the poem, which is probably a reference to Homer. The attribution of the hymn to Homer by inserting this "signature" would provide unimpeachable authority for the fact that there had in earlier times been a great panonian festival on the island; this would legitimise the festival instituted by Polycrates. Burkert suggests that the passage fits the situation

40 See above, 106f.


42 The story is in the Suda s.v. ταῦτα σοι. For other sources see Burkert 1979, 59f. and n.31. On Polycrates and Delos, see Parke 1946.

43 See commentary on 165-78.
which he outlines, in which rhapsodes were establishing Homer as a classic author. The interest in authorship, and the statement that "all of his songs will be the best", suit Burkert's theory. Another possible context would be the time of Pisistratus' intervention on the island. We do not know whether he held a festival on Delos, but it seems likely. We have seen that the Athenians were keen on the idea of Delos as an Ionian centre, and that Athenian paintings possibly influenced by the hymn appear soon after 540. If these do show knowledge of the whole hymn, as the Louvre amphora seems to, this would rule out Polycrates' festival as a context for the hymn's first performance. The references to the temple would also make sense if the hymn was composed around the time of its construction.

This is all speculative, but the evidence of the scholiast about Cynaethus adds to the factors outlined above that suggest a sixth-century date for DAp. This would support the view that DAp is the addition and not PAp. DAp also shows the influence of lyric poetry, which again is in favour of a relatively late date. I have discussed above the suggestions that DAp is more lyric in style than PAp. As a description of DAp as a whole, this is unconvincing, but there are particular sections of the poem that find their closest parallels in lyric rather than epic. This is true of the "choice of theme" (19ff.), and especially of the personal section and description of the festival (165-78). The poet's reference to himself, his claim that his songs are the best, his promise to spread the maidens' fame in his songs, his praise of the female chorus and of the festival he is performing at, are all paralleled in lyric but not epic.

---

45 See above, 111f.
46 See commentary on 165-78 for more detail on these points.
My conclusion is that it is hard to date DAp with any confidence, but that it is a reasonable theory that it was composed by Cynaethus of Chios in the second half of the sixth century (possibly making use of older material) as an addition to a pre-existing Pythian hymn, and was performed at a Delian festival instituted by Polycrates or Pisistratus. DAp is the sort of composition one might expect from a talented rhapsode of this period - at times awkward or misusing traditional language and formulae, but lively and colourful, and showing the influence of lyric poetry.
Commentary on the Homeric Hymn to Delian Apollo

1-13 Apollo arrives on Olympus brandishing his bow, and the other gods spring up in fear. Leto disarms him and gives him a seat, and Zeus welcomes him with a goblet of nectar. The other gods resume their seats, and Leto rejoices in her mighty son

The opening scene is problematic, and has attracted many negative comments. Its critics tend to focus on both its content and on linguistic or stylistic difficulties. It seems odd that Apollo should appear brandishing his bow and frightening the other gods in this way. The action seems out of place on Olympus, is unmotivated (or at least no motivation is given) and has no serious consequences: Apollo allows himself to be disarmed by Leto, accepts a drink from Zeus and peace is restored. West (1975, 163) calls this scene "a peculiar business. What is Apollo thinking of, coming into the company of the gods with his bow at the ready, as if he were Odysseus and they the suitors?" Kirk (1981, 166f.) is still more critical, calling it "a post-Homeric exaggeration" that is "well outside the limits of Homeric ethos" (on these criticisms see prolegomena, 71ff.). Förstel (1979, 166) thinks that this may be a displaced motif from a theomachy (but what was the poet's purpose in using it?). One reaction to this sort of criticism has been to attempt to tone down the scene, to make it less startling. Baumeister (1860, 118) asserted that Apollo is merely returning from the hunt and carries his bow on his shoulder - this hardly matches the words of the text. Similarly, Miller (1986, 15) argues that Apollo has been using his bow outside Olympus, and has not yet put it away. "His bow is at the ready because he has been wielding it in the world at large and has not yet, at the moment of entering Zeus' halls, adjusted his mood and bearing to his new surroundings." He compares h. 27 to Artemis, which
has parallels with *Ap.* 1-13 (and also 186-206). In this hymn Artemis is depicted hunting with her bow (5 παγρύσεαι τὸξα τιταινεῖ; cf. *Ap.* 4) and then goes to Delphi, hangs up her bow (16 κατακρεμάσασα...τὸξα; cf. *Ap.* 8) and dances with the Muses and Graces. But there is no such contrast in *Ap.*: it is on Olympus that he bends his bow, and the gods are clearly said to spring up in fear. Why should they do this if they knew that Apollo posed no threat to them? Equally weak are the suggestions of Gemoll (1886, 121), that Apollo stretches his bow as a joke, and of Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, on 1) that "as Apollo approaches the seated gods he strings his bow to test it".

The passage becomes less problematic if we remember that this is a hymn in praise of Apollo. The purpose of the opening is clearly to stress Apollo’s power; and how could this be more clearly done than by showing that even the other gods are afraid of him? Apollo is depicted from the start as a powerful and frightening god. This is also how he is portrayed in Homer, especially in the *Iliad*, and in the rest of this hymn (see prolegomena 52f. and commentary on 65ff.) Clay’s view of the opening scene is that, after an opening that recalls earlier theomachies, it shows that Apollo is proved to be not a threat to the Olympian order, but a loyal son of Zeus; and that this is a major theme of the whole poem (Clay 1989, 38). I prefer to say that it emphasises Apollo’s power even among the other gods; and there is never any question of a threat to Zeus (see on 5). The fact that Leto and Zeus disarm and welcome him is natural in the prologue to a narrrative of Apollo’s birth: his parents are praised too, and we are reminded that he is a loyal son as well as a powerful archer god.

Kroll (1956, supported by Walcot 1966, 48f.; Cássola 1975, 84; Penglase 1994, 98f.) argues that the scene shows the influence of Near Eastern models. To show a
young god exercising such power over the others is a Near Eastern conception; Kroll compares the unruly behaviour of Marduk in Babylonian myths. For the Greeks, power over men and gods is the prerogative of Zeus alone (cf. on 65ff.). The idea is not inherently implausible: it is well known that some Greek myths about the gods, particularly the Hesiodic succession myth, show Oriental influence (see West 1966, 18-31). Yet I deem it unnecessary to invoke such an explanation here. Parallels in other hymns show that it is regular for the other gods to admire or even fear a new god (see below, 139); and the desire to stress Apollo’s power is natural in a hymn to him. He is not dangerous in the way in which Marduk is; the scene makes clear his subordination to Zeus and Leto. In any case, it is unlikely that Greek poets would imitate Near Eastern stories in ways that were alien to their own ways of thinking about the gods: in fact they adapted them in various ways (on this process see Kirk 1990, 7-14). Penglase (1994) attempts to find pervasive parallels between the Hymns and Mesopotamian myths, but his ideas, particularly with regard to DAp, are often implausible.

The other major difficulty with this scene is the changes of tense that occur in it. In 2–4 the verbs are present; in 5 we have an imperfect, in 6–10 aorists, and then in 12–13 presents again. Various explanations have been put forward for this, often assuming incompetence on the part of the poet. Bound up with this is a debate about whether the scene is a narrative of Apollo’s first appearance on Olympus after his birth, or a typical description of his activity. In favour of a first appearance are Jacoby 1933, 728; Dornseiff 1933, 10; Deubner 1938, 272; Kroll 1956; Forderer 1971, 64; Heubeck 1972, 133. That it is a typical description is argued by West 1975, 163; Fürstel 1979, 166 and 170; Kirk 1981, 167; Sowa 1984, 176; Miller 1986, 12, and that it is a mixture by Wilamowitz 1916, 442; Cassola 1975, 485f.; Van Groningen 1958,
305n.2; Unte 1968, 22. Both these types of scene occur in the *Homeric Hymns*; for first appearances, cf. *Herm.* 322ff.; 6. 14-18; 19. 42-7; 28. 4ff; *Th.* 68ff. These have some parallels with our scene: the new god is admired or feared by the others at 6. 16ff.; 19. 45ff.; 28. 6f.; and Zeus rejoices in his children, as Leto does here, at *Herm.* 389ff., 28. 16 (and cf. 205f.). On typical scenes, see prolegomena, 13f. If it is his first appearance, that might explain his behaviour in brandishing his bow on Olympus; he would not yet know how to behave, and his mother has to take the weapons off him (Wilamowitz 1916, 442) states that Leto "lehrt den Sohn, was sich auf dem Olymp schickt"). The fear of the other gods would also be natural if they had never seen Apollo before; and Zeus’ welcoming gesture would be appropriate in this context (see on 10f.). So the idea is superficially attractive; but scenes of a first appearance on Olympus naturally follow, rather than precede, a birth narrative; and the present tenses are hard to explain if this is a unique occasion (the historic present is not used in early epic; cf. Chantraine 1948-53, 2.191). If, on the other hand, this is a typical scene, then the content seems odd. As West (1975, 163) puts it: "It is represented not just as something he did once but as something he does regularly; and the gods jump every time, as if they had never seen the charade before." It is difficult to compose a typical scene with narrative development; contrast the second scene on Olympus, which is more like a tableau of the gods dancing and singing.

Some see this combination of typical and specific elements as the cause of the changes in tense. Hermann (1806, on 4) suggested that the poet started a typical scene, but got carried away by the narrative element and dropped into the past tense. Wilamowitz (1916, 442 n.2) argued that the poet slipped into past tense narrative because he was a narrative poet by profession. Similarly, Unte (1968, 22) believes that the poet starts with a typical picture of Apollo, but "falls into" a past narrative
and then "falls back" into the present. The return to the present is a problem for all these theories which present the poet moving almost inadvertently from present to past, from typical description to narrative action.

A similar approach was proposed by Janko (1981, 17). He divides the *Homeric Hymns* into two main types: those in which the central section is descriptive or typical, which he calls attributive; and those in which it is past narrative, which he calls mythic (see prolegomena, 13f.). He comments on the start of *Ap.*: "The poet clumsily chose an attributive scene incapable of narration in the present tense without absurdity. He began with the present tenses in 2-4, but then realised that the scene depicted could not happen once the gods were familiar with Apollo's appearance. Thus he switched to the past tenses of 5-10, turning the passage into something closer to the common description of a deity's first arrival on Olympus." Again, the return to the present is awkward for this idea. It seems preferable to try to find some explanation that does not involve positing incompetence on the part of the poet. Another difficulty with this theory, and those just mentioned that represent the poet stumbling into an awkward shift of tense, is that it seems to posit a picture of composition that rules out much premeditation or possibility of revision (on oral composition, see prolegomena, 74ff.). In his book on the Hymns (Janko 1982, 100f.) Janko applies the same explanation to other problems in this scene. Having lost his way, the poet used awkward phrases like πρὸς κλονον πατρὸς ἐστι (see on 8) "in the ensuing confusion", his "creative flow was badly disrupted because of his initial blunder." This suggests the poem was composed in performance, and presumably dictated: this is a possible scenario, but surely if dictating a poem the poet who started badly could say "scratch that, let's start again" (and if performing at dictation speed the poet would have more
time to think).¹

Clay, who has a very useful discussion of the whole scene, takes a rather different line. For her "the opening scene of the Hymn to Apollo portrays both the first epiphany of the new god on the threshold of Olympus and his eternally repeated entrance into his father's house." This is possible because "the time of the gods differs from ours . . . although they are born and have come into existence, they henceforth exist forever . . . Hence an event in the past -- say, the birth of a god, his first reception on Olympus, or his first epiphany among men -- is not to be distinguished from his characteristic repeated actions. Each conveys the god's essential nature in all its fullness." (Clay 1989, 28f.). I think there is something in this, but I have reservations. Clay perhaps goes too far in ignoring the grammar of the passage. Moreover, the gods of early Greek epic are not outside time. They have their own history; and on the whole the Hymns do distinguish their unique past actions from their typical activities. It is true that once the gods are born and have developed their characteristic functions and powers, there are no major changes in their lives; but it is precisely this period of growth and development that the Hymns are mainly concerned with.

Clay rightly points out, in support of her view, that there are parallels for past tenses in typical descriptions of divine activity. The best parallel is the start of the *Theogony* (which also provides a parallel for a hymn opening with a description of the gods' typical activity before the account of their birth). This describes the habitual activity of the Muses, and again we see a change from present tenses to aorists, and an imperfect in 10. H. 19 to Pan provides another example, again combining aorists,

---
¹ I now note that Janko 1992, 37 argues that "in Homer, as in oral dictated texts generally, nescit vox missa reverti." See ibid. on Il. 13.419-23, 16.467-9.
presents and an imperfect (19.3-10, 12-14, 29). The aorists can possibly be explained as timeless aorists without recourse to Clay's ideas (cf. West 1966, on Th. 7); however, the actions they describe are rather too specific to fit comfortably into the category of gnomic aorists (cf. Clay 1989, 24 n.18), and the imperfects cannot be explained in this way. An explanation of these has been proposed by West (1989, 135-8) and Pelliccia (1985 -- I have not seen this). They compare the Vedic injunctive in Sanskrit, which West describes as "a usage whereby a primary stem modified only by the so-called secondary personal endings was neutral in respect of tense and mood and could be used, when the context gave sufficient indication of function, with reference to past, present, or future, real or imagined". In Vedic hymns it often alternates with the present in descriptions of gods' typical activities. This could explain the unaugmented imperfect in 5. Greek "timeless" aorists may also derive from uses of an injunctive (there are also Vedic aorist-stem injunctives); in this case they ought to be augmented, but are mostly not. West suggests that perhaps the aorist-stem injunctive came to be regarded as an aorist indicative, and was accordingly augmented. Various parallels have been pointed out between early Greek hexameter poetry and the Vedic hymns, and a common parentage is generally assumed for them (see prolegomena, 5), so it would not be surprising if the Homeric Hymns and Hesiod preserve a stylistic feature also found in Vedic hymns.

This seems the best explanation of the tenses in 1-13, but, whether we accept this theory or not, I would argue that it is a typical scene. This is what we would expect at the start of a hymn. If it is typical, the past tenses can be explained, or at least paralleled; if it is past narrative, the present tenses cannot. The passage begins and ends in the present tense, and there are cases of generalising τε in 2, 3 and 12. The objection that the content is not suitable for a typical scene is, I think, too pedantic.
It is a typical description in that it conveys what Apollo is like, and his relationship to the other gods. To that extent I would agree with Clay that the distinction between past and present breaks down here, and that a god’s unique action can convey his eternal nature. Having said that, it is undeniable that the scene contains elements suitable for an account of a first arrival on Olympus, and there may be some truth in the theories that see this scene as a mixture of unique and typical actions.

Scenes of arrival on Olympus are, as I have said, a feature of the Hymns. In addition to the accounts of a god’s first arrival already quoted, we can compare Dem. 483ff.; Herm. 503ff.; Aph. 291. H. 15 moves from Heracles’ exploits on the earth to his current situation on Olympus, and h.1 also ends on Olympus. Such scenes normally come at the end rather than the beginning of a hymn. In the case of a first arrival, it is natural that it should follow the birth narration; and it is sometimes just a case of the god returning home after whatever action has been narrated, as at the end of Aph. The Hymns have a tendency to return to the present at the end, and to describe the god’s current situation, which is normally on Olympus. This is important thematically, since the position of a god among the other Olympians and his acceptance by them are major themes of the Hymns. So it is unusual for a hymn to open with a scene on Olympus, whether it is typical or not. The Theogony opens with a description of the Muses’ typical activity, but this is on Helicon; however, the poem’s "second beginning" (36ff.), after the account of their meeting with Hesiod, describes their typical activity on Olympus before the narration of their birth and first arrival on Olympus. To open a hymn with such a scene, especially one as vivid as Ap. 1-13, is a striking and effective conception. The image of Apollo the powerful archer is stamped on our minds from the beginning. If we did not have such a scene, Apollo would not actually appear in the hymn until near its end. It is all the more
striking if it is meant as an account of Apollo’s first appearance on Olympus, because of the disruption of the logical order of events.

Of course the closest parallel to such an opening scene on Olympus is the beginning of *PAp* (186-206). In this scene Apollo arrives on Olympus playing his lyre, and immediately the gods begin to dance and sing. The two scenes are clearly related, whether or not the hymn is a unified composition. They show different aspects of his power: the gods react in fear when he brandishes his bow, but joyfully when he plays his lyre. Both end with the joy of Apollo’s parents in their son (only Leto in 12f., Zeus and Leto in 204ff.). West (1975, 163) sees the first scene as an imitation of the second, and its exaggerated portrayal of Apollo’s power on Olympus as an attempt to "outdo" the Pythian poet (see prolegomena, 117f.). I would agree with him that the Pythian scene is smoother and more harmonious, but I do not think that the awkwardnesses of the Delian scene prove that it is the imitation. In fact, one could argue that the reverse is more likely (even though I have argued -- tentatively -- in favour of the priority of *PAp*.; see prolegomena, 116ff.). The unusual conception of opening a hymn with such a scene seems more in the style of *DAp*, which is frequently original in its use of hymnic conventions. Moreover, since 1-13 has elements of a scene depicting a god’s first appearance on Olympus, it is clearly relevant to the theme of *DAp* in a way that the Pythian scene does not seem to be to *PAp*.

I have mentioned the scene’s similarity to other scenes of arrival on Olympus, but it also shows similarities to other standard Homeric arrival-scenes (on the pattern of these, see Arend 1933, 28ff.). A good example is the arrival of Athene (disguised as Mentes) at Odysseus’ house on Ithaca (*Od*. 1.96ff.). Telemachus takes her spear and puts it in a rack πρός κίονα μακρήν (127f.), as Leto takes Apollo’s bow and hangs
it from a hook πρός κόνα (6-9). He leads her to a seat (130ff.), as Leto does for Apollo (9), and serves her with food and drink (139ff.), as Apollo receives a drink from Zeus (10ff.). The narrative in the *Odyssey* is fuller, and includes the washing of Athene/Mentes’ feet, which has no parallel in *Ap.* (would a god arriving on Olympus need this?); but the basic structure is the same. However the motifs are given a rather different significance in *Ap:* the taking of his bow is not just a polite gesture, but the removal of an apparent threat; and the cup of nectar is not so much to quench his thirst as to confirm his status and acceptance among the Olympians (see on 10ff.).

In spite of its awkwardness at some points, the passage does succeed in conveying an impression of Apollo’s greatness, especially with the effective phrase δέ φατάδμα τόξα ττιαάνει. It is a vivid vignette of Olympian life, with the gods springing up in fear of Apollo and the restoration of peace once his bow is hung up.

1. μνήσομαι οὔδε λάθωμαι: This is a slightly unusual opening for a hymn. The opening lines fall into two main types: those in which the poet says "I will sing of" whichever god is concerned, e.g. *Dem.* 1 Δήμητρ’ ἑύκομον...ἀρχομ’ ἀείδειν, and those in which the poet calls on the Muse, e.g. *Herm.* 1 ’Ερμῆν ὑμνεῖ, Μοῦσα (see prolegomena, 9ff.). Our beginning is more like the first type but the wording is untypical. The only other hymn that starts with μνήσομαι is 7 to Dionysus, which begins ’Αμφι Διώνυσον...μνήσομαι, but here with ἀμφί the sense is more "I will tell of" whereas in *Ap.* it seems to be more literally "remember", especially in conjunction with οὔδε λάθωμαι, which emphasises the idea. The hymn poets often promise to remember the god: cf. 1. 18ff., 7. 58ff. and the common closing line οὕτωρ ἔγω καὶ σεῖο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ’ ἀοιδῆς (12 hymns). This is more usual at the end, when the poet promises to remember the god though he is moving on to another
topic; yet such a promise is natural enough at the start of a hymn: cf. poets' promises
to sing of a god or gods when they start and when they finish (1. 17f.; Th. 34 with
West 1966 ad loc., 48; Theognis 1-4). Ap. Rh. 1f., ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοίβε,
pαλαιγενέων κλέα φωτῶν / μνήσομαι may have our passage in mind. See also on
177f. Μνήσομαι is a short-vowel aorist subjunctive, not a future indicative; cf. II.
2.488, Od. 4.240 μνησομαι ουδ' ὀνομήνω (misquoted as μνησομαι οὐδὲ
λάθωμαι by Allen, Halliday and Sikes 1936, on 1); Od. 6.126, 12.383, 13.215. The
subjunctive is often equivalent to the future in Homer (Chantraine 1948-53, ii. 225).
Càssola (1975, ad loc.) argues that μνήσομαι is probably future because of the
parallel with the futures (if they are futures) at the start of other hymns (ἀείσομαι
10.1; 15.1; 23.1; 30.1), but this is unlikely because of the pairing with λάθωμαι, and
cf. 25.1 Μουσάων ἄρχωμαι; Th. 1 Μουσάων ἄρχομαι ἀείδειν, where West
(1966, ad loc.) comments: "the subjunctive expresses resolve"; Epigonî fr. 1 νῦν αὐθ'
οπλοτέρων ἀνδρῶν ἄρχωμεθα Μοῦσαι.

'Απόλλωνος ἐκάτοιο: this is an old formula, with observance of digamma and
genitive in -οιο, also found at II. 7.83, 20.295. It has a newer doublet ἐκτηβόλον
'Απόλλωνος (2x II., Th. 94). ἐκατος, which means nothing on its own, is a
shortened form of ἐκατηβόλος. The etymology of this group of epithets is linked to
ἐκών rather than ἐκός, so the meaning is "working at will" or "hitting the mark at
will" (see Chantraine 1968-80, Frisk 1960-70, s.v. ἐκκατργος, ἐκατηβόλος).
However, the ancients explained it as "far-shooting" and epic poets may well have so
understood it. In any case, the epithet is connected with Apollo's archery, so is
appropriately used here.

2. The continuation with a relative clause is usual in epic, also in prayers and
hymns, to expand the description of the god named in the first line (cf. West 1966 on
Th. 2; Richardson 1974 on Dem. 1-3).

δῶμα Διός: this is quite common in the Iliad, e.g. 1.222, 5.398, 907. δῶμα is often used of temples, and Homer uses it of both human and divine dwellings. It can be used for all the gods, as in the phrase Ὁλύμπια δῶματ' ἔχοντες, or as here of Zeus alone (cf. Leumann 1950, 279).

3-5. In the Iliad the gods stand when Zeus and Hera enter (1.533, 15.85f.); cf. also the winds standing to greet Iris (23.202f.). The motif is obviously suitable for Zeus and Hera, but may have been a common one. The emotions of the gods differ in these passages. In II. 1 the gods show reverence for Zeus, and it is said that nobody dared to remain seated; in the cases of Hera and Iris the gods spring up more out of curiosity and eagerness to welcome the new arrival. Apollo's entry is more like Zeus' in this respect, and it is stressed that the gods spring up out of fear. In fact the poet may have had the scene from II. 1 in mind here, as there are verbal parallels: with 3 cf. II. 1.534f. οὔτε τις ἔτηθη/μείναι ἐπερχόμενον, which could also be echoed in 5 Αἴτω δ' οἶη μίμε. In II. 1.534 the gods rise ἔξ ἐδέων, in Ap. 4 ἀφ' ἐδράων (the detail of the seats is not mentioned in the other parallel passages).

3. ἀνασυναυστω: this is an energetic word, also used at II. 15.85 and 23.203. There it suggests eagerness or curiosity, here fear. II. 1.533 uses the more neutral ἀνέστατων.

ἐπὶ σχέδον with tnesis seems better than ἐπισχέδον, which is not found before Apollonius. Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, ad loc.) compare Od. 22.205 ἐπ' ἐγχλημολογοῦ... ἥλθεν. The genitive absolute at the end of the line is emphasised by position and does not need a pronoun to support it, even though the subject is different from that of the main verb. This independent use of the participle in Homer means that a genitive absolute can be used after a pronoun in the dative, e.g. II. 16.531 δττι
οι δεκ' ἡκουσε μέγας θεὸς εὐξομένου (Chantraine 1948-53, ii.322-3).

4. φαεδίμοι τὸξα: Janko (1982, 101) points out that this is a doublet of the Homeric καμπύλα τὸξα. The latter is used at 131, so this is a doublet in the strictest sense, i.e. one used in the same poem and the same sedes, with the same class of initial sound. Also, φαεδίμοις is not used in Homer for inanimate objects. It is more effective here than καμπύλα, since it emphasises the impressiveness of Apollo’s appearance.

τὸξα τἰτοῖνεί: Barnes, followed by Gemoll (1886), read τἰτοῖνη here. A pure subjunctive after ὅτε or ὅποτε indicates "that the speaker is supposing a case which may occur repeatedly or at any time" (Monro 1891, 289). With the generalising τε in 3 and the present tense, this may be right here. If so it would support the view that this is a typical scene. The indicative after ὅτε is used to state a plain fact, and so mostly occurs with verbs in the past (Chantraine 1948-53, ii. 255). τὸξα τἰτοῖν- is formulaic; cf. Il. 8.266, 11.370; Od. 21.259; h. 27.5; Bacch. 10.43.

5. To say that Leto remained by Zeus is equivalent to saying she remained seated, since of course Zeus himself would never rise at the entrance of another god. This unstated assumption shows that there is no question of a threat to Zeus in Apollo’s demeanour here, pace Clay (see above, 138). The importance of Apollo’s mother in this scene prepares us for the coming birth-narrative; whether or not we take the scene as a depiction of Apollo’s first appearance on Olympus, it is clearly designed to fit the birth-story.

6. Note the chiastic order of nouns and verbs: the pairing of βιός and φαρέτη is formulaic in Homer (1x Il., 2x Od.), but here the formula is separated (see prolegomena, 68). The action is surprising coming after line 5, in which we are told that Leto remained seated: Bücheler wished to emend ἦ ὅτα to ὑφραξ, making Apollo
the subject; but Leto is the subject of the preceding and following lines, and the focus is on her at this point. The whole narrative in these lines is compressed, imperfectly visualised and linguistically awkward. Jacoby (1933, 727ff.), followed by Van Groningen (1958, 305) saw 6 and 7-9 as doublets, of which 6 is original because it does not contradict 4, but this is unnecessary (for Jacoby’s theory of the hymn’s composition, see prolegomena, 91). The passage gives more of an impression than most of the hymn of clumsy imitation of Homer, or at least awkward use of traditional phraseology. We need to be cautious about assuming that similarities to Homer are due to imitation, or that where the Hymns use a phrase differently they are inferior (see prolegomena, 71ff.), but this passage is undoubtedly awkward in its use of material that Homer uses skilfully.

7. It is hard to see how the bow can be removed from Apollo’s shoulders if he has been stretching it. As in the previous line, a step in the narrative seems to have been omitted. Forderer (1971, 166 n.17) suggests that the object of ἔλοδοςα is φορέτρην, not τόξον; but this makes the passage very jerky. An attractive suggestion is that Apollo’s bow here is of the Scythian type, in which a combined quiver and bow-case was slung over the shoulder (see Càssola 1975 ad loc.; Lorimer 1950, 284). In this case Leto unstrings the bow and puts in its case, closes the quiver and then removes the whole from Apollo’s shoulder. The action omitted would then be the placing of the bow in its case.

χείρεσσιν: this is metrically less convenient than the alternative χερσί(ν), so the latter is commoner in Homer (used 200 times against 33 uses of χείρεσσι(ν)). Since χερσί is used by Sappho and Alcaeus, χείρεσσι is not a true Aeolic form (see Chantraine 1948-53, 1. 206).

8-10. In composing these lines the poet may have had in mind passages from the
Odyssey about Demodocus (or passages about bards generally); cf. especially Od. 8.65-70. In this passage Demodocus is given a θρόνος to sit on, leaning πρός κλόνα; his lyre is hung from a hook, and food and drink are placed before him. It is interesting that Apollo should be described in terms suitable for a bard here, since it his role as archer that is emphasised in this passage, not as lyre player.

8. τόξον: here this must include the quiver; the use of one word for both bow and quiver supports the theory that Apollo’s bow is of the Scythian type (see on 7 above).

πρός κλόνα πατρός ἐοῖο: in Od. 8 it is the chair Demodocus sits on that is against the pillar; this is what we would expect here, but it is only the hook that is said to be πρός κλόνα. Demodocus’ lyre is hung over his head, so this is a parallel for hanging from a pillar; but perhaps this is more natural for the bard’s lyre, which is placed ready for him to use it, than for a bow and quiver that are being put away. What is meant by κλόνα πατρός ἐοῖο? This is an awkward phrase, on which Janko (1982, 100) comments: "There is no conceivable defence for this." It combines two Homeric phrases, πρός κλόνα and πατρός ἐοῖο (5x ll., v.l. at Od. 20.289 - all but one at the line end). Again this passage gives the impression of awkward use of traditional language. "His father’s pillar" is more likely to mean "the pillar against which his father’s chair rested" (Allen, Halliday and Sikes 1936 ad loc.) than "a pillar of his father’s house" (Evelyn-White 1914, 325; Kirk 1966, 167).

9. πασσάλον ἐκ χρυσέου: Homer uses both this form and the genitive πασσάλοφι, as in the formula ἐκ πασσάλοφι (Od. 8.67, 105). The genitive in -φι is older, but originally was not used with o-stems. ἐκ is used for hanging something from a peg, ἀπό for taking it down from one. A bow is taken down from a πάσσαλος at Il. 5.209; Od. 21.53. The peg is gold because this is normal for imperishable divine artefacts (like
the goblet in the next line); cf. Hainsworth 1993 on Il. 9.533.

Being led to a seat is a normal part of epic welcoming scenes, and the phraseology here is formulaic; cf. e.g. Il. 9.200; Od. 1.130, 7.169, 8.65 etc.

10f. It is a mark of Apollo’s importance that he is served by Zeus himself, who is of course his father. A drink is given to an arriving god at Il. 15.85f., 24.100f. (and they toast each other at 4.3f.). It is a sign of welcome as much as a practical act of hospitality.

10. πατήρ: here this has a double meaning: Zeus is Apollo’s father, but also πατήρ ἄνδρων τε θεῶν τε (12x Il., 3x Od.). There is the same ambiguity at Il. 5.662. For πατήρ on its own used of Zeus cf. e.g. Il. 8.69, 245; Od. 12.65; Dem. 325.

δέποι χρυσέως: see on 9.

11. δεικνύμενος: this is usually translated "welcoming" here. There are a group of related verb forms in Homer that mean either "pledging" (with a drink) or welcoming. Cf. Il. 15.85f. δεικνύωντο δέπασσαν; Od. 18.111, 24.10 δεικνύωντ’ ἐπέσσοι; Il. 9.196 τὸ καὶ δεικνύμενος. Some of these forms are from δείκνυμι (δεικνύομαι) and some probably from another root (δειδόσκωμαι, δειδέχομαι may be related to δέχομαι or a stem δηκ-). The forms have probably been confused with each other, and it seems best to follow Russo (in Russo, Fernandez-Galiano and Heubeck 1992, on Od. 18.121), who says that "all these verbal forms ... share an idea that extends from offering formal greeting with words to doing so with a cup of wine in hand." (cf. Kirk 1985 on Il. 4.4, Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. δηδέχομαι). With δείκνυμι the meaning "pledge" may be primary (it is usually explained as to "show" in the sense of pointing to the person whose health was to be drunk), and hence it comes to mean "welcome" where no drinking is involved. Here both meanings are
clearly present, and possibly "show" in a literal sense, if this is Apollo's first appearance; in H. 19.44f. Hermes takes Pan to Olympus, places him by Zeus and δειξε δε κοῦρον ἑὼν. Gemoll (1886, ad loc.) wanted to punctuate at the end of this line, supplying a verb from δεικνύµενος (or, better, from διδοκε, since that is the main verb), because the order ought to be ἐνθά δ’ ἐπείτα. I think this is right: Allen and Sikes (1906, ad loc.) argue that ἐνθά here means "tum demum", "then and only then", but they cite no parallels for this, and do not explain the odd word order. Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, ad loc.) prefer to argue that it is local. This must be right if we do not punctuate at the end of 11, but it does not make much sense in the context; the emphasis is not on their sitting in a particular place, but at a particular time. There are a lot of Homeric parallels for sentences beginning with ἐνθά and a verb of sitting at the start of a line (and with asyndeton): cf. Il. 3.426 ἐνθά καθήζ’ Ἀθήνη; Od. 16.48, 19.59 and 102 ἐνθά καθήζετε’ ἐπείτα; Il. 10.202, 20.149; Dem. 197. ἐνθά in these cases is generally local, referring to an already mentioned place, but there is no reason why it should not be used similarly with a temporal meaning. On this type of asyndeton, see Denniston 1954, xlv. It is natural for all the gods to toast Apollo, once Zeus has done so. This emphasises the honour paid to him and his acceptance by all the gods. At Il. 15.85f., on Hera's arrival, πάντες ...δεικνύωντο δεσποσσίν; at 4.3f. they toast one another; cf. also 9.670f.

12f. Cf. 125f. and note ad loc., 204ff., and see above, 138f. This sums up the meaning of the opening scene: it stresses Apollo's power, and also links this with the theme of his birth by foregrounding Leto's joy in him.

12. πότνια Λητώ: this phrase is not Homeric (though based on a common pattern πότνια - -); it is used at Theognis 5, also in an account of Apollo's birth.

13. τὸξοφόρον: this is used of Artemis at Il. 21.483 (its only Homeric use) and
of Apollo again at Pi. Pae. fr. 19.30 Snell-Maehler.

14-18. *Apostrophe of Leto as mother of Artemis and Apollo.*

This salutation of Leto has often been seen as an interpolation. For a summary of the older views, see Baumeister 1860 ad loc. Förstel (1979, 114ff.) has a good survey of analytical views. The passage is defended by van Groningen 1958, 306; Càssola 1975 ad loc.; Förstel 1979, 114-20; Thalmann 1984, 15; Miller 1986, 17ff.; Clay 1989, 29-32. Interpolation has been suggested on various grounds:

(i) the salutation of Leto is out of place in a hymn to Apollo;

(ii) it is too like 12f. and so repetitious;

(iii) the mention of Artemis is out of place in a hymn to Apollo;

(iv) it anticipates the birth story and is too like 25ff.;

(v) the apostrophe of Apollo in 19 is very awkward directly after the apostrophe of Leto (19 does not indicate the change of addressee);

(vi) άυγατοτάω is an untraditional form (see on 18);

(vii) it is inconsistent with the birth description in 116ff. (see on 17f.);

(viii) χορή always comes at the end of hymns.

These objections are mostly weak. The salutation of Leto serves a clear purpose here, as she is the main character in most of the following narrative, and I have stressed her importance in the opening scene. It is not detrimental to Apollo’s honour to praise his mother -- quite the contrary -- and she is praised in her capacity as mother of Apollo and Artemis (cf. van Groningen 1958, 306). She was also important in Delian cult (see Gallet de Santerre 1958, 143-7 and 257f.), which may be a factor here (this is stressed by Förstel 1979, 116-18); van Groningen (1958, 306) suggests that in these
lines the poet may have turned to a statue of Leto. Bethe (1936) argues that 1-18 of this poem show the importance of Leto on Delos, and that the opening scene reflects a Delian belief in Leto (rather than Hera) as consort of Zeus and queen of heaven (see on 95ff.). The address with χοῖρε is normally a sign of the ending, but this poet often treats the hymnic conventions in an idiosyncratic way, and this hymn is an unusual case in that the subject of the hymn is not the main character in most of it; Leto therefore deserves such an address, but it could not come at the end of the hymn (reserved for Apollo), so the poet has put it at the beginning. The lines also allow the poet to add a mention of Artemis. The similarity to 12f. is not a problem; in fact it is a neat link between the opening and this apostrophe (West 1966, 76f. lists some cases in Hesiod and Homer of "words in one sentence picked up in the next").

The address to Apollo in 19 is undeniably awkward, but it is still abrupt even without 14-18 (in 125ff. Leto's rejoicing is followed by an apostrophe of Apollo, but this is clearer as the title Φοῖβε is used). Cassola (1975, ad loc.) suggests that the change of addressee could be made clearer in oral delivery, by a pause before 19. Another possibility is that DAπ has imitated this line from PAπ, and used it awkwardly.

With the close link between 12f. and 14, the lines tie the opening scene still more closely to the theme of Apollo's birth alluded to here. The anticipation of the birth narrative is effective, not awkward; the subject is hinted at before being fully treated. Thus, even before the choice of theme in 19ff., the poet has made it quite clear what his theme will be. The relevance of 1-18 to the following narrative goes against the idea that these lines are a separate hymn to Leto that has been added (Wilamowitz 1916, 443 calls 1-18 "ein kleines Proœmium an Leto"). The opening line shows that this is the start of a hymn to Apollo, and 14-18, in spite of the use of χοῖρε, are not
designed as an ending (see below on 14); cf. the remarks of Janko (1981a, 17). The birth is alluded to at slightly greater length in 25ff.; on this sort of "spiral structure" in archaic poetry, cf. Thalmann 1984, 22-4.

14. χαίρε: on χαίρε in the Hymns see on 166, and prolegomena, 11f. Here there is no suggestion of the meaning "farewell" (which makes no sense followed by ἐπεὶ), and the sense "rejoice" is made clearer by the link with 12f.

μάκαρ ὦ Λητός: For this word order, cf. Od. 4.26, 8.408, 18.122, h. 26.11. For parallels with μάκαρ Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, ad loc.) cite Eur. Bacc. 565 μάκαρ ὦ Περίτα; Ar. Clouds 1205 μάκαρ ὦ Στρεψάδες; Orph. h. 3.12 Quandt μάκαρ ὦ Νόξ.

15. The closest parallel to this line is Th. 14 (cf. 918). The accusative *Ἀρτεμίν ἱκέαραν is used in these two places and also 159 below, but Homer only uses the nominative (9x). West (1966, 79) lists some examples of formulae used in the accusative in Hesiod but not in Homer. The etymology is uncertain; the most popular explanation is "scatterer of arrows" from ἱός and χέω (with the ending -αρα added by analogy with feminines like μάκαρα); see e.g. Hainsworth (in Heubeck, West and Hainsworth 1988) on Od. 6.102. However, this formation is unusual, and a better explanation is to derive it from ἱός and χέαρ (see Heubeck 1956); the development from *ghesr-ia > χέαρα parallels -ανερα < -αν-ia.

16. (= Orph. h. 35.5 Quandt). Miller (1986, 18) notes that Apollo’s birthplace is placed second here, to allow the poet to expand on it in the following lines.

*Ὀρτυγίη: it is not certain what place is meant by this, if any. Several places had the name Ortygia = "quail island" (see Schmidt 1942, 1520f. for full details). Delos itself was one, but here the two places are explicitly distinguished. This was probably a late identification, after the idea that Artemis and Apollo were both born
on Delos became popular (cf. schol. Ap. Rh. 1.419; Call. h. Ap. 59; Verg. Aen. 3.124; Hesych. s.v. 'Ọρτυγ(α). This implies that they were not always thought to be twins. Ortygia was also an island off Syracuse. Allen and Sikes dismiss the idea that this could be meant here; they do not say why, but presumably because of the Ionian milieu of the poem. However, this Ortygia should not be ruled out, since it is mentioned in early sources and associated with Artemis (Pi. Nem. 1.1f., Pyth. 2.7; cf. Hes. fr. 150.26 M.-W.). The association of Artemis and Ortygia may, however, have come to Syracuse from elsewhere (perhaps influenced by this line). Ephesus is another possibility: an Ortygia is located there by Strabo (14.639f.) and schol. Pi. Nem. 1, and supported for our passage by Wilamowitz (1916, 443) and Cassola (1975, ad loc.), who suggests that this would suit an Ionian audience. Allen and Sikes (1904) opt for Rheneia because of its proximity to Delos: the evidence for this is that Strabo (486) says that this island was once called Ortygia. This is perhaps the most plausible suggestion, but a decision on which place is meant is impossible, as with the Homeric mentions of Ortygia (see Stanford 1961-2, and Hoekstra, in Heubeck and Hoekstra 1989, on Od. 15.404). In fact the poet may not even have had a particular place in mind; he may simply have known Ortygia as the birthplace of Artemis.

17f. This is the first description of Apollo’s birth (see also 25ff., 115ff.) and it appears to be geographically precise, locating the birth near Mt. Cynthus, the palm tree and the river Inopus. It has been debated whether there was a version of the myth in which Apollo was born on Cynthus, and also whether his cult was on Cynthus before its move to the plain (the best discussion is Gallet de Santerre 1958, 115ff.). The oldest temples discovered are in the plain, and this was certainly where Apollo was thought to have been born in classical times. The earliest cults discovered on Cynthus are of Zeus and Hera, not Apollo or Artemis. Allen and Sikes (1904, on 16
and Appendix 1) argue that the birth is envisaged on the mountain in Ap. (both here and in 26), but that "in later times, beginning with Theognis, the scene was transferred to the plain below". Similarly Picard (1930, 229ff.) suggested that the cults and legends were transferred from the mountain to the plain. This view is, I think rightly, disputed by Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, ad loc.). One piece of evidence adduced by Allen and Sikes was the cave on the west slope of Cynthus that Lebègue (1876, 49ff.) thought was the earliest site of Apollo’s cult; but it was later proved that there was nothing in it earlier than the Hellenistic period (Gallet de Santerre 1958, 120f.). Neither archaeology nor other literary descriptions give any indication that his cult was originally located on Cynthus. Theognis 5ff. says that Leto grasped the palm-tree ἐπὶ τροχοειδέας λίμνη. Pi. pae. 12.8ff. (fr. 52m Snell-Maehler) describes Zeus watching the birth from the summit of Cynthus, but this does not mean that the birth was on the mountain. Eur. I.T. 1234ff. says that Leto bore him ἐν κορποφόροις γυάλοις, and then carried him ἀπὸ δειράδος εἰνολίας; but this last refers to the whole island, not specifically Cynthus — cf. χοιράς used of Delos at Aesch. Eum. 9; Eur. Tr. 89. Gallet de Santerre (1958, loc. cit.) points out that Apollo is given the title Kynthios only in literature, not in inscriptions (Call. h.Del. 10; Horace Odes 1.21.2; Servius ad Aen. 3.92; Steph. Byz. s.v. Δῆλος; schol. Lyc. 574). So why does DAp say that Leto leaned against Cynthus? Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, 203) argued that the birth is here located at the base of the mountain; this is argued in more detail by Le Roy (1973) and Förstel (1979, 363ff.). This is possible, but it is perhaps wrong to worry too much about what precise location is meant here, since the poet may not have meant to be accurate; he may just be naming prominent Delian landmarks which normally featured in poetic accounts of the birth (there must have been many Delian hymns). To say that the birth took place by the mountain, the palm and the river
seems to me to smack more of poetic licence than precise geography. There seems to be a contradiction between Leto’s position here (and in 26) and 117; how can she have clasped the palm tree and leaned against the mountain? Again this is probably to press the details too closely: 17f. and 25ff. are overviews, mentioning prominent features of the island, and 117 is more of a "close-up" describing her posture more precisely (cf. Miller 1986, 47f. n.117).

17. κεκλιμένη πρός: in Homer κεκλίμεν- is always followed by a dative, and most often comes after the first foot: cf. e.g. Il. 11. 371, 21.549; Od. 6.307, 17.97. So κεκλιμένη πρός is surprising here, and would most naturally mean "incli ned towards" rather than "leaning against": the closest parallel seems to be Hdt. 4.73 ξόλα ες δάληα κεκλιμέναι (and cf. 24 below εις δάλα κεκλίμεναι). At 26 κλινθείσα πρός is used: this is easier because the aorist has a stronger passive sense than the perfect of this verb, and so this is the passive of the normal κλίνω τι πρός τι - cf. in particular Call. h. Del. 209f. (which must have Ap. in mind) ἐκλίθη φοίνικος ποτὶ πρέμνον; Il. 6.467f. ὁ παῖς πρὸς κόλπον ἐυζωνοι τιθήνης/ ἐκλίνθη; Archil. fr. 36 West πρός τοίχον ἐκλίνθησαν.

μακρὸν δρός καὶ Κύνθων δϭθον: this is an awkward phrase. The καὶ here is explained by Denniston (1954, 291) under the heading of "linking appositionally related ideas"; he translates it here as "and in particular", which I think is not quite right because the two phrases refer to the same thing, the second one in a more precise way; "i.e." is a better translation. Cf. Il. 5.398 πρός δῷα Διδ καὶ μακρὸν Ὄλυμπον; Eur. Bacch. 919 δίσσας δὲ Θῆβας καὶ πόλισμ’ ἐπτάστομον; Hdt. 9.25.2 ἐς τούτον δὴ τὸν χώρον καὶ ἑπὶ τὴν κρήνην τὴν Γαργαφῆν. The same explanation is given by Humbert (1954, 412f.), who translates "s’appuyant sur la vaste montagne et (= précisément) l’ escarpement de Cynthe." Κύνθων δϭθον also occurs
at Eur. I.T. 1098. ὑθος is not in Homer or Hesiod, so probably first here (the word
is not otherwise attested before the fifth century, so this could be another argument
for this passage’s lateness).

ἄχριτω φοινικος: The palm tree on Delos, one of the famous sights of the
island, is mentioned in Homer: Odysseus compares Nausicaa to the palm he saw there
Ἀπόλλωνος παρά βωμόφ (6.162f.) The mention of the altar implies that the tree
was sacred to Apollo, and so Homer probably knew its role in the birth. It is also
1099. Later an olive tree was often mentioned instead of or as well as the palm. At
Eur. I.T. 1102 the olive is called Λατοῦς ὅδιντ φίλον; cf. Cat. 34.5-8; Hyg. Fab.
140.4; Strab. 639. Some try to have the best of both worlds by making Leto hold
onto both trees (Schol. Lyc. 401); both are linked to the birth in Callimachus’ Delian
Gallet de Santerre 1958, 193-5. The site of the palm has been debated; in classical
times the palm was certainly shown to pilgrims by the sanctuaries in the plain. Our
passage has been taken to show that there was a palm on the mountain (so Rubensohn
1931, col. 383 suggested two palms, the one by Apollo’s altar seen by Odysseus and
the one grasped by Leto), but this is misguided, for the reasons already outlined.
ἄχχοτατω is seen by Kirk (1966, 168) as a sign of lateness, because it is a doublet
of the traditional ἄχριστον. But Janko (1982, 101) points out that ἄχριστον only
occurs once in Homer (Od. 5.280), and for the form Càssola compares ἐκαστάτω (ll.
10.113) and τῆλοτάτω (Od. 7.322). It is probably Ionic, not an Atticism as Zumbach
(1955, 27) and Kirk (1966, 168) suggest, since it is quite common in Herodotus, but
absent from Thucydides and Plato.

ὑπ’ Ἰνοποιο βεσθορις: The Inopus is mentioned at Call. h. Del. 4, h. Art. 171;
Lyc. 576; Paus. 2.5.3. ὑπ’ is difficult here, so Reiz’ emendation ἐπ’ is probably correct. ἐπ’ was read by nineteenth-century editors, Allen and Sikes (1904) and now Cassola (1975); ὑπ’ was kept by Allen (1912), Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936) and Humbert (1936). For the variation between ἐπι and ὑπὸ with places cf. Il. 2.616; Od. 9.284. There are possible parallels for this use of ὑπὸ with a river: at Il. 21.87 all MSS have ὑπὸ Σατνιδεντὶ. Strabo (605) reads ἐπί, and comments γράφουσι δὲ τινὲς οὐκ ἐν ὑπὸ Σατνιδεντὶ, ὃς ὑπὸ ὅρια Σατνιδεντὶ κειμένης τῆς πόλεως; at 619 he has ὑπὸ according to the MSS, but editors read ἐπί (Corais). Ap.Rh. 2.794 has ὑψ’ εἰσιμεναῖς ὕπτοτο. For ὑπὸ with places cf. Il. 2.866; Od. 1.186; Aesch. Ag. 860; Eur. Hec. 764 (see Schwzyer 1939-53, 2.526). Some want ὑπὸ to have its usual sense "under" here, arguing that if the birth is at the foot of the mountain the river flows down from above (Wilamowitz 1916, 443 n.3, who remarks "wer das Tal beschritten hat, in dem der Bach herabkommt, wird sich über die Präposition nicht wundern"; Le Roy 1973, 284ff.; Förstel 1979, 363). As I have said, I do not think these lines are so geographically precise, so the vaguer ἐπί is more likely. ἰθῷοτος is a short dative plural (on these cf. Chantraine 1948-53, 1.194ff.; Janko 1982, 54ff.). Here it is the result of adapting the pattern -οτο ἰθῷοτο (3x Il., 2x Od., Th. 695).
19-29. The poet wonders in what way to sing of Apollo, since the choice is so wide, and opts for the story of his birth on Delos.

19ff. The praise of a poem's subject by this sort of "aporetic priamel", in which the poet praises his subject by claiming to be spoilt for choice and suggests other possible themes, is common in later poetry (see the discussions of Bundy 1972; Race 1982a, 47-9; Miller 1986, 20-31). The technique is used in Homer (cf. Od. 9.14f. τι πρώτον τοι ἔπειτα, τι δ' ύστατον καταλέξω/ κήδε' ἔπει ομο πολλά κτλ.): some other examples are Theoc. 17.7-12; Pi. Isthm. 7. 1-21; Call. h. Del. 29ff., h. Art. 183ff., h. Ap. 28-31. 19 here = 207, where there is also a choice of theme. West (1975, 164) thinks that this passage is an imitation of 207ff., since in the latter passage alternatives are actually proposed, whereas here there is no real questioning: the poet just selects a theme. He calls this "a perfunctory treatment", but says nothing of 20-4, which express in a different way from 207ff. the wide variety of possibilities open to the poet (and this passage is much clearer than 208-13, even if the latter passage has suffered corruption in our MSS). There is no reason why such a question should require an enumeration of alternatives: is 19ff. more "perfunctory" than for instance Il. 1.8f. τίς τ' ἔρων ἡμῶν ἔριδι ξυνήκε μόχυμεθα; Αὐτοὺς καὶ Διός υἱός? (See further on 25). 20ff. are a little surprising in that they give a list of places where we expect a list of possible themes. For this reason among others 20-4 were suspected by analytical critics. Baumeister (1860, ad loc.) calls the lines "Versus quinque male huc illati et omni modo eiiciendi" and believes that 25 should follow 19 directly. But the passage serves a purpose: the wide variety of choice is expressed in geographical terms, thus emphasising the wide spread of Apollo's worship. This also leads neatly to the description of the chosen theme, Apollo's birth on the island of
Delos (the stress in 25-8 is on the situation of the island rather than the details of the birth). The sequence of thought is similar to that in 140-6, where 144-5 are a repetition of 22-3 (see commentary ad loc.). The passage also prepares the way for the catalogue of places in 30ff.; after a general panoramic description of mountains, headlands, rivers and coasts comes a specific list of places in which the scenery is similar. As the choice of theme moves from this wide range of places to focus on Delos, so the narrative moves from Leto’s wanderings around the Aegean (though this only becomes clear at the end of the catalogue) to her arrival on Delos and what happened there. An emphasis on the wide area of Apollo’s domain is a feature of both parts of the hymn: cf. 29, 80ff., 140ff., 247-53 (= 287-93) and the three geographical catalogues (30-45, 216-85, 409-39) which between them cover the Aegean, Northern Greece and the Peloponnese (cf. Clay 1989, 57; Baltes 1982, 42, and see on 30ff. below).

The posing of this question displays a more explicit artistic self-consciousness than is usual in early epic. This is a feature of DAp in particular (see commentary on 165-78) and is one of the ways in which it shows the influence of lyric poetry (see prolegomena, 111f.). It is true that Homer does ask questions of the Muse, for instance at the start of both epics, and in the prologue to the catalogue of ships (Il. 2.484-93) reflects on his inability to recount the list of forces without the Muse’s help. Here the Muse is not mentioned (though the question is addressed to Apollo) and the poet is more direct in his use of the first person: there is no suggestion that the Muse (or Apollo) needs to tell the story for the poet, as there is in the Homeric passages. On invocations of the Muse, see de Jong 1987, 45-53, with bibliography.

19. This is the first apostrophe of Apollo in the hymn (see on 120), and the direct address is awkward coming after the lines addressed to Leto (see on 14-18). Janko
(1981a, 17) points out that the poet uses Φοίβε in the next line to make it quite clear who is being addressed.

τ' ἄρ: this, Barnes' emendation of the MSS' γάρ, seems certain in spite of the attempts of Forderer (1971, 65f.) and Miller (1986, 28 n.71) to defend it. I cannot see what sense γάρ would make here, and τ' ἄρ is confirmed by 207 (the γάρ may have come from the line below). For τ' ἄρ in questions, cf. e.g. Il. 18.188 πῶς τ' ἄρ ἰω μετὰ μόλον, 1.8, 11.838, and see Chantraine 1948-53, 2.340; Ruijgh 1971, 804ff.; Denniston 1954, 533f.

ὑμνήσω: this verb is not in Homer, and the noun only occurs at Od. 8.429. It is used eleven times in the Hymns (five of them in Ap.), and eight in Hesiod (7x Th., 1x Op.). On the meaning of ὑμνος see prolegomena, 7.

ἐυμνων: this could mean either "worthy of song, easy to sing of" or "celebrated in many hymns" (so LSJ s.v.). Call. h. Ap. 30f., an adaptation of our passage, uses the former meaning in οὖν ὁ χορὸς τοῦ Φοίβου ἔφ' ἐν μόνον ἡμιμέρ ἀείσει. ἐστι γάρ εὐμνος. τις δὲν ὢν ἀμὴ Φοίβου ἀείδου; This is probably also the sense at Call. h. Del. 4, fr. 229.1 Pfeiffer. In Ap. either meaning is possible; the following lines explain 19, as γάρ in 20 shows, but the sense of 20 is debatable (see below) and the point could be either that there is a wide range of places in which Apollo takes pleasure, and so would enjoy a song about any of them, or that there are many places that please Apollo because he is (already) sung of there. The former is better.

Wilamowitz (1916, 443 n.1) thinks that both ideas are present: "an jedem Fleck der Erde liegt ein Lied von ihm, besser seine Grundlage, ein apollonischer Stoff, der besungen ist oder besungen werden kann" (cf. Jacoby 1933a, 703). The expression of the range of choices in a geographical form has the advantages that I have outlined, but is slightly illogical, or at least the logic is not made clear.
20: Φοῖβε: this title is used 9x (3 in apostrophe) in DAp, 10x in PAp (none in apostrophe, 8 in the Homeric formula Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων which in DAp is only used once (130)). The meaning of Φοῖβος is not certain. The link with φῶβος proposed by Schmid 1923 (and cautiously supported by Kretschmer 1926-7, 199) is implausible: Schmid sees it as a lengthened form, but in that case we would expect "Φουβος. More attractive is the explanation "purifier" supported by Usener 1896, 332f.; Wilamowitz 1931-2, 2.36; Ruipérez 1953; Cassola 1975 ad loc. Ruiperez cites a gloss in Hesychius, ἀφικτον- ἀκόθαρτον as evidence for a root "bheig" - "purify" to which Φοῖβος would be related as ἀοιδὸς to ἀετεῖν, πομπὸς to πέμπειν etc. Cf. Chantraine 1968-80, Frisk 1960-70 s.v.

νομὸς βεβλήσατοι φθῆς: This is a difficult phrase. The MSS' νόμος gives us a singular subject with a plural verb. Allen, Halliday and Sikes attempt to defend this, but none of the Homeric examples they cite is certain (the best they can come up with is Od. 3.438, where "several MSS. have θεὰ κεχαροαίτ' Ἰδουσα") and these must be cases where scribes (or singers) have not understood that this type of verb is plural. So either νόμος should be emended to νομοί (Matthiae) or βεβλήσατοι φθῆς to βεβλῆται ἀοιδῆς (Ludwich 1908, 184; Laroche 1949, 172). Another possibility is to read νομοί βεβλήσατ' ἀοιδῆς (Ilgen 1796, Cassola 1975 ad loc.). The reading νομοί βεβλήσαται involves the fewest changes and is also supported by Od. 11.193f. πάντῃ οἴ...χρησιμολατὶ βεβλήσαται εὐνοι. Is it supported by the meaning? There is disagreement over whether to read νομοί or νομοί here. The more satisfactory explanation is to read the latter, comparing Il. 20. 249 ἐπέων δὲ πολὺς νομὸς ἔνθα καὶ ἐνθα ("a wide field for words to go this way and that", Edwards 1991 ad loc.) and Op. 403 ἀχρεῖος δ' ἤστατι ἐπέων νομὸς. West (1978, on 403) glosses the phrase in Ap. "there is wide scope for singing about you" which gives a satisfactory sense.
If this is right, then the singular νομός is preferable (this is read by West, loc.cit.). However, I am not convinced by this as an interpretation of Op. 403, where something like "all your expenditure of words" seems more natural (so LSJ s.v.); this could be related to the scholiast's explanation of νομός at Il. 20.249 as νέμησις "apportioning". Could νομοὶ ἀοιδής here mean something like "your portions of song, those that fall to you"? In any case νομός or νομοι seems preferable. νόμος in a musical sense is first found at Alcman fr. 40 PMG οἴδα τ' ὀρνίχου νόμοσ. In this sense it seems appropriate to the context of 20, but what would νόμοι ἀοιδής mean? A possible parallel is Od. 8.429 ὄμνος ἀοιδής, but the meaning of ὄμνος there is uncertain. The meaning of βεβλήστατα is also tricky here. In the closest verbal parallel, Od. 11.194 quoted above, it means "laid out, spread" and the meaning here is probably similar (for similar uses of βάλλω in Homer, cf. Od. 7.96f., 10.352; it is used of laying foundations at Pin. Pyth. 4.245, 7.4). This would make most sense with the meaning "scope, field" which on the whole seems best here. There is no need to emend φόδης to ἀοιδής: the contracted form is not in Homer, but Ap. is post-homeric, and it is used at Dem. 494, and Th. 48 (though this is spurious according to West (1966) ad loc.).

21. Cf. Aph. 5 ἤμεν δὸς ἡπειρος πολλὰ τρέφει ἡδ' ὅσα πόντος, also Th. 582, 964; Cypria fr. 7.9ff Davies. The commonest contrast is between land and sea, but ἡπειρος/νῆσοι is also a natural pairing, particularly from an islander’s point of view, such as would suit a hymn performed on Delos (cf. Od. 13.234f., 14.97f.); the mention of islands is also natural in this passage leading to the choice of Apollo’s birth on Delos as a theme.

πορττιτρόφον: "calf-rearing". This word is only elsewhere found at Bacchylides 11.30. Janko (1982, 28) suggests the poet may have known the line quoted above
from Aph., and that the phrase πολλάκ τρέφει suggested an adjective beginning with πο-.

22-3 (=144-5). See on 144f. for discussion of this repetition, which analytical critics saw as a reason to reject the lines here, because they are more obviously appropriate to a description of Apollo's favourite haunts.

πάσαν δὲ σκοπιαὶ...καὶ πρόφονες ἄκροι: cf. Il. 8.557, 16 299. Here the formula is used slightly differently and the two parts are split by a verb.

tοι ἄδων: cf. Aph. 10 πόλεμοι τε ἄδων καὶ ἔργον Ἀρης, 18, 21; 14.3f.; Th. 917, 926. The precise form is not Homeric, but cf. Il. 12.80 ἄδε δι᾽ Ἐκτορὶ μόθος ἀπήμων; Il. 14.340, 17.647, Od. 16.28 τοι εὐαδεὶ(ν). Here the digamma is neglected, as also at 75 below and Th. 926. At 144 τε φύλακι is used (see commentary ad loc.).

Note the movement of 22-4 from the mountain peaks and headlands to rivers running seawards and then to the coast, which all leads neatly on to the mention of Delos (see Roux 1964, 4-6). Cf. Alcman fr. 89 PMG, which has a similar movement from mountains to the sea, and some of the same elements (ὄρεων κορυφαῖ, πρόφονες, βένθεσι πορφυρέας ἀλός).

23. υψηλῶν ὄρεων: common at the start of a line; cf. e.g. Il. 12.282 υψηλῶν ὄρεων κορυφάς καὶ πρόφονας ἄκρους; Od. 9.192.

ποταμῷ θ' ὀλαὶ προφέστες: a formula used by Homer and Hesiod (Od. 10.351; Il. 5.598; Op. 757), but only here in the nominative.

24. ἀκταῖ τ' εἰς ἀλα κεκλιμέναι: Cf. on 17 above. I commented there that κεκλιμένα- with πρός or εἰς would most naturally mean "inclined towards" or "sloping towards", so this is easier of ἀκταί than of Leto leaning against a mountain; in Homer, though, similar phrases take a dative (Od. 13.234f. ἢ ὑς τις ἀκτή/κεῖθ' ἀλα κεκλιμένη, 4.607f. νῆσων ... αἱ θ' ἀλα κεκλίσται).
λιμένες τε θολόσσης: this is used in the accusative at *Od.* 5.418, 440.

22-4 are made up of Homeric formulae but with slight differences. These are not necessarily adaptations, except in 22; for all we know, λιμένες τε θολόσσης or ποταμοῖ . . . προεόντες may be the original forms of these formulae; cf. prolegomena, 71ff.

25ff. Here the poet announces his theme, though it has already been foreshadowed in 14-18, and in the depiction of Leto’s joy in her son. There is no need for the poet to state that this is the chosen theme: the structure of the passage makes it clear, with the expansion of the idea in 27ff. (cf. Race 1982a, 48). The birth description here echoes the first in 26, with κλινθεῖσα πρὸς Κόννθου δρός (cf. 17) and κρανωτῇ ἐνὶ νῆσῳ (cf. 16), but then takes a different tack, stressing the situation of Delos as a rocky and windswept island. The bleak picture of the winds and waves beating on the island makes the contrast in 29 more effective: it is from this unpromising beginning that Apollo has become sovereign over all mortals (cf. Miller 1986, 22ff.; Förstel 1979, 111; prolegomena, 57). Delos too reaches greatness in spite of her situation. This is an important theme of the hymn: Delos is small, rocky and barren (cf. 64f., 72), yet because of the greatness of the god who is born on her she becomes a rich and famous sanctuary; this is symbolised by her gilding at 135ff., and depicted in the description of the festival (146ff.).

25. The phrasing is similar to the introduction of the chosen theme in 214.

姮: this is read by most editors (Gemoll 1886 is the most recent exception). Denniston (1954, 283) lists examples of姮 “introducing a suggested answer, couched in interrogative form, to a question just asked.” Cf. *II.* 1.203ff., 20.16f.; *Aesch. Ag.* 1542; *Soph. O.T.* 622. In all these cases the suggested answer follows the question directly, another argument against the assertion that 19 requires an enumeration of
alternative themes (see above on 19ff.). Race (1982a, 48 n.39 and 1982b, 7 n.5) wants to read ἡ here; he compares 214 and Call. Ἡ. Del. 30 (which imitates Ἀρ.): ἡ ὡς τὰ πρῶτα. But 25 is not disjunctive, as he claims: no alternatives have been suggested. The examples he cites of ἡ at the end of a priamel without disjunctive force are all later.

πρῶτον: this is used in similar phrases at II. 6.345 ὥστε μὲ πρῶτον τέκε μήτηρ; Od. 19.355, 14.141, 4.13. Hence it is best to take it as adverbial here, simply referring to the beginning of Apollo’s life, though it could be adjectival, meaning that Apollo was the eldest child, as at Aph. 22 ἡ πρῶτη τέκε μήτηρ. τὸ πρῶτον is used in 214, where it is also ambiguous. πρῶτον is common in Ἀρ. and is used of origins at 71, 80, 237 and 493. Pace Miller (1986, 23), πρῶτον here does not suggest that this is merely the first topic the poet is going to treat. Poets like to stress that they are beginning at the beginning -- cf. e.g. II. 1.6 ἔξ ὦ δὴ τὰ πρῶτα; Th. 108 εἶπε δ’ ὡς τὰ πρῶτα θεῖοι καὶ γαῖα γένοντο; Virg. Aen. 1 qui primus ab oris; Milton, P.L. 1 "Of man’s first disobedience".

χάριμα βροτοῖσι: a common formula type in birth descriptions: the same phrase is used at II. 11.325; cf. also 306 πῆμα βροτοῖσιν and 364 δῆλημα βροτοῖσιν; Od. 11.287; Hes. fr. 193.19 Merkelbach-West. Here Apollo’s benefits to mortals are stressed (this phrase is illustrated by the description of the festival), in 29 his power over them.

26. κλινθεῖσα: see on 17 above. κεκλιμένη would be more normal to describe someone leaning against something. Homer only uses compounds of this participle; the closest parallel is Od. 4.794, 18.189 ἔδει δ’ ἀνοκλινθεῖσα;

Κόνθοι δρος: the Mss. read Κόνθος, but the masculine is used in 141, and early epic uses a genitive in this type of phrase -- cf. 34, 35, 40 below.
26-7. κραναξ ἐν νῆσῳ, Δήλῳ ἐν ὁμφαρῷ τῆς: Cf. Il. 2.721f. ὀλλ᾽ ὦ μὲν ἐν νῆσῳ κεῖτο . . . Λήμυνῳ ἐν ἕγαθε, and possibly also Il. 1.30.

27. Δήλῳ ἐν ὁμφαρῷ τῆς: this is an adaptation of the formula νῆσῳ ἐν ὁμφαρῷ τῆς, used in this position at Od. 1.50 and 198, 12.283; cf. Ap. 251, 291 ὁμφαρῷ τοῖς κατὰ νῆσος. Od. 11.325 has Δῆλ ἐν ἄ. ὁμφαρῷ τοῖς is a common epithet of islands in Greek poetry: cf. Th. 983; Dem. 491; Pi. Isthm. 1.8.

27-8. Kirk (1981, 169) states: "I cannot explain "from each side dark wave came out to the shore with swift-blowing winds". Its homeric elements are re-organised to give an obscure sense, which might however have fitted some different context." His translation seems designed to maximise the obscurity, but the clause is awkward. It is perhaps too pedantic to worry that ἔκατερθὲ is used of an island, which has more than two sides. Cantilenā (1980, 109ff.) discusses this in some detail, and concludes that this makes sense because of the oblong shape of Delos, with two longer sides, and its position in a channel between Rheneia and Mykonos. The main difficulty is the meaning of ἐξήετ. Translators give various sense, which are not really possible for ἐξείμητ: "i neri flutti battevano la spiaggia" (Càssola 1975); "a dark wave rolled on landwards" (Evelyn-White 1914); "la vague sombre s’avancait vers la terre" (Humbert 1936). The sense must be that the waves beat on the shore of Delos: χέρσος is often used in such contexts in Homer -- cf. Od. 9.147 κύματα . . . κυλινδόμενα προτι χέρσον; Il. 4.425, 14.394; Od. 7.278, 9.485f. Moreover the form is Attic, and there are no other definite Atticisms in DAp. -ῃετ is found in Homer, at Il. 10.286, 13.247, Od. 8. 290, but all these are at the verse end, where the original form was probably -ῃε (see Chantraine 1948-53, 1.285-6). Hence Cantilenā’s (1980) emendation ἐξείετ is probably right. The error would be a simple itacistic one. ἐπὶ meaning "flow", with the object understood, occurs at Od. 7.130, 11.239. The compound is normally used
of rivers flowing into the sea (e.g. Hdt. 1.180.1, 6.20; Thuc. 4.103.1) but makes sense of waves breaking on a shore: at any rate the sense is better than with ἔξηει.

κύμα κελαίνυον: found once in Homer, at Il. 9.6: the more usual phrase is κύμα θαλάσσης (Il. 1.496, 4.422 etc.). Here its use reinforces the bleak atmosphere of the lines.

λιγυνοίοις ἀνέμοισιν: λιγυνοίοις is a ἀπαξ λεγ. Cf. Od. 4.567 Ζεφύρῳ λίγῳ πνεύμοντος. The construction is unusual. The closest Homeric parallel is Il. 12.207 πέτετο πνοιῆς ἀνέμοιο, where the dative is probably comitative, since it is a shortened form of the expression δμα π. ἃ. A closer parallel is Ap. Rh. 1.600, 4.1624, πνοὴ Ζεφύρῳ θέεσκον (of a ship), where the dative seems to be instrumental, as also in the hymn, with a verb like "driven by" understood (cf. Chantraine 1948-53, 2.75).

29. On the contrast between this and the preceding lines see above on 25ff. In 68f. it is said that Apollo will rule over men and gods (see commentary ad loc.). In structural terms this could be the end of a hymn (or of the part before the χοίρε), with its move to the present tense after a birth description no briefer than in some of the short hymns (see prolegomena, 9ff.). The audience would not have known whether there would be a long birth narrative to follow, but there have already been indications that this will be a long hymn: the whole prologue is elaborate, and the careful choice of theme suggests it will be treated at some length.

ἐνθεν ἀπορνύμενοι: cf. Th. 9 ἐνθεν ἀπορνύμεναι (of the Muses).
30-44. A list of places ruled over by Apollo - or of places passed through by Leto in her search for somewhere to give birth?

This is the first of the geographical catalogues in the hymn. The others are in PAp, one describing Apollo’s wanderings in search of a site for an oracle (216-86), the other his voyage with the Cretans to Delphi (409-39). As I noted above (on 19ff.), both parts of the poem stress the wide extent of Apollo’s power. There is a problem with this catalogue in that it seems to begin as an account of places ruled by Apollo, and finish as a list of places visited by Leto. Opinions have differed as to whether this double connection is possible, and if so whether it is skilful or clumsy. The connection at the end is clear, so there are two possibilities: either the list does serve a double purpose, or we can put a full stop at the end of 29, and take the list purely as a description of Leto’s wanderings. The dual purpose is accepted by Wilamowitz 1916, 444; Kalinka 1932, 390; Dornseiff 1933, 5; Drerup 1937, 115; Fränkel 1960, 72 n.4; Koller 1968, 20ff.; Forderer 1971, 70-72; West 1975, 164; Kirk 1981, 169f.; Baltes 1982, 26; Race 1982a, 49; Miller 1986, 31-4; Clay 1989, 33. In favour of punctuating after 29 are Jacoby 1933, 703; Allen, Halliday and Sikes 1936, ad loc.; Cássola 1975 ad loc.; Förstel 1979, 111. It seems best to accept the double connection, largely because, as Miller puts it "it makes such good syntactical and rhetorical sense construed in either direction." Kirk (1981, 169) rightly states that "there can be no conceivable doubt that normal oral composition ... would not allow a mammoth sentence of 16 verses, such as 30-45, in which the grammatical and semantic resolution is left to the end." It is irresistible to connect 30 with 29 if one does not know what is coming: Förstel (1979, 111) and Baltes (1982, 26) suggest that in oral performance there would have been a pause after 29, but this does not really
remove the difficulty. If we punctuate after 29, there is a long list with no indication until the end of what it refers to: the awkwardness remains on either view (this was why Hermann (1806) postulated a lacuna after 29). The list begins as a list of peoples (ὥσσον), whereas τόσσον at the end is purely geographical. Why begin it as a list of peoples if it functions only as a list of places passed through by Leto? It is the lands she asks to receive her, not the people (see on 46). Another argument in favour of its dual purpose is that it is a list of places with little elaboration. This means that the illusion of its being purely a list of places ruled over by Apollo can be kept up until the end (see below on the contrast with the catalogues in *PAp*). The lack of verbs is particularly important, since it means the poet does not have to indicate whether the list refers to the past or the present (a similar technique is used in 140-6, to make the transition back from narrative to the present). However, those who advocate a stop at the end of 29 are right to point out that the list seems suitable for Leto’s wanderings, but not as a catalogue of places ruled by Apollo. It is not a list of places famous for cults of the god (see Allen, Halliday and Sikes 1936, ad loc.; Förstel 1979, 111), but of islands and landmarks of the Aegean coast: mountains are especially prominent, and Janko (1992, on *Il.* 13.17-20) imagines Leto striding from peak to peak. The movement around the Aegean also suits Leto’s wanderings: beginning from Crete, the poet describes a circle of the coasts and islands of the Aegean, gradually approaching Delos and finishing at Rheneia, the closest island to Delos. This does not mean it cannot be a list of places under Apollo’s domain; we have just been told that he is sung of on the mainland and islands, that peaks, rivers, headlands and harbours please him. The catalogue says the same using the names of specific places: they need not be places famous for particular cults of Apollo.

If the catalogue does have this dual function, does it serve a poetic purpose? Race
(1982a, 49) calls it "one of the most delightful surprises in Greek literature", whereas to Kirk (1981, 170) it is "clumsy", a "bare-faced manipulation". I think it is effective, though at the cost of a certain awkwardness -- in fact typical of the style of DAp. Race (1982a, 49 n.43) compares the simile at Od. 23. 233-40; this comes at the point of Odysseus' reunion with Penelope, and compares the feelings of sailors who have reached land after a shipwreck. This naturally seems apt for Odysseus, but in fact the simile ends ὅς ἀρα τὴν ἀσπαστος ἐν πόσις. Thus Penelope's sufferings are linked to her husband's and we are reminded that it has been a long journey for her too. I suspect that if the device used in DAp were in Homer, it would be highly praised. Part of its function is to make the transition from a timeless or present tense section to the narrative; and it enables the narrative to open strikingly in medias res, with no preamble about, say, Apollo's conception. Of course the poet can do this because the story was a familiar one to his audience. It has also been pointed out that the connection shows that the places that rejected Leto are now ruled over by Apollo (cf. Kalinka 1932, 390; Forderer 1971, 71; Race 1982a, 49f.; Miller 1986, 33f). Fränkel (1955, 72 n.4) comments that the cult of Apollo in these areas is here traced to his visit while still in his mother's womb.

Catalogues of various sorts are of course common in early epic. Probably the best parallel to the catalogues of places in Ap. is the catalogue of ships in Iliad 2, which is as much a list of places as of forces. Here we have pretty much a bare list, though there is some attempt to give it variety: some lines contain two place names, some three, and 37-8 both have one. Some places are given an epithet, some have other types of description (Lesbos has both), some are just named. This catalogue is less skilful than some: the poet is fond of ending a line with a place in the genitive plus a phrase like ὅς ἀρα ἁπάντω (as I noted above, mountains are prominent in this
catalogue), and this construction is over-used (33-5, 39-41) which leads to a lack of variety at points. One question that the epithets raise is whether they are specific to the places named or simply conventional. The answer is probably the latter. The epithets are of the sort that could be applied to a wide variety of places (bright, windy, rocky etc.), and although these epithets are mostly Homeric and many of the places are mentioned in Homer, the only cases where places have the same description in this list and Homer are 36 (Lemnos), 37 (Lesbos) and 41 (Mycale). It is not that the epithets are applied randomly, but they are chosen from a store of stock epithets for places. Whether a particular place receives an epithet or not is partly determined by metrical considerations: there are (as is usual) more epithets in the second half of the line, and the places which are simply named mostly come at the start of lines that contain three places (32, 35, 44, and also Crete in 30, Miletus in 42). Kirk (1985, 173ff.) reaches similar conclusions about the epithets in the Homeric catalogue of ships.

30. Cf. II. 2.845 δισσος τος Ελλησπόντου άγαρρος έντος ένργει; 2.616f.; 24.544f. The last passage begins with δισσον Λέσβος and ends των, which parallels δισσος...τόσον here.

Κρήτη: Crete is a natural place to begin a circuit of the Aegean ending at Delos, and Apollo was certainly important there, so I see no need to link this specifically with PAp as does Baltes (1981, 26 n.7), who comments: "Von Kreta holt Apollo seine Priester, von Kreta stammt der Paian."

δήμος Αθηνών: this could possibly be a verbal echo of II. 24.776 δήμος άπείρων. δήμος is here used in its original sense of "land, territory" or the country, as opposed to the πόλις. This is illustrated by Od. 11.14 Κιμμέριων άνδρον δήμος τε πόλις τε. The contracted genitive Αθηνών is post-homeric: the Odyssey uses
'Αθηνᾶων at 3.278 (at the line end), and 'Αθηνᾶων at 3.307, 11.323.

31. νοωσικεῖτη: this is only found once in Homer (Od. 6.22), and used of a person, not a place so there is a slight shift in meaning here (νοωσικεῖτος also occurs 6x Od., 5x of the Phaeacians, once of Phoenicians). 31 (with the necessary emendation Αίγινη for the MSS Αίγινα) is entirely spondaic. On the question of spondaic lines in Homer see Pye 1964. Some of these are hard to alter, so there seems no reason to deny that such lines are possible. Here we can obtain dactyls by reading νοωσικεῖτη or 'Εὐβοῖα (see Janko 1992, 14 n.19), but this is not necessary.

32. Αἰγαί: there were several places of this name, but the only one that fits here was in Euboea. Strabo (8.386, 9.405) says that this was on the west coast to the north of Chalcis, and that there was a temple of Poseidon situated on a mountain there. This may be the Αἰγαί where Poseidon had a palace, mentioned at Il. 13.21 (see Janko 1992 ad loc.), Od. 5.381. Cássola (1975, ad loc.) needlessly denies that this is meant here, on the grounds that it is on the landward side of Euboea and that Euboea has already been named. He prefers to see it as an island off Euboea: Hesychius says Αἰγαί· νῆσος πρὸς τῇ Εὔβοιᾳ and the scholia to Od. 5.381 assert that it was an island that in their time was submerged. Another possibility has been suggested by M.B. Wallace (my only knowledge of this comes from Fowler 1988, 101 n.20), who identifies it with the promontory of Philagra in the south-east of Euboea between Carystus and Caphereus (where the Greek ships were wrecked on their way home from Troy). This would certainly fit the type of place mentioned in this list.

τ' Ἐλέρεστια: Pliny (N.H. 4.23) mentions an island Iresia in the Thermaic gulf. Imber (1979) identifies it with the modern Pipéri, since on a sixteenth-century Turkish chart this is marked Hirsiz, which could be a corruption of Iresia; this is probably
meant here. Ruhnken emended to Πειρεστα, which is in Thessaliotis, too far inland to be likely in this context. Another objection to Ruhnken's emendation is that it would create an instance of asyndeton (see on 35).

ἀχισάλη: this is more logically used of a coastal city, as at Il. 2.640, 697, but it is also used of an island at Soph. Aj. 135 Σαλαμίνος ἀχισάλου.

33. Ὀρηκίκος τ' Ἄθως: is the use of Ὀρηκίκος here influenced by the following line, where it is necessary for clarity? The geographical order is reversed here, but this is not significant within a single line, where metre can determine the order.

ἀκρα κάρηνα: the phrase is not in Homer but cf. Il. 2.735 λευκά κάρηνα (which is not a doublet as it starts with a consonant).

34. Ὀρηκική τε Σάμος: Samothrace is also called Σάμος Ὀρηκική at Il. 13.12 to distinguish it from Ionian Samos (here mentioned in 41). At Il. 24.78, 753 it is called simply Samos.

Ἰδης τ' δρεα σκιδεντα: cf. Herm. 70 Πιερτης...δραε σκιδεντα. The phrase is also used at Il. 1.157, Od. 7.268, in neither case with a name.

35. This is the most serious departure from geographical order: Scyros and Phocaea ought to come after Lesbos. Samothrace, Imbros and Lemnos would naturally be listed together, as at Il. 24.753. It is possible the line has been misplaced, and Humbert in his Budé edition puts it after 37. This line is also the only case of asyndeton in the list. West (1966, on Th. 245) gives examples of the omission of a copula in epic lists, which normally occurs only after the first name in the line, as here.

Αὐτοκάνης δρος οὕτω: this name is known from a coin with the inscription ΑΥΤΟΚΑΝΑ (see Head 1911, 478). Hdt. 7.42 refers to a Κόνης δρος in Aeolis, and
Strabo (65) says this is opposite the S. point of Lesbos. There was a town named 
Κάναν near, on which see Oldfather 1919. For the phrase cf. 40, 428; II. 2.603, 
829 etc.

36. Ίμβρος τ' εύκτιμήν: εύκτίμενος is used of an island at Od. 9.130, where 
Heubeck (in Heubeck and Hoekstra 1989, ad loc.) translates "good to live in". It 
implies that the place has been cultivated by humans (cf. Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. 
κτίζω). It is also (surprisingly) used of Delos in 102 (see commentary ad loc.). The 
word is used in various expressions in Homer, but always in the same place in the line 
(after the feminine caesura) except at Od. 23.259. At 102 below, Aph. 292, h. 10.4 
it is in the usual place. In every case except this line it has five syllables, but here 
four: the contraction εδο for εδῶ is due to the introduction of τ', but there is no need 
to omit τ' with Hermann, since this innovation was spreading (see Janko 1992, 14 n. 
19). It also has four syllables at Bacch. 5.149.

ἀμιχθολέσσω: this, also used of Lemnos at II. 24.753, is one of the most 
obscure of Homeric epithets. The notes of Càssola (1975) and Richardson (1993, on 
II. 24.753) give a good idea of the variety of interpretations. The more popular 
etymologies, ancient or modern, are:

(a) "misty, smoky": this is linked to ὄμιχλη (cf. Chantraine in LfGrE s.v.) and 
might refer to the alleged volcano Mosychlos and "Lemnian fire" (see Jebb 1898, on 
Phil. 800). Callimachus fr. 18.8 Pfeiffer has ἀμιχθολέσσων ἥρα, but this is no 
doubt just his interpretation of the word: cf. van der Valk 1963–4, 1.280.

(b) "inhospitable", with α- privative and μικτ-. Hesychius s.v. says 
ἀπροσδόμιστος ἐκ θαλάσσης.

(c) Some scholiasts gloss it εὐδομονά and say it is Cypriot, which is hard to 
prove or disprove (Van der Valk 1963–4, 1.488 is sceptical). Based on this
Lagercrantz (1932) suggested "ὁμικτο-θαλάσσα "of unmixed prosperity."

(d) Leumann (1950, 214 n.8), following a suggestion of Doederlein’s, argues that it is cognate with ὀμυγδαλον "almond-tree". Like many plant names it is probably of non-Greek origin, which might explain the -νυθ/-νυθ-variation.

Of these the first and last are the most plausible (or least implausible). Most epic epithets for places refer to physical features, and adjectives of this type refer to an abundance of something. "Inhositable" is also unlikely because epic epithets for places are rarely uncomplimentary (however, this is put in the mouth of Hecuba, who mentions Lemnos as one of the places to which Achilles sold her captured sons, so this might be her viewpoint; if so, the hymn is simply imitating Homer). Leumann’s suggestion has the advantage of explaining the whole word most simply.

37. Μόκαρος ἔδω: Lesbos is also called this at II. 24.544. Makar was the legendary colonist of Lesbos, which was said to have been called Makaria after him. He is son of Aeolus also at Paus. 10.38.2 -- not a surprising tradition for the ruler of the largest Aeolian island. Cf. scholia to II. 24.544; Kolf 1928. The last syllable of Μόκαρος is irregularly scanned long both here and at II. 24.544, perhaps because h-still had consonantial force when the phrase was coined; cf. πότνια ἡρη.

38. Only Chios and Lesbos get a line to themselves in this list. The praise of Chios is appropriate for a Chian poet (cf. on 172). For the phrase ἦ νῆσον λιπαρωτάτη εἰν ὅλη κεῖται, cf. Od. 7.244, 9.25. Callimachus (h. Del. 3), imitating this line, says of the Cyclades οἱ νῆσοι έρωτατοι εἰν ὅλη κεῖνται.

39. ποιαπολέοις τε Μίμας: Mimas, a mountain opposite Chios in the peninsula of Erythrai, is mentioned once in Homer, Od. 3.172 παρ’ ἡνεμὸντα Μίμαντα (ἡνεμότεις would fit here). In Callimachus’ hymn to Delos (157) Iris watches from Mimas to prevent any places in the Aegean receiving Leto. The meaning and
etymology of παυτολίδες are disputed. In epic it is used of paths, islands and mountains; it is used below at 141 (of Mt. Kynthos) and 172 (of Chios). The translation "rugged, rocky" seems almost certain (or at least this is how poets understood it), but it is not clear why it should mean this. It is probably connected with παυτόλη, "flour or fine dust". Leumann (1950, 236-41) suggests it originally referred to dusty paths. Palmer (1939, 142) interprets it as a reduplicated form of πάλλω meaning "much shaken", and so "rough, rugged". This is supported by Od. 15.419 πολυπατάλαιοι, which could mean "much tossed", on the sea. However, it seems less plausible than "dusty" for an adjective of this termination. See Shipp 1961, 48-51; Cassola 1975 ad loc.

40. Κλαρός ατηλήσσα: in Homer ατήλησις is only found in the phrase ατήληστος Ὀλύμπου (Il. 1.532; Od. 20.103). It is used of horses at h. 32.9. Here it is not clear why Claros is "bright"; it may merely be a complimentary epithet. Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, ad loc.) explain it as "the brightness of an elevated city".

Αἰσοτής: the precise location is not known. Nicander (Ther. 218) mentions it with Cercaphus, near Colophon.

41. ὑδρήλη: the word is only found once in Homer, at Od. 9.133, where it describes meadows. Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, ad loc.) quote Call. h. Del. 48, where Samos is νήσοιο διαβροχον ἔδατ χαλτύν.

Μυκάλης τ' αἰπείνα κάρηνα: also at Il. 2.869.

42. πόλις Μερόπων ἄνθρωπων: the Meropes were the inhabitants of Cos (cf. Pi. Nem. 4.26, Isthm. 5.31; Thuc. 8.41.2; Strabo 15.686). μερόπων ἄνθρωπων is a Homeric formula, used after πόλις at Il. 18.432 and 490, 20.217. Its meaning is not clear: cf. Chantraine 1936; Leumann 1950, 214 n.8; Kirk (1985) on Il. 1.250; Russo
(in Russo, Fernandz-Galiano and Heuback, 1992) on *Od*. 20.49. Koller (1968) suggests that the hymn’s usage is prior and that the Homeric formula is a misunderstanding of it. However, we would expect ἄνδρες in such a phrase, as at e.g. *Il.* 1.594 Σίννες ἄνδρες, *Od.* 6.3 Φωικῶν ἄνδρῶν, so this makes it more likely that the hymn exploits an existing formula. There is a parallel adaptation at *Cat.* 204.48 West, where the formula μέγαρα σκιώντα (7x *Od.*, *Dem.* 115) becomes Μέγαρα σκιώντα.

44. Here Leto makes her final approach to Delos, swinging into the Aegean after reaching the most southerly point in 43.

Ῥήναια: cf. Hdt. 6.97, Theocr. 17.76 for the form; on Attic inscriptions the usual form is Ῥήνεια, cf. Dittenberger 1906, 172. Rheneia is close enough to Delos for Polycrates to have connected the two islands by a chain (*Thuc.* 3.104.2).
45-88. *Every place is afraid to receive Leto, until she reaches Delos. Delos is willing to receive her, but has heard that Apollo will be powerful and haughty, and so fears that he will scorn her poverty and barrenness and push her to the bottom of the sea. She persuades Leto to swear an oath that Apollo will honour her*

45. ὡδίνωσα: this is also used transitively at Eur. I.A. 1234, LXX Cant. 8.5. The word is perhaps slightly inappropriate here, since at 91 it seems her birth pains do not begin until Delos agrees to accept Apollo: then there seems to be the start of a new stage at 116 when Eileithyia arrives. This is due to the long drawn-out form of the birth narrative, which is achieved by having two obstacles for Leto to overcome, first the problem of finding a birthplace, and then Eileithyia’s absence.

Ἑκπήθιλον: cf. on 1 for discussion of the meaning.

46. This type of construction is common in Homer: κε is not usual with the optative in such sentences (Chantraine 1948-53, 2.278f.). Note that it is the lands Leto is asking, not the peoples: this prepares the way for the coming personification of Delos. Callimachus (h. Del. 70ff.) has the places actually run away from Leto in fear.

γαιεσων: this has an Ionic genitive in -εων, with synizesis as is usual (Homer only has γαιεσων). DAp only has one other a-stem genitive plural, ἐδρασων in 3, which has the older type of genitive. On these forms in Hesiod and the Hymns, see Edwards 1971, 126-31; Janko 1982, 49f. The MSS of the p family have εἰ τις γαιεσων, which is smoother but unlikely to have been corrupted to οἱ γαιεσων; it could be an emendation of σοι γαιεσων, read by most of the remaining MSS.

υτε εἰθλοι: the usual epic form is εἰθλω. The only examples of θελω in Homer
are uncertain: at II. 1.277, where the Oxford text has Πηλετήν, θελ', Aristarchus wished to read Πηλετθελ'. At Od. 15.317 the MSS. vary between ὑπ' θελοιεν and ὑπ' ἐθελοιεν. The examples quoted from the Hymns by Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, ad loc.) are all easily emendable: Herm. 274 and Dem. 160 εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις; Aph. 38 εὑρ' ἐθέλοι. On the whole, though, keeping θέλοι seems preferable to reading ὑπ' ἐθέλοι with Franke and Gemoll (1886), where the synizesis is impossible. Hoekstra (1969, 22) points out that the irresolvable -ει in ὑπ' is a recent feature; in Homer, among 26 datives of ὑπός, the final syllable is only once in arsis. Wilamowitz (1916, 446 n.2) supports the reading θέλοι ὑπεί, which would change this and observe the digamma of οἰκτο; this is attractive, but unnecessary.

οἰκτο θεσθαί: this is always used in the plural in archaic and classical Greek, and suggests something grander than οἶκος. Here the digamma of οἰκτο is neglected.

47. = II. 7.151 (with οί for οι). There are many expressions for describing fear in Homer, but this one only occurs once, so this might be a case of imitation rather than a common formula. Apollo several times evokes fear in DAp (2, 66, 70) and also in 404. In every case the fear is dispelled. Why are the islands afraid? In Callimachus' Hymn to Delos they are afraid of the wrath of Hera, who does not want Zeus to bear a son whom he will love more than Ares. Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, ad loc.) say that their fear has the same motive here, but there is no mention of it, and no need to assume it (so Gemoll 1886, ad loc.; Ludwich 1908, 182; Dornseiff 1933, 5; Cassola 1975, ad loc.; Förstel 1979, 181f.; Miller 1986, 37). If this were the case then presumably Delos would say so, but she gives an entirely different ground for her fear, viz that Apollo may scorn her because of her barrenness (72), and there is no reason to think the other islands are afraid for a different reason. The phrase καὶ πιστέῃ περ ἐσώσα also makes better sense if their fears are the same as
those of Delos; wealth would not protect them from the wrath of Hera, but might from
the scorn of Apollo. That even the richer islands fear Apollo may scorn them stresses
his greatness (cf. Förstel 1979, 183).

48. πιοτέρη: richness is a key concept in this part of the poem. Delos is afraid
because she is infertile and rocky, and Leto makes this the basis of her appeal,
pointing out her current poverty and promising future riches. The form is not found
elsewhere in epic poetry, but the superlative πιοτάτων is used at Il. 9.577. It is not
a true comparative here but means something like "fairly rich" (or possibly "richer
(than Delos) since Delos is in the next line).

49ff. Leto’s dialogue with Delos. The places visited by Leto have already been
personified in 46-8, but here this is taken a stage further. Personification of and
conversation with an island seems rather unusual: there is not really anything like it
in Homer, who tends to exclude anything fantastic (cf. Griffin 1977). Achilles does
fight with the river Scamander (Il. 21.212-382), but this is possibly less surprising
because springs had their resident god or goddess. Callimachus’ decision to write a
hymn to Delos rather than to Apollo may have been influenced by this personification
(see prolegomena, 57f.). Is Delos the island or a presiding nymph? Perhaps the
distinction would not have mattered to the poet; but Delos is certainly talked of in
terms that fit the physical island (54f., 72-8). Pindar sometimes blurs this distinction,
as at e.g. Isthm. 8.17-26; cf. Norwood 1945, 35f. Callimachus, in his Delian hymn,
deliberately oscillates between the two conceptions; see Mineur 1984, 59f., 84. The
conversation adds variety to the narrative, and enables the problem and its solution to
be set out clearly and vividly. The dialogue tells us about Delos’ poverty and foretells
her future fame: in both parts of the hymn it is mainly through speeches that we learn
about the future glory of the sanctuary (though in DAp also through the depiction of
the festival); see prolegomena, 33f.

The episode has striking similarities to Apollo’s encounter with Telphousa (244-76). In both cases the god or goddess, after a long search, reaches a possible site, and enters into dialogue with the place’s local goddess; in both cases this goddess raises an objection to the plan, and proposes a solution, which is then carried out. The correspondences are well set out by Förstel (1979, 247). The differences, however, are as notable as the similarities. Leto arrives after being rejected by other places, and Delos is her last hope; Apollo has rejected the other places he has passed through, and chooses Telphousa himself. This is reflected in how they approach the local goddess: Leto is tactful, Apollo high-handed. Delos is able to refuse like the other islands, but does not; Telphousa cannot refuse directly, so has to be cunning. Delos rejoices on hearing Leto’s words (61); Telphousa is angry on hearing Apollo’s (256). This is natural, since Delos is barren and unimportant, so Apollo’s arrival can only help her; but Telphousa already has beauty and fame, which can only be diminished by Apollo’s presence. In the sequels, Delos is beautified, covered with gold (135ff.), whereas Telphousa’s beauty is defiled by the rocks thrown into her stream (382ff.). Both, however, help bring about the desired outcome -- Delos wittingly, Telphousa unwittingly -- so the contrast in their fates does not seem quite fair. This is not the view of most commentators: Miller, for instance, contrasts the characters of the two goddesses (1986, 79): he says that Delos is open about her fears and takes the necessary steps, whereas Telphousa "resorts to duplicitous indirection for a solution". Moreover, "Telphousa’s character is no less emphatically stamped by pride and spite than Delos’ is by modesty and generosity." Similar views are expressed by Förstel (1979, 245) and Clay (1989, 73).

But do we really see in the fate of Delos an instance of generosity rewarded, in
the punishment of Telphousa of hubris punished? Delos’ admission of her own poverty and ill-repute is a rhetorical strategem, a preparation for the extortion of an oath from Leto. In fact Delos is in a position to control the situation and takes advantage of it; she knows that Leto is desperate for a place to give birth, and sees an opportunity to improve her lot. She knows that she has much to gain from becoming Apollo’s birthplace, and so welcomes him eagerly. She is motivated as much by self-interest and a desire for prestige as is Telphousa. Their different reactions reflect a contrast not so much between their characters as between their situations. Delos has nothing, but Telphousa already has beauty and glory. They each take the necessary steps, the one to increase, the other to preserve, her prestige.

49. πρὸν γ' δὲ δῆ: this combination is also found at Il. 12.436, 9.588; Od. 4.180, 23.42, always with the indicative as here. The construction is not found after the hymns (see Goodwin 1897, 247).

50. Cf. 525 τὸν καὶ ἀνειρόμενος Κρητῶν ἁγῆς ἀντίον ηὕδα. The line is probably based on the common καὶ μὲν ὀμειβομένη ἡπειρα π. π. and so there is no need to see this as older than 525 because the poet avoided saying φωνήσασ’ and thereby neglecting the digamma (so Janko 1982, 110, arguing that PAp imitates DAp). Moreover, ἀνειρόμενη is not equivalent to φωνήσασ because it means "ask", not simply "say". See prolegomena, 119.

51. The construction is difficult. It has been interpreted in various ways: (i) as a wish (so Kühner-Gerth 1955, i.230; Schwyzer 1939-53, ii.330); (ii) Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, ad loc.) say that it is a conditional in which the apodosis is not expressed; (iii) Matthiae (followed by Càssola, 1975) emended to Ἡ ἄρη, comparing Od. 18.357 Ξεῖν’, Ἡ ἄρη κ’ ἑθελοίς ὑπεμεμεν κτλ. A wish makes good sense here, but the problem is that it is very doubtful if such a wish is possible with κε. The
Homerian passages quoted in support of the construction are *II. 6.281-2 ὀς κε οἱ αὐθὴ
gαῖα χάνοι and *Od. 15.545 Τηλέμοχ’, εἰ γὰρ κεν σῷ πολὺν χρόνον ἐνθάδε
μὴ μνοῖς, τόνδε τ’ ἐγὼ κομιῶ. Of these the latter passage makes better sense as a
conditional protasis (with τ’ emended to γ’), and at *II. 6.281 Bekker emended to δε.
This is accepted by Leaf (1900-2), but not by Kirk (1990). Leaf ad loc. comments:
"κε necessarily implies some conditioning circumstances, whereas a wish necessarily
excludes them". However, Chantraine (1948-53, 2.218) takes the Homeric passages
as wishes. The use of κε is not the only difficulty in taking it as a wish: Denniston
(1954, 94) lists the passage under εἰ γὰρ wishes, but admits that it "stands apart from
all other examples of εἰ γὰρ, in that the particles occur at the opening of a
conversation, without any obvious logical connection".

γὰρ would also be hard to explain if this were a condition with the apodosis not
expressed. It could be an explanation of the address to Delos (cf. Denniston 1954,
69), as at e.g. *II. 23.156 Ἀτρέδη, σοὶ γὰρ τε μᾶλιστα . . . Here, though, the γὰρ
clause gives a specific reason for addressing Agamemnon.

On the whole it seems best to emend to a question with Matthiae, especially since
ἀνειρωμένη leads us to expect a question, and in Homer the verb is always used in
connection with an actual question (so also in 168, 525 below); cf. Peppmuller 1884,
Càssola 1975 ad loc. ἦ δὲ is more likely than ἦ γὰρ (though harder
paleographically) since the latter in questions is not Homeric and ἦ δὲ is supported
by the parallel of *Od. 18.357 quoted above.

52. πτονα οὐν: also at 478, 482, 501, 523; *Dem. 297. The precise phrase is not
in Homer (ἐν πτονι νηφ at *II. 2.549), but it is modelled on formulae like πτονα
δῆμον. Leto knows that the epithet will appeal to Delos (cf. on 48 above). On the
first temple of Apollo on Delos, see prolegomena, 127f.
53. ὀλλος in JS should probably be read, as it is more forceful here than the weak ὀλλος.

οὐδὲ σε λήσει: the Mss. read οὖδε σε λίσει, which must be corrupt, though it is defended by Förstel (1979, 427). The best emendation is Ernesti’s τίσει (cf. 88), accepted by Baumeister (1860), Gemoll (1886), Humbert (1936) and Càssola (1975). Agar’s λήσει is read by Allen and Sikes (1904) and Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936). οὐδὲ σε λήσει is a Homeric phrase, but would make little sense here. It occurs at Il. 23.326, Od. 11.126 in the line σήμα δε τοι ἐρέω μαλ’ ἀριφραδες, οὐδὲ σε λήσει, where the sense "you can’t miss it" is straightforward. In neither case is it a threat, pace Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, ad loc.). Also possible is οὐδ’ ἐθελήσει (cf. Il. 15.215, 18.262).

54. Cf. Od. 15.406 (of Syrie) εὔβοτος, εὐμηλος, οἴνοπληθῆς, πολύπυρος; 529 below; Od. 4.605ff.

εὔβοια: this form is in the best MSS and is the lectio difficilior here. Cf. βὼν at Il. 7. 238 with Kirk ad loc., μεσάβων Op. 469 v.l. (West 1978 ad loc. prefers μεσάβω); Simonides ap. B 342 in Photii Patriarchae Lexicon, ed. C. Theodoridis. See also Janko 1992, 35. The word is not found elsewhere, but cf. the name Εὐβοία.

σὲ ἔσεσθαι: the hiatus is harsh, but cf. Il. 19.288; Od. 6.151 (both after σὲ) and other instances are Th. 549, below 88 (v.l.). This seems enough support to make it unnecessary to add γ’ (Hermann 1806), or to read σ’ ἔσεσθαι (Wilamowitz 1916, 442 n.1; printed by Càssola 1975).

ὄφωμαι: as often, this has an ironic tone, expressing something obvious merely as the speaker’s opinion: cf. Od. 1.173, 4.754ff., 11.101, 22.67.

55. τρύγην: not in Homer, though the related ἀτρύγετοι, τρυγῶνεν are: cf. 529 below. The situations are clearly parallel: in both places Apollo is going to found a
temple and the site is too infertile to support the inhabitants unaided. This makes sense for the barren Delos; however, the motif of living off the sacrifices of pilgrims is more associated with Delphi than Delos (see prolegomena, 117f.).

56. Ἀπόλλωνος ἐκαέργου: ἐκαέργος Ἀπόλλων usually occurs in the nominative at the line end (as 5x in \textit{PAp}); this is the only occurrence of the epithet in the genitive and in this part of the line, so it is clearly an adaptation (yet digamma is "observed"). Leto gives Apollo this conventional epithet, though he is not yet "far-working" (though that is probably not its real meaning; cf. on 1) or anything else, since he is yet to be born. The line perhaps reflects a certain tension between the god as addressee of the hymn and the same god as its subject, especially in a birth narrative where at the first the god does not exist.

57. ἀρινήσουσι: this verb is often used of bringing gifts to a god. The future is not in Homer (cf. \textit{LSJ} s.v.), but is used at 249, 260 below in the line ἐνθὰδ' ἀρινήσουσι τελειόσον ἐκατόμβας. The close parallels of language, and in particular the use of the rare future, make it clear that the passages are not independent (see prolegomena, 114ff.). Both parts of the hymn stress that the sanctuary will be rich and visited by many pilgrims.

ἐκατόμβας: especially appropriate for Apollo, who was often called ἐκατόμβας; there was a month Ἐκατόμβας in many Ionian communities, cf. Nilsson 1906, 138, 174.

58. ἐνθὰδ' ἀριστομενοι: cf. 539 ἐνθὰδ' ἀριστομενοι, also used of men coming to Apollo's temple. ἐνθὰδε is common throughout the poem, especially at the start of the line; cf 80, 168, 170, 249, 258, 287, 381. This reflects the importance of places in the hymn, since both parts are about the search for a site and the founding of a sanctuary.
κνήσῃ δὲ τού: Leto talks of the smoke of sacrifices rising almost as if Delos were an Olympian goddess savouring the smoke (on this idea see Kirk 1990, 9ff.), but she is an island and the sacrifices will be offered to Apollo (τοῖς is presumably an ethic dative). It is her inhabitants who will benefit from the meat. In *P Ap* things are clearer, since it is the priests Apollo tells they will be able to feed off the sacrifices (see prolegomena, 117f.).

59. On the reconstruction of this line, which seems certain, cf. Allen, Halliday and Sikes 1936, ad loc.

ἀναφέ: in Homer this is normally used of people springing up, as at 3 above, so is slightly surprising of smoke. The closest parallel is *Il.* 22.147f. πηγα...ἀναφέσουντι.

60. Cf. *Od.* 1.160 (of the suitors) ἀλλότριον βιοτον νήπιονον ἐδούσιν.


πίαρ ὑπ᾽ οὐδας: cf. *Od.* 9.135 ἐπεὶ μόλα πίαρ ὑπ᾽ οὐδας. In both passages it is easier to take πίαρ as a noun, as at *Il.* 11.550, 17.659; *Aph.* 30. This is the view of Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, ad loc.) and Cassola (1975, ad loc.), who translates "non hai richezza nel tuo suolo". The alternative is to take it as an adjective, with ὑπ᾽ standing for ὑπεστ. πίαρ (only used in the nominative and accusative) is certainly a noun, belonging to the class of neuter *n*-stems (see Sihler 1995, 298f.), so is unlikely to have been used as an adjective. Solon 36.21 πίαρ ἔξελη γάλα, is explained by Allen and Sikes (1904, ad loc.) as a double accusative.


62. Delos is careful to open with a flattering full-line address to Leto, as Telphousa flatters Apollo at 268.
μεγάλου Κοφότο: this, suggested by Barnes, is fairly certainly the right reading, not Κρόνοιο as in the MSS. Leto is always elsewhere the daughter of Coeus; cf. Th. 404 ff.; Pi. fr. 33d.3 Κοιογενής, pae. 7b.44, 12.13; Ap. Rh. 2.710 Κοιογένειο; Call. h.Del. 150; Aristonous fr. 1.5 Powell. μεγάλοιο Κρόνοιο at I. 8.383 may have influenced the corruption. Κρόνοιο is defended by Jacoby 1933a, 705; Forderer 1971, 175, n.45. On Leto’s parentage see also West 1966, on Th. 136.

63. ἐγὼ γε: Miller (1986, 36) points out that the particle emphasises the idea that there is some difficulty in the way, implying "if it were entirely up to me ...".

ἐκάτοιο ὑνακτος: on this type of genitive, which is almost equivalent to a clause in apposition, see Chantraine 1948-53, 2.62. On ἐκατος, see on 1.


64. δυσηχής: the contrast with περιτιμήσσα seems to require the meaning "of ill-repute", connected with ἥχεω. In Homer the word is only used of πολέμος and θανάτος, always in the genitive, e.g. I. 2.686, 16.442. In these cases the connection with ἄχος makes better sense: the formulaic use of the word in Homer suggest it may have been an archaic word which the poet of DAp has misunderstood as from δυσ- and ἥχεω. On the etymology, see Leaf 1900-2, on I. 2.686; Chantraine 1968-80, Frisk 1960-70 s.v.

65. περιτιμήσσα: Delos uses the strong form with περι as she savours the idea of being honoured by all men: the honour that will come to Apollo and his temple is important as a motive for Delos her and is a theme throughout the hymn, cf. 88 and 381, 479, 485, 522.

66. For the fear motif cf. on 47.

ξιος: this may be used here in the sense of "oracle, prophecy", as at e.g. Od.
12.266f. καὶ μοι ἐπος ἔμπεσε θυμὸ | μόνην. Certainly it is more than just "word" here.

οὐδὲ σε κεύσω: used at Od. 3.187 (also with reference to the future, and φασι in the following line), 23,273 (again followed by a prophecy); cf. οὔδε ἐπικεύσω at Il. 5.816 (after ἐπος as here), 10.115. This sort of declaration of intent is a common epic way of speaking: cf. phrases like ὡδε γὰρ ἔξερεν, τὸ δὲ καὶ τετελεσμένον ἔσται (Il. 1.212), etc.

67-70. This passage has provoked discussion because of the apparently excessive power it attributes to Apollo, and the description of him as ἀτασθάλος. Clay (1989, 37f.) says that to rule over gods and men is the prerogative of Zeus, and therefore Apollo is here depicted as a possible threat to Zeus, a son who might overthrow his father as Zeus and Kronos overthrew theirs. For discussion of this, see prolegomena, 108f., and commentary on 1-13.

67. Cf. Od. 16.86 λήν γὰρ ἀτασθαλον ὄβριν ἔχουσι (of the suitors). For τις with an adjective cf. e.g. Il. 5.638 ἀλλὰ οἰόν τινα φασι βίην Ἡρακλείην. This line might be made by combining the two quoted above.

φασιν: the sources of the prophecy are left unspecified, but Delos has probably heard rumours from the other islands, who also fear Apollo. When an important god is to be born, it seems that his future nature is known to some extent: Delos also knows that Apollo will be πολυώνυμος, which in 82 is simply stated as a fact. Perhaps Delos here uses φασιν to distance herself from a negative picture of her son.

ἀτασθαλον: this is a surprising word to use of Apollo, who as the god of Delphi promoted moderation and order (see Kroll 1956, 185; Càssola 1975, ad loc.; Guida 1972, 13; Miller 1986, 38ff.). It and its cognates are common in the Odyssey, where it is frequently used of the suitors, e.g. 16.86, 17.588 (= 20.170, 370), 24.282, 352;
it is also used at 1.7 of Odysseus' companions who perish through disobeying a divine command. It has a range of meaning from "folly, blindness" to "arrogance, lawlessness" (see LfGrE s.v. ἀτασθαλία, ἀτάσθαλος for full discussion). Förstel (1979, 416, n.459) tries to argue that it can be "wertneutral" and merely mean "powerful", but this is unconvincing. There is no escaping the negative connotations of the word: it is often linked with ὄβρτς (cf. Od. 3.207, 16.86, 24.282; Th. 514ff., 996, and Fisher 1992, 155.). If we translate ἀτάσθαλος as "arrogant, haughty" this does not seem inaccurate for his portrayal in Ap. and in Homer (see prolegomena, 51f.). His appearance in the opening lines is often cited in this connection; see Baumeister 1860, ad loc.; Gemoll 1886, ad loc.; Wilamowitz 1916, 442; Altheim 1924, 431; Dornseiff 1933, 5; Förstel 1979, 170f. and 183. Possibly the word does not have the same implications when applied to a god, since their behaviour is not judged by the same standards as men. Apollo can act in ways that would be wrong for humans, but are not so for him. He boasts over the defeated Delphic snake, whereas Odysseus says one should not boast over a defeated enemy (Od. 22.411f.). He commits another breach of Odyssean etiquette by asking the Cretan sailors who they are before they have eaten: in this his behaviour is like the lawless Cyclops. It is also worth noting that the epithet is put in the mouth of Delos; what she might see as ἀτασθαλία might not be wrong for Apollo. Telphousa would no doubt have thought his treatment of her ἀτάσθαλος. Miller (1986, 39ff.) says that the ἀτασθαλία is confined to his possible treatment of his birthplace and would consist in rejecting the idea of contingency inherent in being born, but I think it merely refers to his general character and does in fact come to pass, an idea which Miller rejects ("it is in the very contrafactuality of his ἀτασθαλία that the poet's real point lies"). Apollo's behaviour in the prologue and in the Pythian half suggests the
contrafactuality of this view.

68. προτανευσεμεν: this seems to be the first occurrence of the verb. It and its cognates are not found in Homer, though Προτανις is used as a name (for a Lycian) at Il. 5.678. προτανις is used by Stes. 235; Sim. 628; Adesp. 954a (all PMG); Bacchylides Epinicia 1.128, Dithyrambi 19.43; Pi. Pyth. 2.58, 6.24; Aesch. Supp. 371, P.V. 169. It is often used of gods, e.g. Aesch. P.V. μακάρων προτανις (of Zeus). προτανις is a borrowed word, like some other Greek terms for "ruler"; see Chantraine 1968-80, s.v.; Janko 1992, on Il. 13.789ff. The only classical examples of the verb are in the technical Athenian sense (as in the official formula "Χ επροτανευσε") and only one of these is in poetry (Ar. Ach. 60). It is quite common in later prose. The dative after verbs of ruling is quite common, usually with groups of people in the plural as here, e.g. Od. 11.485 μέγα κρατέεις νεκύεσσιν; cf. Il. 1.231, 2.669; Od. 1.245, 7.59 (Ar. Ach. 60 has προτανεύω with a dative).

69. = Od. 3.3, 12.386, and cf. 19.593. ἐπὶ ζείδωρον δρούραν is a doublet of ἐπὶ χθονα πουλυβότειραν (2x Il.; Dem. 305; Th. 531).

70. Fear is the normal reaction to Apollo in this hymn; cf. on 2, 47 and in the Pythian half 404 (of the Cretan sailors).

αίνδος δείδοικα: cf. Od. 24.353, 18.80. This verb is not followed by κατά φρένα καὶ κατά θυμόν in Homer, only κατά φρένα on its own. It would be wrong to try to draw too much of a distinction between φρήν and θυμός here; both can be used of feeling various emotions, including fear (for fear in the θυμός cf. Il. 24.672). There is a large literature on these words in Homer: see most recently Sullivan 1995, with bibliography.

71. ὁπότε ἄν: generally used, as here, when a particular future event is envisaged (Chantraine 1948-53, 2.257f.)
τὸ πρῶτον: cf. on 25.

φόος ἡλίοιο: quite common in both Homer and Hesiod in connection with birth and death. The uncontracted forms suggest it is an old formula, but here used after a neglected digamma. The closest parallel to this line is Aph. 256 ἐπὶν δὴ πρῶτον ἰδὴ φόος ἡλίοιο, where Aphrodite is talking about the birth of Aeneas.

There is a scholium on this line, which draws the interesting conclusion that τὸν ἡλιον φασίν προυπάρχειν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος.

72. νήσον: it seems slightly odd for Delos to speak of herself in the third person and the first in the same sentence, but the idea could be to emphasise that Apollo may despise her because she is a small, barren island. It also prepares for the following description of the island pushed beneath the sea. In these lines there is no doubt that Delos is a personification of the physical island, and not merely a resident goddess (see on 49ff.).

ἀτισάσας: this is awkward followed by καταστρέψας without a connection. Some MSS. read ἀτισῆ, but this necessitates the insertion of a conjunction in 73 (after καταστρέψας, not after ἄση). The construction with two participles seems to be possible: of the parallels quoted by Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, ad loc.) the best are Ar. Nub. 937; Hdt. 8.105. Jacoby (1933, 707-8) says 72 is merely a doublet of 73 (another possibility could be that 72 is interpolated -- see Càssola 1975, ad loc.), but the two lines are not parallel in sense and 72 provides a necessary step in the argument. Also if 72 is removed the verbs in 73 are left without an object (though this could have been a motive for interpolating 72).

ἐπεὶ ἣ: this is common in Homer in this place in the line; cf. also on 82 below, Aph. 195.

κρανοαπεδός: this is a ἐπαξ. κρανοδές in Homer is only used of Ithaca. It is
used of Delos in this hymn at 16, 26.

73. καταστρέψας: this is used of turning over earth with a plough by Xenophon (Oec. 17.10) and the sense here seems to be "overturning", as Allen, Halliday and Sikes say (1936, ad loc.). Gemoll (1886, ad loc.) thinks there may be a reference here to the story that Delos was a floating island before Leto’s arrival but there is no suggestion of this in the current passage. The floating island story may have been a later invention; it is first found in Pi. fr. 33d Snell-Maehler (cf. Call. h. Del. 34f., Virg. Aen. 3.3) and is connected with the idea of the islands not receiving Leto through fear of Hera: until the arrival of Leto the island had been hidden.

δοσι: cf. 382 ἐπὶ βτον δοσι. The fate envisaged by Delos has some similarities with that actually experienced by Telphousa.

όλος ἐν πελάργοσίν: also found at Od. 5.335, h.33.15. The ἐν seems odd after δοσι: the poet may have taken over the formula and used it inappropriately. This is perhaps supported by the hiatus after δοσι.

74ff. At this point M resumes (see on 23). These lines give a vivid picture of what Delos thinks may happen to her. The switch to the future indicative makes it sound more vivid, and more probable. Delos has a certain gloomy side to her character: she almost seems to relish describing her own poverty in 72 and now indulges in a pessimistic prophecy of what Apollo will do to her. She has, however, a desire to better herself, and agrees with Leto that this is her only chance to do so.

74. κατα κρατός: at Od. 10.362 this is used of Odysseus being bathed. Of course in both cases the water goes over the whole body (or island), but the head is affected first, so this is the usual expression (cf West ad Op. 65). Here it is particularly apt as the waves will be literally over her head when she is at the bottom of the sea.
ολις: used of water at Il. 17.54 ὅθ' ολις ἀνοβέβροχεν ὄδωρ. Note the observed digamma.

75. κλύσει: in Homer κλύζω usually means "to be stormy", of the sea (e.g. Il. 14.392, 23.61; Od. 9.454). It never has the sense of "wash over" that it has here: however, a (relatively late) parallel to this use of the word is Bat. 69 κύμασι πορφυρέοις κλύζετο. At 181 below Delos is called περικλύστος; this, compared to the Homeric πολυκλύστω ἐνὶ ποντῷ, shows a similar difference in the use of the verb; in Homer the compound is active, of the sea; in the hymn it is passive, of the island.

αδη: cf. on 22.

The construction of 75-6, with τεῦξασθαι as infinitive after ἀφίξεται, and ἕ κεν αδη ότι in parenthesis, seems straightforward enough; however, in the parallel passages 220-1 and 244-5 in PAp the infinitive plainly depends on the verb ἀδε, so that we get the construction "the place pleased him for building", apparently an epexegetical infinitive. Since the passages are not independent, it is possible that this is the construction here too. I think that the epexegetical infinitive is more awkward; it is possible that, if PAp is the imitation, its poet misunderstood the infinitive here as epexegetical rather than expressing purpose.

76. = 221, 245, cf. also 80, 248, 258, 287. The idea of founding a temple is important in both halves, especially of course in the Pythian half where it is the main theme.

νηόν: this word is used eighteen times in the hymn, but only seven times in the whole of Homer. Many of the uses in the hymn are repetitions of lines used earlier, and the subject of the hymn is obviously one in which temples are a key concept, but the difference is still interesting, and may reflect a growth in the use of temples during
the archaic period.


ηδ'ν τε κατ' ἄλσεα δενδρημέντα: this is probably an adaptation of the phrase ἐν ἄλσει δενδρημένται (Od. 9.200, below 235, 384). Most temples were associated with a grove, and in fact the grove was usually a sacred place before the foundation of a temple. Is it possible to τεῦξοσθαι ἄλσεα? Perhaps there is a zeugma here, or else νησὸς τε κατ' ἄλσεα δενδρημέντα is linked together as a single concept.

77. Cf. Od. 5.432 πουλύποδος θαλάμης ἔξελκομένοιο: The use of both πουλύποους and θαλάμη in both places suggests the poet may have had the Odyssean line in mind here, though the association might be traditional.

φόκατ τε μέλαιναι: are seals out of place here? Delos imagines herself thrust to the bottom of the sea, a home more suitable for octopuses than seals. However, the picture is quite effective poetically, and the author is more concerned with poetry than natural history.

78. οἰκία ποτήσονται: the same phrase is used at the start of a line at Il. 12.168, of wasps.

ἀκηδήξα: this word usually has a passive sense in Homer, "uncared for", especially "unburied", e.g. Il. 24.553f. ὄφρα κεν Ἠκτωρ / κεϊται ...ἀκηδήξα. In an active sense it can mean either "careless, heedless" (Od. 17.319 γυναίκες ἄκηδέας οὐ κομέοσαι) or "carefree" which is not found in Homer, but at Th. 61 we have ἄκηδέα θυμὸν ἐχούσας (cf. Op. 112, 170). Strict logic would suggest this last meaning is right, with the epithet transferred from the seals to the dwellings: it is the seals' homes that are said to be ἄκηδέα because of the lack of people. However, it is more likely that Delos is being slightly loose in phrasing here, and is thinking of herself as uncare for and uninhabited.

χήτει: this word is found at Il. 6.463, 19.324; Th. 605, always in the dative as
here but in all these cases at the start of the line.

79. Cf. *Od.* 5.178, 10.343, which are also addressed to goddesses, the first to Calypso and the second to Circe. The situations have some similarity to this one, in that Odysseus on both occasions is trying to secure himself from harm by extracting an oath from the goddess. The phrase θεός, μέγαν δρκον is no doubt an adaptation of θεός μέγαν δρκον (as in 83 below, *Herm.* 518), since the latter is a set phrase for the oath of the gods.

μέγαν δρκον: on δρκος, cf. West (1966) on *Th.* 231. On the meaning and etymology, cf. Leumann 1950, 81ff.; Benveniste 1948, 81ff and 1969, 2.165-73; Bollack and Hiersche 1958. The interpretation which sees δρκος as an o-grade form of ἔρκος seems the most plausible (though disputed by Leumann and Benveniste); it gives a suitable sense of "binding" the oath-taker. In this case δρκος would originally have meant the thing sworn by, as it does in 86, and often. The μέγας δρκος is the oath by the Styx, on which cf. Frazer 1898, on Paus. 8.184; Allen, Halliday and Sikes 1936, ad loc.; Bollack and Hiersche 1958; West 1966, on *Th.* 400; Janko 1992, on *Il.* 14.271-9. *Th.* 397ff. tells the story of how Styx was the first to come and offer Zeus her help against the Titans, and so he gave her the honour of being the oath of the gods. According to Janko (loc. cit.) the significance of this is that Styx with her children Victory and Power enabled Zeus to defeat the Titans; she has the power therefore to change sides and overthrow the Olympian order, and this is the ultimate sanction against perjury. In Homer, the gods call Earth, Sky and Styx to witness, as here (also *Il.* 15.36-8; *Od.* 5.184-6), or the Earth, the Sea, Styx and the gods of the underworld (Titans) as at *Il.* 14.270ff.: in the latter passage Hypnos makes Hera place one hand on the earth and the other on the sea as she makes her oath. On touching the object sworn by see Cäsola 1975 on *Herm.* 460-2. The Styx as the third element
in the formula seems to represent the underworld and is the equivalent of ὁι ἐνερθὲ θεοῖ at Il. 14.274. The gods cannot of course swear by themselves, so they call on cosmic powers to witness their oaths: Earth, Sky, Sea and the Styx (i.e. the underworld) make up the entire universe. For this idea, which may be of Oriental origin, cf. Dem. 9, 13f., 33-5 with Richardson (1974) ad loc.; at 334ff. below Hera strikes the ground and calls on Γοξία καὶ ὄροινδος ἐυρός ὑπερθεν; at Il. 15.187-193 the partition of the universe between Zeus, Poseidon and Hades is described. In Hesiod the water of the Styx itself is significant. At Th. 783 ff. we read that Zeus sends Iris to fetch a jug of the water of the Styx; the god pours a libation of it, and is punished if he breaks the oath.

In this passage Leto is swearing an oath on Apollo’s behalf: she swears that he will found a βομῖδς καὶ τέμενος (88). Would such an oath be binding on Apollo, and would Leto have the power to enforce it? The poet seems to assume that this is so, but the idea is necessary for his story, since Apollo obviously cannot swear himself. At Il. 19.108ff. Hera asks Zeus to swear that the man descended from him who is born that day πάντεσι περικτιόνεσσιν ἀνάξει, but it is natural to assume that Zeus can bring about what he wishes.

80f. Cf. 247f., 258f., 287f; as with other parallel passages in the two parts of Ap. the language is too similar for them to be independent (see prolegomena, 114ff.).

80. περικυλλέα νηόν: not in Homer, but cf. Il. 8.238 π. βομῖν; Od. 8.567 v.l. π. νῆα.

81. χρηστήριον: not in Homer. In this hymn it is always used with ἀνθρώποι/-οίς (see on 80); both parts emphasise the benefits Apollo’s foundations bring to mortals. It is debatable whether there ever was an oracle on Delos at an early period. The only early reference to it is this one, and in the classical period, if it did
exist, it was of no importance and totally eclipsed by the oracle at Delphi. There are later literary references, suggesting that there was an oracle from the Hellenistic period. The most notable is in the third book of the Aeneid, in which Aeneas goes to Delos and receives a prophecy from Apollo (84ff.; cf. also Diod. 5.58; Lucan 6.425; Serv. on Aen. 4.143; Himerius 18.1; Max.Tyr. 41). There is an inscription (IG XI, 2, 165, 1.44) from c.280 B.C. that mentions a μαντεῖον. Bouché-Leclercq (1879-82, 3.13ff.) argued that there never was an oracle; this is also the view of Bethe 1931, 19-20. The existence of the oracle is supported by Wilamowitz 1916, 446 n.2; Jacoby 1933, 717 n.3; Gallet de Santerre 1958, 249f.; Cassola 1975, on Ap. 81. It has been pointed out that Leto does not actually mention an oracle in her oath, and this could imply the rejection of Delos’ request (cf. Heubeck 1972, 146; Miller 1986, 44f.; Clay 1989, 39). But it seems an odd procedure to have Delos mention the oracle if it is to be rejected. Unitarian critics see this as looking forward to PAp; Delphi is the place where Apollo must found his first oracle (Gemoll 1886, ad loc.; Ludwich 1908, 183; Forderer 1971, 75; Heubeck 1972, 136 n.8; Miller 1986, 44f.; Clay 1989, 39). But this theory implies a snub to Delos in favour of Delphi, which is unlikely in a Delian hymn. DAp elsewhere seems concerned to glorify Delos as Apollo’s favourite shrine: indeed this is one of the arguments against the hymn’s unity (see prolegomena, 106f.). Another possibility is that DAp is simply carelessly imitating PAp here (so Bethe 1931, 19-20), but this would be odd if there never was an oracle. More plausible is West’s view (West 1975, 165) that there was an unimportant oracle on Delos, but the poet would not have bothered to mention it without the influence of the passages in PAp. On the whole, I think that this passage suggests that there was some sort of oracle on Delos at an early period.

81f. Hermann was probably right to posit a lacuna after 81, since the text is hard
to make sense of as it stands. The text is defended by Baumeister 1860; Gemoll 1886; Dornseiff 1933, 6; Humbert 1936; Forderer 1971, 75; Förstel 428, n.491. Humbert explains "son oracle sera d'abord celui des gens (du pays), pour devenir enfin celui de l'humanité", which the Greek can hardly mean. Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936) and Cassola (1975) accept the lacuna. The main problem is that πάντος ἔτι ἀνθρώπους does not make sense. Allen, Halliday and Sikes suggest as a supplement τεῦξιασθω νηοὺς τε καὶ ὀλσεα δενδρημενα. This does not solve the difficulty with πάντος ἔτι ἀνθρώπους. Latacz (1968) points out that in Homer this always refers to the extent of someone's κλέος (Il. 10.213; Od. 1.299; 19.334; 24.94). ἔτι here means "throughout, among", cf. also for this sense Od. 23.124f. σὴν γὰρ ἀρίστην μῆτιν ἐπὶ ἀνθρώπους and see LSJ s.v. C.5. Something about Apollo’s κλέος would make good sense here, and so Latacz suggests ὀλλη τεῦξιασθω νηοὺς καὶ οἱ κλέος ἔτη. Hermann (1806, ad loc.) already saw this, and said that the sense of the missing line should be "ac deinde Apollinis claritatem fama perventuram esse ad omnes homines".

82. ἔπει ἦ πολυώνυμος ἔσται: this balances 72 and so emphasises the difference between Delos’ poverty and Apollo’s (future) greatness. ἔπει ἦ is often before πολυ- in Homer, which may have influenced this line (cf. 72). πολυώνυμος is used of Hades at Dem. 18, where it means "of many names" (cf. Allen, Halliday and Sikes 1936, Richardson 1974 ad loc.). The meaning is probably the same here, referring to Apollo’s many cult titles (for this sense cf. Soph. Ant. 1115; Ar. Th. 320; Call. h.Art. 7; Theoc. 15.109 with Gow). The word can simply mean "famous", as at Th. 785, where it describes the water of the Styx, and Pi. Pyth. 1.17; but these are both descriptions of inanimate objects, and this sense would be weak here. The idea that Apollo is widely worshipped is also found at 20-4, 143-5.
83. In Homer this phrase is only used when the words of the oath are not given (though at II. 23.42 the words are given after ἔπι δ' ὄρκον δίμοσσεν). Interestingly 89 is a line also only used in cases where the words are not given, cf. Od. 10.346, 2.377-8. In fact the poet could have put 89 straight after 83, as at Od. 2.377f. He also differs from Homeric practice in not repeating the words of the one suggesting the oath. Such differences from Homeric practice are not uncommon in the hymn, and are not necessarily inferior (cf. on 89 and prolegomena, 71ff.).

84-6. = II. 15.36-8, Od. 5.184-6: is there any significance in the fact that all three times the lines are spoken by a goddess?

85. Στυγός ὀδώρ: on Styx as the oath of the gods cf. on 79. On the Styx in general, cf. West 1966 on Th. 778-9, 805. In Hesiod (Th. 775-6) Styx is a goddess, the eldest daughter of Oceanus. Her name is connected with στυγερός (cf. Th. 775 στυγερή θεός ὁθονάτοισι; Milton P.L. 2.577 "Abhorred Styx, the flood of deadly hate"). Bollack (Bollack and Hiersche 1958, 1ff.) points out that in Homer the Styx is always referred to as Στυγός ὀδώρ, and suggests that the name originally referred not to the water but to the rock from which it fell. In Hesiod the Styx is associated with rocks (Th. 792 ἐκ πέτρης προφέτει; cf. 778, 786, 806). West (1966, on Th. 805) suggests that Στυγός ὀδώρ, the "water of shuddering", is the river's original name.

86. δεινότατος: an oath is something which inspires dread and respect, especially in the case of the Styx (see on 79 above). If an oath were not awe-inspiring in some way, it would not be effective. An oath is also terrible because of the punishment it may bring to perjurers: this is why Hesiod says that Horkos πλείστον ἐπιχθονίους ἀνθρώπους / πηματεί (Th. 231-2, cf. West 1966 ad loc.). He also describes Horkos as the son of Eris (Op. 804) and Styx, the divine equivalent of Horkos, as μέγα πήμα θεοίσιν (Th. 792).
87. ἡ μὴν: this is not used in oaths in early epic, only in its basic sense of strengthening an assertion. In oaths it does not seem to be used, until the fifth century; cf. Denniston 1954, 350-1. Perhaps ἡ μὲν should be read here: it is used in oaths at *Il.* 1.77, 14.275; *Od.* 14.160; see Denniston 1954, 389.

θυώδης: cf. *Aph.* 59 τέμενος βωμός τε θυώδης; *Il.* 8.48 (with θυήτες); in our passage this formula is split up, and there is violent enjambement, with the adjective in the line before the noun (see on 91 below). θυώδης is used of a temple at *Dem.* 355, 385, *Aph.* 58; Theoc. 17.123; of altars at *Th.* 557; and of Olympus at *Herm.* 322, *Dem.* 331. Homer uses θυήτες rather than θυώδης also at *Il.* 23.148, *Od.* 8.363; Kirk (1990, on *Il.* 8.48) asserts that θυήτες "refers to burnt offerings in general, strictly non-animal ones . . . 'fragrant' is a mistranslation here, though correct for 15.153 θυάειν and for θυώδης." θυώδης does occur in the *Odyssey* (3x), but not of altars or temples.

ἐσσεται οὖς: cf. 495-6. The idea of the sanctuary lasting for ever is important in both halves of the hymn, cf. 58, 248, 259, 288, 299, 536.

88. βωμός καὶ τέμενος: this is a common pairing (see examples in previous note). The two together form a concept which is equivalent to νηὸς. Therefore it is not of major importance that Leto swears that Apollo will have a βωμός καὶ τέμενος whereas Delos asked for a νηὸς (see Unte 1968, 31; Förstel 1979, 429f. n.492; Baltes 1982, 29 n.18; Miller 1986, 44). In 52 and 56 she has already promised that there will be a temple if Delos accepts Apollo. Leto in fact grants Delos more than she asked for: she only asked to be his first sanctuary, but Leto says that he will honour her above all. On the omission of the oracle from her oath, see on 81. A τέμενος is originally any piece of land set aside for a particular purpose (cf. LSJ, Frisk 1960-
70, Chantraine 1968-80, s.v.). The βωμός is the focal point within this enclosure.

τισεὶ δὲ σε γ′ ἔξοχα πάντων: cf. Od. 24.78 ἔξοχα τίς ἀπάντων, 19.247; II. 9.631. For the motif of honour in this hymn cf. on 65. The occurrence of τισεὶ here lends some support to reading it at 53.

89. = II. 14.280; Od.2.378, 10.346, 15.438, 18,59. As noted above (83n.), in Homer this line is only used when the words of the oath are not given. There are several cases of non-Homeric usage of phrases beginning or ending speeches in this part of the hymn. αὐτῷ ἐπεὶ τὸ γ′ ἄκουσε (107) is only used in Homer after an actual speech, and 111 is the only example of ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηῦδα which is not followed by a speech. This could be seen as a sign of a decline in skill in handling the traditional language; but in 83, 89, 107 and 111 there is no awkwardness in the hymn’s use of the formulae — it is simply different from Homer’s. Given the relative lengths of Homer and the Hymns and the large amount of speech in Homer (see prolegomena, 31f.), it is not surprising that the hymn should use lines like 107 and 111 without the actual words of the speech. It is more surprising that this difference should be reversed in the use of 83 and 89, but again there is no awkwardness involved.

τελευτησέν τε τῶν δρκον: δρκον τελευτῶν suggests that there was a certain ritual which had to be completed if the oath was to be binding. In all cases it seems to be the invocation of the right witnesses that is important (cf. II. 14.277-80).

90. Cf. 161, where Delos also rejoices at the prospect of Apollo’s birth. In the earlier passage the joy was tempered by fear, but now the obstacle has been overcome.

γόνῳ: at 63 the phrase γονῆν ἐκάτοιο αὐξακτος is used, in the same context of Delos’ joy as here. The similarity of both sense and language suggest that γονῆν in 63 ought to mean the same as γόνῳ in 90; yet in 63 "offspring" seems the meaning;
it is the child Delos receives, not the birth. Perhaps then the meaning in 90 is "offspring"; Delos is said to rejoice in Apollo before he is actually born. The meaning "birth" is not attested for γόνος before Aesch. Supp. 173, and this is a doubtful case; the first secure examples are in the fourth century.

91. ἐννήμαρ τε καὶ ἐννέα νύκτας: nine is a conventional epic number (cf. Richardson 1974 on Dem. 47).

άξιοποιος: Ahrens (1860) and Wackernagel (1927), in discussing whether αξιοποιος or άξιοποιος should be read at Aesch. Supp. 908, both suggest αξιοποιος in this line of Ap. (cf. Fränkel on Aesch. Ag. 141). άξιοποιος meaning "unspeakable", accepted by Cassola (1975), would certainly make sense here, and the passages from Aeschylus provide parallels for the variation between these two words. However, the proper epic form is αξιοποιος < 'άξιοποιος, with dietics (see Chantraine 1968-80, s.v. άριστος and άξιοποιος). άξιοποιος here could have several meanings. LSJ s.v. translate it as "hopeless" in this passage, but that seems an odd adjective to apply to birth pains. The passive sense is more likely, but this too could be taken in different ways; the pains might be "unlooked for" because of their severity, or, in a good sense, "beyond hope", because of the obstacles that had to be overcome (cf. its use of an unexpected child at Dem. 219, 252). The former seems more likely. άξιοποιος is a short dative plural (see on 18), and there is also a violent enjambement here. There was a similarly harsh enjambement at 87f., where again the epithet comes in the line before the noun it describes; see Kirk 1981, 171; Janko 1982, 101.

92. ωδίνεσσι: ωδίνα usually refers to birth pangs (cf. 45, Il. 11.271). This epic form of the dative plural (non-epic ωδίνα) is also used by Pindar (Ol. 6.43 ὑπ' ωδίνεσσι' ἑραταις) and Theocritus (17.61 βεβαιημένα ωδίνεσσιν). Callimachus in h. Del. 202 has ὑπ' ωδίνεσσι βαρυνομένην, also of Leto, which suggests he may
have had this passage in mind. On the relationship of Callimachus’ Delian hymn to Ap. see prolegomena, 57ff..

πέπαρτο: πέρω is usually used of things being literally pierced in Homer (e.g. Il. 1.245f. σκῆπτρον . . . χρυσείος ἐλοισι πεπαρμένον), but its use of pain is paralleled at Il. 5.399 ὄδυνησι πεπαρμένος.

ἐνδοθ: this seems odd, and has been emended to συνώθ (Ilgen) or ἐνθάδε (Hermann). However, these are unlikely to have been altered to ἐνδοθ and the MSS. reading is supported by Hes. fr. 205.4 M.-W. ὅσσοι ἔσσον μύρμηκες ἐνδοθ νήσου.

93. ἔσσον: Wolf (1784) suggested reading ἔσσι, since Διώνη has a short first syllable in Homer and Hesiod. However, ἔσσον is supported by Il. 17.377 ὅσσοι ἀριστοὶ ἔσσον, cf 12.89 and 197 of πλείστοι καὶ ἀριστοὶ ἔσσον; ἔσσον is found in expressions of a similar type at Od. 4.720, 11.227, 20.163, 22.244. On the scanion Διώνη, cf. Schultze 1892, 155 n.7; Debrunner 1927, 183.

The list of goddesses is slightly surprising; instead of the major Olympian goddesses we find those of an earlier generation. Perhaps the younger goddesses (Athena, Aphrodite), as well as Artemis, are not born yet. Rhea and Themis are in the list of Titans given by Hesiod (Th. 135) and Apollodorus (1.3) lists Dione too as a Titan. This choice may well reflect the connection of Leto with the Titans; she is of the same generation as Zeus, whether her father is Cronus or Coeus, but at Th. 18 she is listed next to Iapetus and Cronus (and after Dione); cf. West 1966, on Th. 136. Themis and Dione were both wives of Zeus: cf. Th. 901 for Themis; Dione was associated with Zeus at Dodona, where she replaced Gaia. Whatever the reasons for stressing these particular goddesses, the scene is clearly based on the customs of human communities where the women of the community gather to help a woman in labour; on this, cf. e.g. Garland 1990, 61ff. In Ar. Eccl. 526-34 Praxagora explains
her absence to her husband by saying that she has been helping a friend give birth. The Hippocratic school said that at least four women should be present at a birth (Cutting up of the Embryo 4); Soranus recommends the presence of at least three beside the midwife (Gyn. 2.5). It is not clear whether these goddesses were the only ones present, or are only the ones singled out for attention: the poet goes on to say that all the others were there, except for Hera and Eileithya, but see on 95ff. In the story of Typhaon's birth in the Pythian half (305-55) Hera calls on the Titans for help (335ff.), whereas here they are on opposing sides.

Διώνη: according to Hesiod (Th. 353) daughter of Oceanus and Tethys; in Apollodorus (1.13), of Ouranos and Ge. As mother of Aphrodite by Zeus (Il. 5.370, with Kirk 1990 ad loc.), she might naturally come to mind as a helper for the mother of Apollo. Like Leto, she has little importance other than as mother of one of the major deities.

Πετη: again a suitable choice to assist at the birth, because of her nature as a mother goddess: she was the mother by Cronus of Demeter, Hera, Hades, Poseidon and Zeus (Th. 453 ff., Il. 15.187). She was sometimes called "mother of the gods" and identified with Cybele, "the great mother"; see e.g. Farnell 1896-1909, 4.292ff. Πετη is the correction of the editio princeps for the MSS. Πετη, a form used at Th. 467, Dem. 459. Πέτα and Πέτα are also found in epic poetry, but Πετη is the commonest form of the name. Cf. West 1966, on Th. 135; Janko 1992, on Il. 14.203f.

94. Ἰχνοτή τε Ὑμις: Ichnae was a place in Thessaly famous for the worship of Themis (Strabo 9, 435 Ἰχνοτή, ὑπὸ Ὑμις Ἰχνοτή τιμᾶται; cf. Allen, Halliday and Sikes 1936, ad loc). It is possible, however, that the place was named from an epithet of Themis, rather than the other way round. The title is apt for the goddess of law who "tracks down" the evil-doer; Nemesis is called the Ἰχνοτή
παρθένος at A.P. 9.405.1. In Hesiod (Th. 135) Themis is the sister of Rhea, and this
is probably one reason for her inclusion here; at 124-5 it is she who first feeds Apollo
with nectar and ambrosia (see commentary ad loc.).

ὀχυρόστονος Αμφιτρίτη: in Hesiod Amphitrite is a Nereid (Th. 243, with West
1966 ad loc.), and consort of Poseidon (930). In the Odyssey, however, Amphitrite
simply means the sea (3.91, 5.422, 12.60, 97). The derivation of the name is
uncertain, but it is probably connected with Τριτών and Τριτογένεια; West (1966,
on Th. 243) quotes Hesychius, τριτώρεμός. At Th. 930 she is said to be the
mother of Triton; in the opinion of Wilamowitz (1931-2, 1.222) she owes her name
to this. Cf. Stanford (1961-2) on Od. 3.378, LfGrE s.v. ὀχυρόστονος is also used of
her at Od. 12.97. The epithet is more suitable to the sea than to a sea-goddess, but
is no doubt traditional. Amphitrite fits the list as one of the older generation of
goddesses; she may well be mentioned here, as Miller (1986, 48) suggests, because
of Delos’ natural association with the sea. She was depicted at the birth of Athena on
the relief by Gitiias in the temple of Athena Chalkioikos in Sparta (Paus. 3.17.3), and
at that of Aphrodite on the base of the statue of Zeus at Olympia (Paus. 5.11.8).
95. νόσφιν λευκόλευκον Ἡρῆς: the same phrase is used again at 105, but with a different meaning: here it means "except" (cf. Od. 1.20, also "all the gods except..."), but in 105 it means something like "without the knowledge of". The formula λευκόλευκος Ἡρῆ is not found in the genitive in Homer (cf. Janko 1982, 103). West (1966, 79) lists cases in Hesiod of non-Homeric declension of noun-epithet formulae for gods: another example in this hymn is Ἀρτέμιν ἱσχύσοσιν (15, 159).

West (1975, 169f.) argues that all the references to Hera in this part of the hymn are interpolations. He says that she has no place in the poem since she is ignored at two points where we might have expected her to be mentioned, the opening scene and Leto's search for a birthplace; that 95-8 as they stand are awkward and repetitive; that at 98 Eileithya is said to be ὀπὸ χρυσάτους νέφεσιν, whereas at 110 Iris calls her ὀπὸ μεγάρου; that 107 follows on more smoothly from 104 if 105-6 are removed; and that when Iris carries out the orders, no mention is made of Hera.

96 is missing from MET; this means that its absence is well-established, since it occurs in both branches of the tradition; see e.g. the stemma of Càssola (1975, 612). Together with the awkwardness of the repeated ἰστὸ γὰρ this makes it likely that 96 is either interpolated or, more probably, is a variant of 98 (cf. 136-9). That it is an interpolation is argued by Baumeister 1860; Gemoll 1886; Càssola 1975, ad loc.; Ludwig 1908, 185; Förstel 1979, 120ff.; and that it is a variant of 98 by Hermann 1806, ad loc.; Wilamowitz 1916, 450; Breuning 1929, 64; Jacoby 1933a, 708f. To say that all the goddesses were present, and then list exceptions is typical hymnic style; cf. Aph. 6ff. West, because of his desire to remove Hera from the story, wishes to delete 95 and 98-101, and move 96 to after 97, thus bringing the description of
Eileithyia into line with 110; this is unnecessarily drastic. Moreover, there is no real discrepancy between 98 and 110; the house is in the sky, or is the sky. Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, ad loc.) defend the version in the MSS, and argue that 96 fell out of some MSS because of the homoearchon with 98, but Wade-Gery (1936, 59f. n.2) pointed out that if this were so one would expect 97 to be omitted also, which it is not. In favour of keeping 97 and 98 as they are (rather than 97 and 96) is a parallel passage in Homer: in ll. 13.521ff. we have οὐδ' ἄφα πῶ τι πέπυστο . . . Ἄρης . . . ἄλλ᾽ ὧ γ' ἄφα ἀκρω ὅλομπῳ ὑπὸ χρυσεόις νέφεσιν / ἦστο, Διὸς βουλῆσιν ἐξελμένος κτλ.

West’s main complaint about the passage is that Hera does not belong here. It is true that she is suppressed in favour of Leto in 1-13, and possibly also also in the story of Leto’s wanderings; but Hera is necessary in this section. She was connected with childbirth, and in particular with Eileithyia or the Eileithyai, and at Th. 922 Eileithyia is her daughter; cf. West 1966 ad loc. and ll. 11.270ff. At ll. 19.119 she delays the birth of Heracles, again out of jealousy, by the same means as here. Hera’s role as the jealous wife of Zeus is a familiar one, and the whole story seems weak and ill-motivated if we remove Hera from it. Why should Eileithyia not come? Normally her arrival is automatic, and the only similar case is ll. 19.119, where again the delay is caused by Hera. Why should she not perceive what is happening on Delos? In ll. 13.521ff. Ares is unaware of events before Troy because this is planned by Zeus, and surely there must be someone behind Eileithyia’s deception too. The bribe of the necklace also makes more sense if it is needed to counteract Hera’s influence.

ἥστο: this is common in descriptions of a god’s absence or inattention (ll. 13.524; Dem. 28, 356). Other examples of such absence at an important moment are
II. 1.423ff., Od. 1.22ff., and the elaborate deception of Zeus in II. 14.

ἐν μεγάροισι: this is common in Homer, but not used with Δίς as here. μέγαρον is mostly used of human houses, but can be used of the gods’; cf. Od. 1.27 Ζηνᾶς ἐνί μεγάροισιν Ὄλυμπιον, 9.76, 24.42.

97. οὐκ ἐπέπνυστο: cf. II. 13.521 and 674. ἐπέπνυστο is only used in these three places, each time of somebody failing to observe something which he or she should have observed. A god could usually hear from wherever he was (II. 16.514ff.); here and in II. 13.521ff. it is by the agency of another deity that the god is unaware of what is happening.

μονοστόκοις Εἰλεθθυίω: the same epithet is used of Eileithyia or the Eileithyiai at II. 11.270, 16.187, 19.103. At Amnisos in Crete a cave dedicated to Eileithyia has been found: it is mentioned in Homer (Od. 19.188; see Russo in Russo, Fernandez-Galiano and Heubeck 1992, ad loc.), and on a Mycenaean tablet from Knossos (Gg 705 = Ventriss and Chadwick 1973, 206); cf. Willetts 1958, 221-3; Fauré 1964, 82-90; Gérard-Rousseau 1968, 101ff. The name may be a corruption of Ἐλεθθυίω, referring to the "coming" of labour pains (cf. Jessen 1905, 210ff.). Palmer (1963, 238) prefers to connect it with Ἐλεθθερός and Latin "liberi", children. She is closely connected with Hera (see on 95) and also Artemis: there was a cult of Ἰρά Εἰλεθθυίω at Argos and Athens (Hesych. s.v. Εἰλεθθυίας), and Plutarch (Quaest. Conviv. 658f.) mentions the worship of Artemis Eileithyia. Farnell (1896-1909, 2.608ff.) suggests that Εἰλεθθυίω is an adjectival form, and that the goddess developed out of a function of Hera. There was a cult of Eileithyia on Delos; cf. Hdt. 4.35; Paus. 1.18, 8.21.3, 9.27.2. She is essential to the process of birth, and so here and at II. 19.119 Hera is able to delay a birth by holding her back. She is not a midwife figure but a
personification of labour-pains: at 115-6 Leto enters the last stage of labour as soon as she steps on the island. This view is supported by the scholia to Il. 19.119, where εἰλεθίνως is explained as ὠδίνως, μετωνυμικῶς (Hesychius has εἰλεθύμως ὠδίνως). If so, μοχοστόκος is best explained as "generating pangs" rather than, as the scholiast to Il. 11.270 explains, ὀδίν τῶν μύγας ἀκτυσιών πετομέναι (cf Frisk 1960-70 s.v.). In the hymn, however, it is the actual birth she brings on, not the pains. On Eileithyia see also Baur 1902.

98. ἀκροφ. Ὀλύμπως: only used in Homer at Il. 13.523, also before ὑπὸ χρυσέοις νέφεσιν. Leaf (1900-2, ad loc.) sees it as an interpolation, commenting "the idea of the gods sitting under a canopy of golden clouds on Olympus is hardly Homeric". The line, though, definitely envisages Olympus as a mountain, which is the earlier conception; in the Odyssey it is seen as a sort of heaven, cf. S. West (in Heubeck, West and Hainsworth 1988) on Od. 1.102; Hainsworth, ibid., on 6.42-7.

99. Ἡρης φραδμοσύνης λευκωλένου: this is a further modification of the formula λευκωλένος Ἡρη; it is not only used in the genitive, as at 95 above, but split up and moved from the line end, its invariable position in Homer. It is this modification which causes the use of the short dative plural (cf. on 18). The only other occurrences of the word in early epic are in similar expressions in Hesiod, also in the dative plural (but always φραδμοσύνησιν), Th. 626, 884, 891; Op. 245. Cf. Janko 1982, 103.

100. ξηλοσύνης ἀπαξ, perhaps influenced by φραδμοσύνης in the previous line.

δ τε: = δτε: cf. Chantraine 1948-53, 2.288f. Ruijgh (1971, 810-23) believes that there is no such conjunction as δ τε, and that the examples are really uses of δτε
in a causal sense (Càssola 1975 prints ὅτε here). This seems unlikely: the causal use of ὅτε is rare, and in Homer it seems to be the combination ὅτε ἤ that is so used.

ὑδν ὁμύμωνα τε κρατερόν τε: a formulaic expression, also at Il. 4.89, 5.169, 13.451, 18.55, 21.546; Th. 1013 (without ὑδν), but not elsewhere used of a god. The line is similar to 13 and 126: there Leto views Apollo with pride, here Hera views the same qualities with envy. The meaning of ὁμύμων is uncertain. The traditional translation is "blameless", connecting it with μόμος, cf. Hesych. μύμωρ· οἵσχος, φόβος, ψόγος. This explanation has been challenged, particularly with regard to the most notorious occurrence of the word, ὁμύμων Ὀλυμπίων at Od. 1.29. A. A. Parry (1973), after examining every instance of the word in Homer, concludes that its basic meaning is "handsome, beautiful", which would make good sense here. There are certainly Homeric passages which suit this theory (e.g. Il. 2.674, 6.155, 8.302), and it would do away with the problem of "blameless Aegisthus", but it is only based on probabilities: there is no concrete evidence to support it, and no satisfactory etymology, whereas the gloss in Hesychius provides good support for "blameless."

The traditional view is defended by Combellack 1982.

101. τέξιςθα: interestingly, in every passage where this form occurs in early epic, it is in conjunction with ἐμέλλει(ν) / μέλλει(ν), and focuses on the moment before the birth (Il. 19.99; Th. 469, 889, 898). In every case there is some deception or some envy of the child about to be born: Il. 19.99 comes in the story of Hera’s deception of Zeus with regard to the birth of Heracles; Th. 469 refers to the birth of Zeus, who is in danger from Cronos; Th. 889 and 898 describe the swallowing of Metis by Zeus when she was about to give birth to Athena, to prevent her bearing a son stronger than him.
Note the split formula, Αττώ . . . καλλιπλάκωμος.

102ff. This is an unusual messenger scene (on the typical pattern, see Arend 1933, 54ff.). The basic difference between it and similar Homeric scenes is its brevity. There is no direct speech either when the goddesses give Iris the message or when she relates it to Eileithyia; in Homer the speech is normally given both times, and II. 7.416 is the only example of omission of direct speech. This scene does however keep to the basic outline: the orders are given, then there is a description of the journey, arrival and delivery of the message. Two elements are omitted: the description of what the recipient of the message was doing, and a phrase such as ἀρχος δ’ ἵσταττενη before the delivery of the message. There are three messenger scenes in Dem.: 314ff. (see Richardson 1974, ad loc.), 334ff. and 441ff. These follow the Homeric pattern more closely, except that they relate the initial giving of the message in indirect speech, but use direct speech when the message is actually delivered. See also West 1978, on Op. 84ff.

102. Ἡρειν: in the Iliad, and at Dem. 314ff., Iris is the messenger of the gods, probably because she is the personification of the rainbow, which connects heaven and earth (II. 11.27, 17.547); in the Odyssey Hermes is the divine messenger. She is usually sent by Zeus in the Iliad, so it is unusual to have her sent by the goddesses here. At II. 18.166ff. she is sent by Hera to Achilles κρύβειας Διώς ἔλλαων τε θεων, and she can act independently (3.121ff., 5.352-69, 23.194-212); but in Homer she is not sent by any god other than Zeus and Hera. This may be partly why the goddesses need to bribe her; she is not compelled to obey them. It is also unusual for her to be sent from earth to Olympus. She is not named among the goddesses present at the birth, but the poet says they were all there (95); it is also true to say that when the
poet wants a message sent he assumes Iris is present, as she naturally is when sent from Olympus. In Callimachus' hymn to Delos, Iris is on the side of Hera, and watches the Aegean to prevent any place giving refuge to Leto; this may be a deliberate reversal by Callimachus of her role here, but the association of Iris and Hera is found elsewhere, e.g. at Eur. Herc. 822-73. Our poet may show awareness of this relationship in making the goddesses bribe Iris to deceive Hera. The Delians made offerings to Iris of cakes, figs and nuts (Semos of Delos ap. Athenaeus 14.53, FrGrHist III B, 396.

έυκτιμένης ὀπὸ νῆσου: Janko (1982, 103) compares phrases like ἔυκτιμένη ἐνι Λέσβο (Od. 4.342 etc.) and έυκτιμένην κατ' ὀλωήν (Il. 23.282; Od. 5.70; Op. 739), and suggests that the contracted genitive in -ου may be a sign of modification. On εὐκτιμενος, see on 36. The epithet seems inappropriate for the barren and uninhabited island of Delos. It is either used carelessly, or else is proleptic, looking to Delos' future prosperity.

103. ὑποσχόμενοι μέγαν δώρον: this participle is always in this place in the verse in early epic; cf. Herm. 521, Th. 170 and especially Il. 9.576 ὑποσχόμενοι μέγα δώρον, also a case of a mission to win someone over.

104. χρυσεότισι λύνοσιν ἔρμενον: Barnes wanted to read χρύσεον, ἥλεκτροσιν ἔρμενον on the basis of Od. 18.296, also of a necklace, but this is palaeographically unjustifiable. The Mss. read ἔργμενον, but Barnes may be right to correct this; the Homeric parallel supports ἔρμενον, and ἔργμενον is hard to explain here (it is defended by Förstel 1979, 430 n.493). If from ἐφρατο it would mean "enclosed, encircled" which does not make sense, and there is no parallel for the use of ἐρδο with the meaning "worked" which Förstel wants to give it (following
With ἐκρεμένον the meaning would be "strung on golden threads (or wires)". The plural λίνοις is slightly surprising, and is not found elsewhere in early epic, so Peppmüller's λίθοις is possible, though λίθος is not used of precious stones in Homer (and certainly not of golden beads). On the use of the necklace as a bribe, cf. on 102; the best Homeric parallel is Hera's bribery of Hypnos to help her deceive Zeus (Il. 14.231-79).

Εννεάκτημν: this is 13'6", which is very large for a necklace, even a divine one (though it could go round the neck many times), so the figure is probably conventional (see on 91).

105. νόσφιν: here this seems to mean "without the knowledge of" (see on 95); for this use cf. Dem. 4, 72; LSJ s.v. II.3.

107. ποδήνεμος ὁκέα Ἰρις: a Homeric formula (9x Il.). The use of ποδήνεμος need not mean that Homer conceived of Iris as having winged feet, pace Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, ad loc.); feet are naturally mentioned in the context of swiftness, cf. πόδας ὁκεός Ἀχιλλεύς (πόδας ὁκέα is used of Iris 9x Il.). Vase paintings normally show Iris with wings, but not on her feet; for bibliography on Iris in art, see LIMC s.v. She is called χρυσόπτερος at Il. 8.398, 11.185; Dem. 314. The epithet is suitable because of her links with the winds (cf. West 1966, on Th. 266). She is ἀειλλόπος at Il. 8.409, 24.77, and at 23.198ff. she fetches Boreas and Zephyrus for Achilles. Empedocles fr.50 Diels-Kranz says Ἰρις ἐκ πελάγους ὁνεμον φέρει ἥ μέγαν διμβρον. In some versions she is married to Zephyrus.

108. βὴ σὺ θέειν: this precise expression is not in Homer, though βὴ δὲ θέειν and βὴ ρ' ἤμεν are both common. Obviously δὲ could not be used here.

τοχέως: Iris is commonly associated with the idea of swiftness, as befits her role
as divine messenger, cf. on 107. In addition to the formulae cited there she is
addressed as Ἦρι ταξεία 4x II.

διήνυσε πάν τὸ μεσηγὸ: this is not used of completing a journey in Homer, but
cf. Dem. 380 ρῆμα δὲ μακρὰ κέλευθα διήνυσον. In Homer μεσηγὸς is only an
adjective or a preposition, and this is the only time it is used as a noun in early epic.
The closest parallel is Dem. 317 μεσηγὸ διέδρομεν, also of Iris; Ilgen (1796)
emended this to τὸ μεσηγὸ, but this seems unnecessary, cf. Richardson 1974 ad loc.
The use of τὸ as a definite article here suggests the hymn’s use is innovative.

109. The repetition of this common way of continuing the narrative after only
two lines is an indication of the speed with which this episode is dealt with (see on
102ff.). This sort of summary style is typical of the poets of the Epic Cycle; see
Griffin 1977, 49, who quotes AP xi.130 (by Polilianus): τοῦς κυκλίους τοῦτους,
tοὺς "αὐτὰρ ἐπειτὰ" λέγοντας, μισό.

θεόν ἔδωκ, ἀπὸν Ὀλυμπον: also at II. 5.367, 868 (after Ἰκόντο and Ἰκανε);
cf. Od. 6.42; Th. 128 with West 1966 ad loc.; Sc. 203; Solon 13.21 West.

110. ἀπὸ μεγάρωτο: this is the reading of M: the other MSS read ἀπέκ (or ἀπ’
ἐκ). ἀπὸ (read by Allen 1911; Allen, Halliday and Sikes 1936) is preferable here;
ἀπέκ (read by Baumeister 1860; Gemoll 1886; Cassola 1975) is not found in early
epic, and may be the work of a scribe who thought that ἀπὸ did not scan. ἀπὸ
μεγάρωτο is found in the same place in the verse at Od. 17.398, 20.343, 23.43. On
the other hand, ἀπέκ is probably the lectio difficilior and, though it is not found in
eyearly epic, διἐκ and ὑπέκ are. Cf. especially Od. 18.386 διἐκ προθύρωτο θύραζε;
the hymn’s phrase may be based on this or a similar line.

111. ἐκπροκαλέσσομένη: also at Od. 2.400, of Athene calling Telemachus out
of the hall. In the *Odyssey* it is followed by a simple genitive (μεγάρων); the hymn combines it with ἀπὸ μεγάρων, which is clumsier.

ἐπεα πτερόδεντα προσηδόνα: as pointed out above (see on 89), this is the only use of the phrase where the words of the speech do not follow.

112. πάντα μᾶλλ': quite often used in conjunction with the idea "as ordered", e.g. *Il. 2.10, 11.768, 23.96*. Interestingly, it is only used in speeches in Homer; Griffin (1986, 45f.) points out that in Homer μᾶλλα with adjectives is much commoner in speeches than in narrative.

'Ολυμπία δύμας ἔχουσα: the feminine version of this formula is not elsewhere used as a periphrasis for θεά, though the masculine form is often used alone. 'Ο. δ. ἔχουσα is used only of the Muses in Homer and Hesiod.

113 θυμὸν ἐπείθεν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλοισι: the phrase θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ἐπείθε(ν)/-ον is used at *Il. 9.587; Od. 7.258 = 9.23, 23.337*. θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλοισι is also a Homeric phrase (3x *Il.*, 5x *Od.*, also 524 below). Here the two formulae are combined, so that ἐπειθε(ν) is moved from its usual position at the end of the line. This leads to the use of n-mobile to avoid hiatus; Hoekstra (1969, 23f.) points out that Homer has only one example of πείθε(ν), and none of ἐπειθε(ν), in which n-mobile is necessary. On θυμός, here apparently conceived as a physical organ, see on 70.

114. The line is quoted by Aristophanes, *Birds 575 'Irín δὲ γ' Ὀμηρος ἔφασκ' ἰκέλην εἶναι τρήρων πελετή.* The schol. Rav. ad loc. comments ὅτι ψεῦδεται ποιεῖν· οὔ γὰρ ἐπὶ 'Irιδος ἄλλ' ἐπὶ 'Αθηνας καὶ 'Ηρας; but Schol. Ven. says οὐ δὲ ἐν ἐτέροις ποιήμασιν Ὀμηρος φασί τούτο γενέσθαι· εἶσί γὰρ καὶ ὅμοιοι. There is nothing surprising in Aristophanes knowing the hymn and
attributing it to Homer, since Thucydides did the same (3.104). See prolegomena, 95f. At Iliad 5.778 Hera and Athene are described in the same way, though they are probably not flying. This makes the comparison surprising; I doubt if the goddesses are imagined as strutting or waddling, as Kirk (1990, ad loc.) suggests. He also cites the suggestions of Ameis-Hentze that the reference is to short, quick female paces, and of N.J. Richardson that the point is the quietness of their movement. In Ap. the simile is more obvious, since the goddesses are flying, but it is still not clear quite why they should be compared to doves. The point could be either the secrecy or the haste of their flight; they are afraid of being seen by Hera. This is the explanation given by Schröder (1975, 25) who argues that it only makes sense in its context in the hymn, and that Iliad 5.778 is borrowed from here. However, it is not clear that the simile is particularly apt in Ap. and awkward in Homer. Richardson (1978, 145f.) points out that ἔμποτα may be more suitable for walking than flying, since in its only other occurrence Callimachus (her Dem. 58) uses it to mean "footsteps". It is also a v.l. at Iliad 13.70-2 (see Janko 1992 ad loc.) The phrase βάν δὲ ποστι in this context might support the idea that Iris has winged feet; see on 107.

τρήρωσι πελευσίν: this phrase (in several cases) is used 4x Iliad, 1x Odyssey. τρήρων may be a noun here; an adjective πολυτρήρων occurs at Iliad 2.502 and 582, and for the type of expression cf. Iliad 5.783 σωσί κάπροισίν, Odyssey 13.86f. ἱππό κήρος. Hesychius has two relevant glosses: τρήρων· δειλή· περιστερά· ἀπό τοῦ τρείν· δ' ἐστιν φοβεῖσθαι· δειλόν γὰρ τὸ ζῷον κοί ταχύ, and τρηρόν· ἔλαφρον· δειλόν· ταχύ. He is probably right to explain it as "timorous" and link it to τρείν· it comes from "trasron, which shows Ionic treatment of the zero grade "trs- of the root "tres-.

See Chantraine 1933, 161; Sihler 1995, 199 (the latter wrongly calls it Attic).
Gods are often compared to birds, and it is sometimes unclear whether they are merely said to be like birds, or actually take on the form of birds; for discussion see Kirk 1990 on Il. 7.59; Janko 1992 on Il. 13.62-5; S.West (in Heubeck, West and Hainsworth 1988) on Od. 1.320. In this line it is unlikely that the goddesses actually become doves, since they are only said to be like them in their way of going.

115ff. With the arrival of Eileithyia on Delos the birth narrative proper begins: all the obstacles have now been overcome, and Leto enters the final stage of labour. The stages of the birth are demarcated by the the overcoming of these obstacles; in 45, when Leto is searching for a place to give birth, she is ὀδύνωσσα; in 91f., when Delos agrees to be the place of birth, she is seized ἀξιόντος / ὀδύνωσσα; now that Hera’s opposition has been overcome, the birth can take place.

The birth narrative conforms in many respects to the usual story pattern for the birth of a god or hero. It is usual for the birth to take place in unusual circumstances, to mark its importance, and often away from the mother’s normal home (in this case Olympus); e.g. the birth of Hermes in Herm. 6 takes place in a cave and Zeus is born in Arcadia or Crete (Call. h. Zeus 5-7). The enmity of another god, frequently Hera as in this case, is also common: cf. the birth of Heracles in Il. 19.95-133, and the story of the snakes in his cradle (Pi. Nem. 1.37ff.). The jealousy of Hera is implied in h.1.7 κρύπτων λευκόλενον / Ἡρη, Herm. 6-8, and perhaps 17.4. Zeus is threatened at his birth by the enmity of Cronus (Th. 459ff.), as Cronus was by Ouranos (ibid. 154ff.).

The narrative is untypical, however, in that there is no account of Zeus’ intercourse with Leto, and indeed the paternity of Zeus is only mentioned in 10-11, and less emphatically in the suspect line 136; the hymn concentrates on the mother
and the actual birth. This suppression of Zeus' role in the story is no doubt deliberate; the poet does not want the spotlight deflected from the greatness of Apollo.

115. ἕντε: this is always used with asyndeton in Homer when it stands first in the sentence, cf. 427; Il. 6.392. According to Schwyzer (1939-53, 2.660) this is because it was originally an exclamation ἔν τε, "und richtig!", cf. Od. 13.77f. This may be so, but in passages like this the poet must surely see it as a mere equivalent to ὅτε. ἕντε is common in contexts of arrival (cf. Il. 6.392, 12.273; Od. 20.73; Dem. 407).

ἐπὶ Δήλου ἔβαλε: cf. 49 ἐπὶ Δήλου ἐβῆσαντο, of Leto's arrival on the island. The two situations are parallel in that both mark an important turning-point in the process leading to Apollo's birth. The imperfect may stress the rapidity with which Eileithyia's arrival takes effect -- even as she was stepping on the island, Leto began to give birth (so Gemoll 1886, ad loc.). We should, however, be careful about reading too much significance into an imperfect, since it is often hard to distinguish in sense from the aorist (cf. e.g. Il. 1.437-9). In the previous line the verb was plural, describing Iris and Eileithyia; now Iris drops out, having fulfilled her role, and the focus is on Eileithyia alone.

μοιχοστόκος Εἰλεθυία: see on 97.

116-9. The actual birth is described in only four lines, after being led up to for 115. Is this perhaps rather perfunctory treatment for such a key moment in the narrative? It takes the form of seven short clauses, six in a row connected by δέ, which is perhaps unusual. But before criticising a passage like this for brevity at an important moment it should be borne in mind that "the requirements of a five-hundred line poem about a single mythical event may differ radically from those of a 12,000
line epic" (Segal 1981, 110). In fact these lines seem to me very effective: the short clauses give the narrative a swift and vigorous movement, leading to a good climax in 119. A longer treatment of the event would lose the sense of breathless excitement which the poet captures in his vignette.

116. τῇν τότε δή: Ilgen suggested reading δὴ τότε τῇν to emphasise the moment of Eileithyia’s arrival: this is an improvement, but an unnecessary one, since τῇν τότε is in all the MSS, and emphasis on Leto as opposed to Eileithyia is perfectly natural here (so Allen and Sikes 1904, ad loc.).

tόκος εἴλε: this sort of phrase is used of forces that take over a person, over which they seem to lack control, e.g. δὲος (Il. 4.421); δτη (Il. 16.805); ἔρος (Aph. 144); θάνατος (Op. 154f.); not elsewhere with τόκος. Is it possible that the phrase may have been suggested by the sound of the end of the previous line, μοιχότοκος Εἰλεθυια?

117. ὧμφι δὲ φοίνικι: cf Theognis 5, Call. h. Del. 208 -- both these accounts of Apollo’s birth seem to have been influenced by the hymn. On the palm tree and versions of the birth story cf. on 17f. Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, ad loc.) are probably right to reject the suggestion of the first edition (Allen and Sikes 1904) that the palm was grasped to assist delivery. It is more likely that Leto is said to embrace the tree simply to link Apollo’s birth with the sacred palm. She is describing as giving birth in a kneeling position, and this does seem to have been a posture used in ancient Greece; more commonly, however, a birthing-stool was used or, if this was not available, another woman would support the woman giving birth from behind (in fact leaning against Mt. Cynthus, as Leto does in 17 and 26, would have been of more help than embracing the palm). For an account of childbirth in ancient Greece, see
Garland 1990, 59-99. Palms are very rare in the north Mediterranean, so the Delian palm was unusual; indeed, this may have led to its being connected with the legend of Apollo's birth (cf. Murr 1969 (1890), 48-50).

The scansion φοίνικι may reflect the original Indo-European dative in *-ei. λειμώνι in the next line also has the long dative, but this proves nothing because it is followed by a liquid. On this type of dative in Homer see Wathelet 1962. Hoekstra (1969, 25) suggests that the long dative may be due to modification of a formula like ὀμφῇ δὲ παιδὶ φίλῳ βάλε πῆχε (Od. 17.38 etc.); πῆχε is only used in phrases of this type.

γοῦνα δ' ἔρεισε: See above on positions for giving birth. On Greek statuettes of kneeling women, which are believed to be goddesses of childbirth, cf. Willetts 1962, 169. γοῦνατα is the more common plural in Homer, but γοῦνα is used too (in the accusative at Il. 14.437, 20.93 = 22.204; Od. 6.147, 9.266, 18.395); cf. on δέσμα in 129.

118. λειμώνι μολακφ: the "soft meadow" seems inconsistent with the rocky and barren nature of Delos emphasised earlier (26, 54f.). Perhaps the poet is more concerned with what is suitable for the moment he is concentrating on than with overall consistency: here the softness and receptiveness of the earth suggests that sympathy of nature with the birth which is made explicit in the second half of the line. Cf. Il. 14.346-53, with Janko (1992) ad loc.

μετάθησε δὲ γαῖ: cf. the reaction to Apollo's birth in Theognis 9-10 ἔχελασσε δὲ γαῖα πελώρη, γῆθεσαν δὲ βασάνος πάντος ἀλός πολιής, and Limenius' Delphic paean (= Powell 1925, 149). For the motif of rejoicing nature, cf. also Il. 19.362; Dem. 13-14; Semonides 7.28 West; Aesch. P.V. 90; Ap. Rh. 880. These passages all
use γέλαω (γάνυται Ap. Rh. 881), which is easier as it also suggests "shining" (according to Stanford 1936, 114-116, this is the primary meaning). μετέδθω used in this way is wholly metaphorical - here it is perhaps made easier by the fact that Delos is personified in the poem, and her joy has been mentioned earlier (61, 90). Other examples of nature reacting to a divine birth are Th. 194f., h. 28.9-16. This theme is more fully elaborated at 135-9. On nature's sympathy with the divine, see Janko 1992, on Il. 13.27-31. μετέδησε in Homer is used without n-mobile only at Od. 20.301. Elsewhere it is restricted to the formula ὥς φύτο, μετέδησεν δὲ...(Il. 1.595 etc). On n-mobile in the Hymns, cf. Hoekstra 1969, 23f.; Janko 1982, 64-8.

γαί' ὑπένερθεν: cf. Dem. 429 γαία δ' ἐνερθε; Od. 12.242 ὑπένερθε δὲ γαία 

φῶνεσκε.

119. ἐκ δ' ἔθορε: for ἐκθρόσκω used of births cf. Herm. 20; Th. 281; Call. h. Del. 255, fr. 43 Pfeiffer. It is a good word for the birth of a god, since it suggests vigour and that the baby leaps out rather than being drawn out as in Il. 19.118 ἐκ δ' ἐγειρε πρὸ ϕώσθε.

πρὸ ϕώσθε: light is common in the context of birth: the same phrase is used at Il. 19.118 (birth of Heracles); 16.188 (Eudorus); cf. 19.103 and 71 above. πρὸ ϕώσθε in the Iliad is always used when Eileithyia (or at 19.103 Hera, taking the place of Eileithyia) delivers the child (cf. Pl. Nem. 7.2f. εὖν σέθεν οὖ ϕώς): here this would be natural after the earlier emphasis on Eileithyia's arrival, but instead the poet says ἐκ δ' ἔθορε to emphasise Apollo's independence.

ὀλολυγεῖν: ὀλολυγίω is used "especially of women crying aloud to the gods in prayer or thanksgiving" (LSJ s.v.), cf. 445; Il. 6.301; Od. 3.450; Aph. 19. It is a ritual cry -- for its utterance at birth cf. Frazer (1898) on Paus. 9.11.3; Call. h. Del.
257; Theoc. 17.64, of the birth of Ptolemy. It is the island who cries out there, and
then makes a speech; this is clearly parallel to the personification of Delos in the
hymn, and in 66-70 Theocritus makes the parallel explicit. Delos speaks in Call. h.
Del. 264f., again no doubt imitating Ap. Since ὀλολίζω is used in this ritual way,
it is slightly odd to find the verb used of goddesses here. This is the result of
describing the divine birth in a similar way to a human one: the goddesses attend Leto
as women do in human communities, and in 120-5 they fulfil the functions normally
carried out by the attendant women, washing, clothing and feeding the child (see on
93 above).

120. ἐπε Φοιβε: this epithet of Apollo is only found here and at Il. 15.365,
20.152, always in the vocative, in this position in the verse and after σὺ/σε. The
meaning is uncertain: Aristarchus connected it with ἣμι in the sense of "shoot" (cf.
scholia to Il. 15.365). The most likely suggestion is that it comes from the cry τῆ and
is a parallel form to τῆιος (Allen and Sikes 1904, ad loc. compare τουλος, ὀδλος)
or from ἦ (so LSJ; cf. Hesych. ἦιος: παρανιστής). This is the first apostrophe of
Apollo since 19-20 (cf. Miller 1986, 48). During the narrative of the search for a
birthplace and the birth itself Apollo is of course not taking part in events, so there
is no reason to address him. Perhaps the poet might hesitate to use the you form when
Apollo in the story does not yet exist, at least not independently. Addressing the god
in narration identifies the god in the poem with the god it is offered to. Ap. is unique
among the long hymns in its use of narrative apostrophe; this is found in both parts
of the hymn, though not after 288. Commentators have largely ignored this aspect of
the hymn, perhaps assuming that apostrophe of a god needs no explanation; but there
is nothing parallel in the other long hymns. The best parallel is Homer's apostrophe
of characters in the narrative. Parry (1972) has shown that this stresses the narrator’s sympathy with the character, though some prefer to see it as a technical device to aid oral composition (see Yamagata 1989, with further bibliography). The case of Patroclus is the clearest; he is only addressed in book 16, the book in which he dies, and the frequency of apostrophe increases as his death approaches. Apollo is also addressed twice by the narrator in the Iliad (15.365; 20.152), and Yamagata (1989, 97) suggests that "the poet is talking to Apollo as an ever-present deity listening to and supervising his performance". Apostrophe of Apollo might reflect the poet’s claim to a special relationship with the god of poetry. It also emphasises an important point in the narrative; Apollo is addressed as soon as he is born, and again when he bursts out of his swaddling bands, the first revelation of his divine nature and power.

θεοὶ λόγον: the first bath is an important occasion, for gods as for men. "The story of a god’s birth was scarcely complete without it", says Parker (1983, 50). Other examples of a god’s first bath: Call. h. Zeus 14-17, h. Del. 6, Paus. 8.16.1, 28.2, 41.2-3, Plut. Lys. 28. It usually as here follows birth immediately (cf. αὐτίκος in Call. h. Zeus 15), and probably had some ritual as well as merely cleansing significance. Those who were believed dead and then returned had to undergo rites including a bath. In Plut. Quaest. Rom. 6.265a Aristinous is washed, swaddled and suckled, the same order as in the hymn and presumably the normal practice; cf. Ginouves 1962, 235-8.

λόγον is a correction of the MSS.’ unmetrical λόγον. For the form cf. Ar. Clouds 838 κατολόθει (the MSS. have κατολούθει); Od. 10.361 λό’; Op.749 λάφεσθαι. Cf. Smyth 1894, 535; Schwyzter 1939-53, 1.682; Chantraine 1948-53, 1.34.

δίδατι κολῷ: the usual formula at the line end is δίδατι λευκῷ (II. 23.282; Od.
5.70; Op. 729. The change may be to avoid ending consecutive lines with λευκῷ (so Janko 1982, 101, and Cantilena 1982, 212), although this type of repetition is not always avoided by the poets of the hymns (cf. 351-2, 537-8).

121. ἄγνῳς καὶ καθαρῶς: the same phrase is used at Op. 337 (cf. West 1978, ad loc.); Orac. 220.3, 374.14 Parke-Wormell. It is used in contexts of ritual, especially of sacrifices, inward and outward purity both being essential when a ritual act is performed (cf. Dem. 274, 369.). Here, as Gemoll (1886, ad loc.) says, ἄγνῳς is not really necessary; goddesses are naturally holy. This is not doubt the result of using for goddesses a formula normally used of mortals (cf. on ὀλόλυξιον above). The formula does emphasise, however, the ritual nature of the bathing of Apollo, and perhaps also suggests that the goddesses are not defiled by their attendance at the birth, as women usually were (on birth pollution, see Parker 1983, 50-66; Moulinier 1952, 66-70). Càssola (1975, ad loc.) thinks that the poet has in mind the ceremony of ἀμφιπληθομένα, since this purified the women who had attended the birth (Schol. Plat. Thet. 160e, Suda s.v. ἀμφιπληθομένα); but this took place several days after birth, and involved carrying the child around the hearth: there is no suggestion of this in the mere phrase ἄγνῳς καὶ καθαρῶς, which, as I said, perhaps shows rather that the goddesses had no need of purification. The birth of a god involves the contradiction that though birth is seen by the gods as polluted, they themselves must be born; so Delos became sacred because it was the site of a divine birth, and hence was afterwards a forbidden place for human birth (cf. Call. h. Del. 276f.). When the Athenians purified Delos in 426-5, women were forbidden to give birth on the island (Thuc. 3.104).

σπάρξαν δʼ ἐν φόρετι λευκῷ: swaddling is of course a natural part of birth
stories -- cf. the description of Hermes in *Herm.* 151 σπάργανον ὅμφ' ὑμιὸς εὐλυμένος, ἡμτε τέκνων, and ibid. 301, 306. When Rhea in the Theogony gives Cronus a stone instead of Zeus, she wraps it in swaddling clothes (*Th.* 485). The robe used is a special one, as befits the importance of the divine child. The form σπάρξαν, as if from a present σπάργαν, is a ὁπαξ: the normal form is σπαργανόω (-ιζο at *Th.* 485), but this probably has a nasal suffix in the present, so the form of the aorist is not surprising; Janko (1982, 105) calls this aorist an archaism. The white robe is suggestive of cleanliness and purity. Dark clothing symbolises mourning and death, so perhaps white is suitable for new life (though at *Il.* 18.353 φορεῖ λευκῷ is used of Patroclus’ shroud). White was not universal for swaddling clothes: Jason was wrapped in purple (Pi. *Pyth.* 4.114), Heracles in saffron (Id. *Nem.* 1.38).

122. λεπτῷ, νηγατέῳ: cf. *Il.* 2.42f. χιτώνα/καλόν νηγάτεον; 14.184-5 κρηδέμnu ... καλῷ νηγατέῳ (followed by λευκόν δ' ἕν ἡλίος δς). λεπτῷ νηγατέῳ, then, is used here in a traditional way for an important item of clothing. Ancient guesses of the meaning of νηγατέος were "newly-made", or "fine", but νη- suggests "not" something, and the word is probably related to modern Macedonian ἀνήγατος, "unworn, new". See Frisk 1960-70 s.v.; Janko 1992, on *Il.* 14.185f.

χρύσεων στρόφον: the στρόφος is presumably some kind of belt or girdle here. στρόφος is used of women’s girdles at Aesch. *Septem* 872, *Supp.* 457 (the former has ὁπόσωι στρόφον ἐσθήσων περιβάλλονται - similar to Ap.’s use). It is naturally gold for a divine baby, as the gods’ implements etc. are regularly of gold (see on 10).


In all these passages ἡκε is used in *timesi*, but περιτήμι is not otherwise attested. ξσσαν would have been more normal than ἡκον, as at e.g. h. 6.6 περὶ δ’ ἀμβροτα
εἴμασι ἔσσαν.

The whole scene of bathing and clothing is similar to scenes in which goddesses (especially Aphrodite) are beautified by their attendants, e.g. in the hymns *Aph.* 61ff., h.6.6-13 (this is after Aphrodite first appears from the waves: there is no bathing, presumably because she has just been in the sea); in Homer, *Il.* 14.169ff. (Hera’s preparation for seducing Zeus -- no attendants are involved on this occasion, but bathing and clothing are described); *Od.* 8.362-6, 23.153 ff. (bath of Odysseus: on baths cf. Arend 1933, 124-6).

123. In a normal birth, the next stage after the clothing of the baby would be its suckling: the poet here emphasises that this did not happen in order to show more clearly that Apollo is not an ordinary baby. Even divine babies are usually suckled at birth; cf. Call. *h. Zeus* 48 σο δ’ ἐθῆσαν πίνακα μαζίν, where ἐβραῖς in the next line suggests he may have the hymn in mind (cf. 127) and deliberately differs from it. At *Herm.* 267, Hermes says ὑπνος ἐμοὶ γε μέμηλε καὶ ἡμετέρης γάλα μητρῶς.

In this hymn, though, the poet wants Apollo to be fully divine as soon as possible, and not to resemble a mortal baby more than is necessary: exaggerated praise of the god is a feature of this hymn (cf. the opening lines, with Zeus serving him at 9-10, and 67-9).

χρυσόρος: this athematic form of the epithet is also found at *Op.* 771, again in the accusative; the o- stem form is commoner, occurring at 395, *Il.* 5.509, 15.256, Hes. fr. 357 Merkelbach-West, h. 27.3, but is probably secondary. This is the view of Janko (1978; 1982, 108f.; 1992, on *Il.* 15.256), who cites parallels for this change from an athematic to a thematic form of a word, Zumbach (1955, 6) and Hoekstra (1969, 25). Edwards (1971, 83) argues for the contrary view. At *Il.* 5.509, 15.256,
Hes. fr. 357 the accusative χρυσὸφοροῦ occurs before δείγον, and the thematic form may have developed to avoid hiatus in such uses. The epithet is usually used of Apollo (395; *Il. 5.509, 15.256; Op. 771; Hes. fr. 357; Pi. *Pyth. 5.104; Ap. Rh. 3.1282), but also of Demeter (*Dem. 4) and Artemis (Orac. ap. Hdt. 8.77; Pi. fr. 139.9 Snell-Maehler). Its use for Apollo is surprising, as his usual weapon is the bow, not the sword. ὀφρύ in Homer always means a sword; it is only later that it can mean any weapon, as at Call. *h.Del. 31. ὀφρύ is connected with ἄείρω (cf. ὀφροτήρ), and so ancient critics suggested that it might refer to the strap for Apollo’s bow or quiver (cf. schol. (bT, Did/A) on *Il. 15.256). It is possible that the reference is to a strap of some kind: the ὀφροτήρ has a tendency to be gold in Homer (ὀφροτήρ/χρύσεος *Od. 11.609f.; κοιλεόν...χρυσέοισιν ὀφροτήρεσσιν ἄρηρός *Il. 11.31), and if so the epithet might be especially appropriate here, after χρύσεον στρόφον in the preceding line (cf. *Od. 13.438 στρόφος ὀφροτήρ). The poet may well have connected it with ὀφροτήρ even if this was not its original meaning; Pindar (fr. 128c.12 Snell-Maehler) uses it of Orpheus, which must refer to his golden lyre-strap. The epithet seems even less suitable to Demeter (cf. Richardson 1974, on *Dem. 4). Apollo is often depicted with a sword in pictures of the Gigantomachy; see *LIMC 2.1.309f.

θῆσατο: the word is here used of the mother, but in *Dem. 236 (of Demophon -- the passage is very like this one); *Il. 24.58; *Od. 4.89; Call. *h. Zeus 47, it is used of the child. θηλάζω can also be used in either way (cf. Baumeister 1860, ad loc.).

124. Themis is the goddess who presides at assemblies of men (*Od. 2.68-9), and of gods (*Il. 20.4), and also at divine feasts (*Il. 15.87ff.). It is probably because of this last function that it is she who feeds Apollo here: at this moment when the poet wishes to emphasise Apollo’s difference from mortal children, the introduction of
Themis in this role sets him among the gods (cf. Vos 1956, 42-4). She may also be named here as representative of the unchanging world order (so Wilamowitz 1916, 449), or in order to emphasise that Apollo will not be ἀτάσθαλος as Delos feared in 67 (so Miller 1986, 48-9). The emphasis is not so much on the fact that it was Themis, not Leto, who fed Apollo, as on his being fed with nectar and ambrosia, rather than mother’s milk. It is partly eating nectar and ambrosia that separates gods from men; it is not only the sign but also the source of their divinity (Il. 5.341f.). Conversely men are seen as those οἱ ἄρρυθρης κοψτόν ἔδωσεν (Il. 6.124), or ἐπὶ χθονὶ σίτον ἔδοιξε (e.g. Od. 8.222; 9.89 = 10.101; cf. 365). Eos gives Tithonus the divine food to make him immortal (Aph. 231f.). At Th. 796f. it is said that when a god breaks the oath by the Styx, he is banished and οὐδὲ ποτ’ ἀμβροσίης κοι νέκταρος ἔχεται ἄσσον; similarly Demeter, when she leaves the other gods in her sorrow, does not taste nectar and ambrosia (Dem. 49f.). It is quite common to attempt to immortalise a human by the use of nectar and ambrosia, cf. Dem. 235ff., with Richardson 1974 on 237; Hes. fr. 23.21f. M-W; Pi. Ol. 1.6, Theocr. 15.106ff., Ap. Rh. 4.869ff.; Ov. Met. 14.605ff. In the case of Apollo, of course, it is not a question of making him immortal, though there may be a sense in which he is not fully divine until he has tasted the gods’ food: rather it gives him vigour and strength, especially causing him to grow rapidly; so at Dem. 235 Demophon is anointed with ambrosia and ἀέξετο δαίμονι ἵσσος, and at Il. 19.347ff. it is given to Achilles to strengthen him.

The precise nature of nectar and ambrosia is unclear: nectar seems to be the divine equivalent of wine in epic poetry. It is served to the gods in goblets, as at 10, and is given the epithet ἐρυθρός, which is common for wine (Od. 5.165 etc.), at Aph. 206.
Ambrosia seems to be a liquid at II. 19.347; it is used on corpses at II. 16.670, 23.186; it is applied as a cosmetic at II. 14.170, Od. 18.192, and at Dem. 237 Demeter anoints Demophon with it. All these passages suggest that ambrosia was not a solid food, and perhaps the distinction between nectar as drink and ambrosia as food was not clear at this time (though at Od. 5.93f Hermes is served with both, and ὁ πίνε κοί ἦσθε). So in this passage ἐπιρξατο in 125 suggests the serving of wine, but κατέβρως in 127 is more suitable for solid food. Onians (1951, 292ff.) suggests plausibly that it was some sort of oil or fat, the divine equivalent of ἀλέιψαρ.

125. ἐπιρξατο: the use of this word here has caused several problems. In Homer it is always used in the context of a servant pouring out wine for the diners at a banquet (II. 1.471, 9.176; Od. 3.340, 7.183, 18.418, 21.263): the meaning seems to be that a few drops are poured into the cup to be poured out as a libation, and after this the cups are filled up for drinking (cf. Mazon 1937, 319-25). It is always used in Homer with δεπρεσσι: here the word seems to have lost the precise meaning and usage it has in Homer, and to be used in a looser sense, = "served". This may be due to the poet's misunderstanding of earlier epic, or just the development of the word's meaning (for its use in this way, cf. I.G. 12.9. 192.10). Though it is simplest to see the word as detached from its Homeric context to mean "serve, offer" there may be some suggestion of ritual in its use here for the offering of food to a god. On ἐπιρχομαι in this passage, cf. Zumbach 1955, 46.

ἀθανάτησιν χερσίν: cf. Dem. 232, 253 χεῖρεσσ' ἀθανάτησιν; II. 16.704 χεῖρεσσ' ἀθανάτησι (possible here). Note the use of n-mobile to make position.

125b-6 ~ 12b-13. Here the idea is obviously appropriate, though it is not out of
place at 12-13. The repetition may be meant to emphasise that the scenes preceding are similar (Apollo is served with nectar by a god or goddess in the presence of other gods both times), or the phrase may have come into the poet’s mind because of this similarity. The parallels between the two scenes, in fact, go further than mere serving with nectar: in both cases we have a sudden appearance of Apollo, to which the other gods react with amazement; both times he is then treated with honour. In the prologue his bow is taken from him and hung up by Leto, then he is given a seat and served with nectar; here he is washed, clothed and then fed with nectar and ambrosia, and Leto rejoices at the sight. This similarity again shows how the opening scene has elements suitable for an account of a god’s first appearance on Olympus (see on 1-13). It could be argued that in DAp this scene at his birth is meant to take the place of such an account; it comes in the usual place after the birth, and so 1-13 might be better seen as a typical scene.

127-132. The divine food has an instantaneous effect on Apollo, turning him from a helpless baby to a full-grown god, without any of the tiresome development necessary for mortals. The motif of the god or hero developing at miraculous speed is a common one: in the hymn to Hermes it is a major theme, cf. 17 ἦλθος ἔχοντως μέσῳ ἤμετρᾳ ἐγκαθάρτες, with a touch of parody. Cf. also Dem. 235 with Richardson 1974 ad loc.; Th. 492f.; Call. h. Zeus 55; Q.S. 6.205. In Pi. Nem. 1, Heracles shows precocious strength in killing the snakes sent by Hera; in later versions of the story of Apollo, the founding of Delphi and defeat of Python followed straight on from his birth (cf. Aesch. Eum. 9-10; Eur. I.T. 1250; Hyg. Fab. 140, Ap. Rh. 2.707). Here the motif is dealt with in more detail than often: it is an important turning point and the poet emphasises this. The idea of Apollo bursting free from his
swaddling-clothes, like Popeye after eating a can of spinach, represents his sudden
growth very forcibly and vividly. In *Herm.*, Hermes remains outwardly a child and
develops mentally: here, Apollo develops physically too, as is more usual.

127. κοτέβρως: this is a rare word, and a strong one too, "devour" rather than
"eat": perhaps its use here emphasises the importance of this particular meal. The
simple form βρῶσκω is used in Homer only of animals (*Il. 22.94* of a snake, *Od.*
22.403 of a lion). Hoekstra (1969, 25) points out that κοτέβρως is an archaism.

ἀμβρόσιον εἴδωρ: used also at *Aph.* 260, of the food of the long-lived but mortal
wood-nymphs. Homer uses ἀμβρόσιον εἴδωρ at *Il.* 5.369, 13.35

128. At 122 a στρόφος was wound round Apollo; now this seems to have become
plural. Perhaps the poet is merely being careless. At 121-2 we had a definite
description of a white robe and a gold band: here the picture is much vaguer; στρόφοι
and δέσματα are mentioned, and it is not clear whether these are all different items
of clothing, or different ways of saying the same thing, nor what elements of the first
description they conform to (if any). The most definite term used, στρόφοι, is clearly
inconsistent with what went before. However, since a στρόφος can have many twists,
it can be plural too (I owe this suggestion to Professor R. Janko). The clothes are
seen as signs of Apollo’s infancy, and his escape from them symbolises his reaching
maturity. The language used (δέσμα) for the swaddling-clothes emphasises this
concept of an imprisonment in infancy of which the clothes are the outward sign.
This may account for the vagueness of δέσμα and πετρατα as clothing terms, but the
explanation cannot be used for στρόφοι.

ἂσπασμόντα: in Homer this is always used of the death struggles of men or
animals, so it seems at first sight surprising that it is used of a new-born baby;
however, this use is paralleled at Hdt. 1.111.

129. δέσμωτα: this is the reading of most MSS, and there is no reason to prefer δέσμα στ. δέσμωτα is read in MΘ, which suggests it goes back to the archetype (see Cassola 1975, 612). Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, ad loc.) prefer δέσμα στ, on the ground that δέσμα is the plural in the Hymns, δέσματα in Homer. This assumes, however, that the Hymns are a homogeneous linguistic entity which can be set against Homer, whereas in fact they may vary widely in place and time of origin. In any case, δέσμα is only found in two hymns (Herm. 157, 409; 7.12, 13), both of which may be relatively late. The line is similar to 7.12 τὸν δ' ἑνὶ ἱερόν ἑσάκει δέσμα, λόγοι δ' ἀπὸ τηλόσι τεπττον (of Dionysus). This reinforces the idea that Apollo is described in terms more natural for a prisoner escaping from chains (as Dionysus is in the line quoted), than a baby growing out of his clothes. δέσματα, however, can be used of clothing without any implications of imprisonment, cf. Il. 22.468 ἀπὸ κρατῶς βάλε δέσματα σιγαλδέντα ("a general name for the articles of the head-dress", Leaf 1900-2 ad loc.).

πείρατα: the exact meaning of this word is problematic: it is used to mean "ends, limits" in phrases like ἐν πείρασι γαθῆς (Th. 622, cf. 738 and, metaphorically, Od. 23.248 πείρατα ἀθλῶν). At Od. 12.51, 162 it seems clearly to mean "ropes" or perhaps "rope-ends"; other passages are more problematic, e.g. Il. 6.143 ὀλεθροῦ πείραθ' 7.102 νίκης πείρατα'; 13.358-60. Schultze (1892, 109ff.) implausibly suggests that πείραρ = "rope" and πείραρ = "limit" are two separate words. On etymological grounds it seems clear that the original sense is "boundary, limit"; Frisk (1960-70, s.v.) says that it comes from "περφωρ, related to πείρω, πέρω, and compares the Avestan pár-van "knot, link". Janko (1992, on Il. 13.358-60) explains
the original sense as "the point where something ends and another begins", hence "limit" but also "bond". Heubeck (1972, 139ff.) plausibly suggests that its use to mean "rope" arose from a misunderstanding of a phrase like I. 7.402 ὀλέθρου πεῖρατα ἐφήμορπται. See also Kirk 1990 on I. 6.143; Onians 1951, 310ff. In our line it clearly means ropes, or possibly knots. The sense "limit" may also be present: the πεῖρατα are "ropes" around Apollo, and also "bonds" confining him. Similarly δέσμαια, as I have said, can mean both "clothes" and "chains". It seems that the poet has chosen words that are suitable both for the actual garment Apollo is wearing, and for the concepts of limitation and confinement that he wishes to convey. At Od. 12.51-4 πεῖρατα and δέσμαια refer to the same ropes.

130. Apollo confirms his new maturity by making his first speech to the assembled goddesses. The use of ἀυτίκα here emphasises the speed at which events are occuring.

ἀθανάττηταί: this is also used as a substantive at Od. 5.213, 6.16; Aph. 109; the nominative ἀθανάττα is so used only in this hymn (95, 135).

μετηνύμχα: the verb may be chosen to stress that Apollo is now a "fully paid-up" deity; in h.26.6 Dionysus grows up and becomes μεταρθήμος ἀθανάττοις.

131-2. Apollo now states what his functions as a god will be: music, archery and prophecy are three of his major spheres of interest. Indeed, in early epic they are his three main roles. In the Iliad he appears among men as the fearsome archer (1.44ff.), and among the gods as lyre player (1.601ff.); there is little in Homer about Apollo as god of healing or purification. All three roles are represented in the hymn: he plays his lyre in 186-206, 514-6; he is the archer in 1-13, 300ff.; and the whole of ΠΑπ is about his founding his first oracle. Because of the prominence of this reference to
Apollo’s oracular role, some have seen these lines as looking forward to \( PAp \), and therefore as evidence for the hymn’s unity: see Dornseiff 1933, 10 and 1935, 12; Kakridis 1937, 108; Heubeck 1972, 146; Miller 1986, 54; Clay 1989, 131f. An obvious objection to this is that, as I have noted, these are Apollo’s main roles in epic, so a reference to them needs no special explanation (the same three spheres are mentioned by Call. \( h. \) \( Ap. \) 44, but he may have had \( DAp \) in mind). To this unitarians respond that it is not the choice of roles, but the prominence given to prophecy, that shows the poet is looking forward to \( PAp \). This point is made most fully by Miller, who says that it is emphasised by its position as last in the list, by having a line to itself, "by the shift from nominal to more vigorous verbal predication, and by the replacement of an optative of wish with a voluntative future." This is a good argument but it does not prove the hymn’s unity: if, as I have argued in the introduction, \( DAp \) was composed as an addition to \( PAp \), its poet might well have used such a line to link his poem to the other; if \( PAp \) is the imitation, its poet may have picked up on this line, or even inserted it himself.

Hermes at \( Herm. \) 568ff. receives his honours and privileges from Zeus: similarly Zeus allots honours to Dionysus at the end of the fragmentary h. 1. This is the normal picture; cf. \( Th. \) 73-4 with West 1966 ad loc. On the importance of Zeus in the Hymns see prolegomena, 38f. Here the poet stresses Apollo’s power by making him claim his own functions, but 132 makes clear his ultimate subordination to Zeus, as does the opening scene.

131. It must be right to see \( φιλή \) here as predicative and not an epithet like \( κομπόλα \), so Humbert (1936) is wrong to translate "Qu’on me donne ma lyre et mon arc recourbé". Such phraseology is common in talking of the habitual tastes and
preferences of gods; cf. 144, Il. 1.177; Od. 8.248, and see on 22.

καιπήλα τόξα: this is the regular Homeric epithet (5x Il., 2x Od.; Herm. 515); see on 4.

132. χρῆσω δ' ἄνθρωποις: this is the first occurrence of this future (apparently next at Aesch. Ag. 1083); in both parts of the hymn, the founding of sanctuaries of Apollo is seen in terms of the reciprocal benefits for men and the god (cf. 57-60, 80f., 247-253 =287-293, 272f., 475ff., 536-8).

Διὸς νημερτέα βουλήν: νημερτέα βουλήν also at 252, 292; Od. 1.86, 5.30. Herm. 538 has Ζηνὸς πυκνόφρονος βουλήν, also with reference to Apollo’s oracular power.

133. The theme of Apollo’s first steps taken up here allows a transition to his favourite haunts in 140ff., and so to his preference for Delos and the Delian festival.

ἐβδομάδες: this is unlikely to be an Ionic iterative imperfect, since these regularly lack the augment in Homer (Schwyzer 1939-53, 1.710; Wackernagel 1916, 118-9). Förstel (1979, 432 n.504) argues that it is a normal imperfect of a present βιβάζοκω, attested in the compounds δια-, ἐμ-, ἐπι-, κοταβιβάζοκω. Hoekstra (1969, 24) points out that among around 90 Homeric lines starting ὅς ἐπιθύν, only three have a verbal form ending in n-mobile before the trochaic caesura.

ἐπὶ χθόνος εὐρυοδέτης: Matthiae’s ἐπὶ is preferred to ἐπὶδ by most editors (Baumeister 1860; Gemoll 1886; Allen and Sikes 1904; Càassola 1975), but is unnecessary. ἐπὶδ χθόνος is a formulaic phrase (186; Il. 16.635; Od. 3.453, 10 149; Op. 197; Sc. 464). Ilgen’s explanation “sublimis abiit” is satisfactory, and provides a better reason for the amazement of the goddesses at his action. I think it is mistaken to defend ἐπὶδ here on the grounds that it can sometimes mean "on" the earth, as do
Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, ad loc.): their parallels are unconvincing. ἐὑροῦδεῖξα is only used in this formula, and not in any other case. It is probably formed from ἑὑροῦδος by analogy with feminines in -εια; cf. Frisk 1960-70, Chantraine 1968-80 s.v.

134. ἄχροσκόμης: this epithet is used of Apollo at Il. 20.35; Pi. Pyth. 3.14, Isthm. 1.7. Greek youths wore their hair long, so the epithet is suitable for Apollo, who was generally depicted as a young man (cf. 449-50). It is common for gods and heroes to have long hair; cf. S.West 1988 on Od. 1.90. This was the fashion for aristocrats in the archaic period (and earlier, to judge from the formula κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοί).

ἐκατηβόλος: regularly of Apollo, but used of Artemis at h. 9.6. Frisk (1960-70, s.v.) suggests it may be a combination of ἐκάτος and ἐκτῆβολος: this seems very likely, though Chantraine (1968-80, s.v.) is sceptical. For the meaning, see on 1.

135ff. This gilding of Delos is imitated by Callimachus h. Del. 260ff., with greater elaboration. This is Delos’ equivalent to the reaction of the goddesses. For the response of nature to the birth of a god cf. on 118. At Pi. Ol. 7.34 a golden snow-shower marks the birth of Athena. Förstel (1979, 191ff.) sees this as the third and culminating stage of Delos’ joy, after 61 χαῖρε and 90 μᾶλλα χαῖρε, her joy increasing as she becomes more certain that Apollo will honour and not destroy her. This is more convincing if 136-8 are accepted, since in these lines the joy is made explicit: I think it is possible, though, that the miracle is caused by Apollo rather than a spontaneous reaction of Delos -- the gold may even spring up where he passes (cf. Il. 14.347ff., where flowers grow up under Zeus and Hera). Perhaps, too, gold is chosen as a symbol of Delos’ new-found wealth.
135. ὀξεῖος: wonder among the onlookers is characteristic of a divine
epiphany, to which this scene is similar (on epiphanies, cf. Richardson 1974, on Dem.
188-90, Pfister 1924). For gods marvelling at other gods cf h. 6.15ff., h. 28.6-7, and
see on 1-13. At Pi. Nem. 3.50 Artemis and Athena marvel at the precociousness of
Achilles. The goddesses’ wonder here is no doubt similarly caused by Apollo’s
miraculous development.

136-9. This is the only case where the MSS of the Hymns indicate doublets. The
problem is studied in detail by Forderer (1971, 89-94) and Förstel (1979, 123ff.) The
lines are found in the margin in ETL, with the critical sign )) and the comment ἐν
ἐτέρῳ κείται καὶ οὕτω οἱ στῆχοι. In Π they have been inserted in the text,
followed by S and the editio princeps. The most plausible view is that we have here
two variants, both designed to follow 135: so Hermann 1806, ad loc.; Jacoby 1933,
710ff.; Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, ad loc.). Allen, Halliday and Sikes think that
139 is earlier; Càssola (1975, ad loc.) prefers 136-8. 136 and 139 certainly both seem
designed to follow 135. Jacoby believed that 139 was the original version, and that
136-8 were composed as an ending for DAp by the poet who added the Pythian
section; he omitted 140-78, and so 136-8 replace 140-6 in stressing Apollo’s
preference for Delos (for Jacoby’s theory of the hymn’s composition, see
prolegomena, 91). The alternative view, supported by Gemoll (1886, ad loc.),
Ludwich (1908, 185), Peppmüller (1894, 253-4) is that 136-8 are an addition intended
to follow 139. The critical sign is an antisigma, but unfortunately this is not used in
a consistent way by ancient scholars: it was used to mark doublets at Il. 8.535-7, Od.
5.247f. (see scholia ad locc.), but at Il. 2.192 it marks displaced verses, and it is also
used differently in schol. Ar. Frogs 152f. See Dover 1988, 212f. The use of the
antisigma to mark doublets is supported by Isidore, *Etymologiarum Libri* I.21.12, and this is probably its meaning here, but we cannot be certain. Forderer's suggestion (1971, 89-94) that the original text was 139 and 137-8, and that 136 is a variant of 139, is attractive but not consistent with the evidence of the MSS. It seems best to see 136-8 and 139 as alternatives: if 136-8 follow 139, the passage is clumsy and disjointed, and this also requires the alteration of βεβρίθει to βεβρίθη (so Gemoll 1886, ad loc.) or possibly βεβρίθεν. βρίθω is often used of plants (see on 136) but is perfectly natural after χρυσόφ; in fact, given the verb's literal meaning "be heavy with", its use of gold is very appropriate.

136. βεβρίθει: this is used of plants at *Il.* 18.561; *Od.* 19.112; *Dem.* 456, 473. βεβρίθει occurs at *Od.* 16.474, also at the start of a line.

κοθορόσσα: this is used twice in Homer, and each time it is used in its proper sense of "look down at", whereas here it is simply "seeing" (*Il.* 11.337, 13.4, both of Zeus looking down at the earth).

γενεθλην: γενεθλη meaning "offspring" is not found before the fifth century (e.g. Soph. *El.* 129). In Homer it means "stock", "family", e.g. *Il.* 19.111; *Od.* 4.232, 13.130; h. 27.10 θηρον γενεθλην "the race of wild animals". At *Th.* 610 γενεθλη means "sort" of wife, not "offspring"; cf. West 1966 ad loc. The formulaic Διδς και Αγατος γιαν could have been used (*Ap.* 545; *Herm.* 243, 321).

137. γηθοσύνη: the adjectival γηθοσύνη is possible here, as at *Il.* 13.29; *Od.* 11.540. The only definite example of γηθοσύνη as a noun is *Il.* 21.390; the fact that there it is followed by δη is in favour of the noun here (and cf. 100 ζηλοσύνη, δη κτλ).

οικάνθεσθοι: the same phrase is used at 46: there the islands are asked to make
a home for Apollo; here he is the subject, making Delos his home.

137-8. Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, ad loc.) suggest that the construction αδρισθα τι τινος is relatively late, and compare Soph. Phil. 1100; however, our passage is different since the construction is not "he chose her in preference to", but "he chose her out of", where the genitive is easier.

138. νήσων ἡπειροῦ τε: see on 21.

φιλησε δὲ κηροθι μᾶλλον; the subject of this must surely be Apollo, parallel to εἰλετο, pace Evelyn-White (1914) who translates "and she loved him yet more in her heart". Cf. Od. 15.370. κηροθι is only used with μᾶλλον, quite commonly in Homer (2x Il., 7x Od.).

139. ἡνθησε: in Homer this only occurs at Od. 11.320, of a youthful beard. It is used of a plant at Op. 582. Its use of gold covering the island is probably not really metaphorical, since "bloom" is not the primary meaning of ἄνθεσι (Stanford 1936, 111ff.).

ὡς ὅτε τε: the only other epic use of this is at Il. 12.132 ἐστασαν ὡς ὅτε τε δρύες οὖρεσιν ὑψικάρηνοι. It is interesting that both passages draw their images from mountains (and in the Iliad too the verb of the ὅτε clause is understood); perhaps one line has influenced the other.

ῥίον οὖρεος ἄνθεσιν ὑλῆς: cf. Od. 9.191-2 ῥίῳ ὑλήνετι / ὑψηλῶν οὐρέων. Kirk (1981, 171) finds this expression odd, and makes this his main reason for preferring 136-8 to 139. He suggests it is based on h. 1.8. ἄνθεον ὑλῆ, which is certainly the closest parallel in language; however, I think ἄνθεσιν ὑλῆς an equally natural phrase (cf. English "flowers of the forest") and see no reason to condemn it as an awkward adaptation of a pre-existing expression.
140-164. An account of Apollo’s favorite haunts, culminating in a description of the Ionian festival on Delos, and praise of the chorus of Delian maidens

140ff. From the description of Apollo’s first wanderings after his birth the poet now turns to his typical wanderings, and completes this movement towards the present by stating Apollo’s preference for Delos and describing the great Ionian festival that took place there. On 140ff. as a "summary priamel" cf. Bundy 1972, 62 n.65; Race 1982a, 50f.; Miller 1986, 56. This reversion to the present suggests that the poet is coming to the last stage of his hymn: every Homeric hymn ends with some sort of return to the present; the concluding formulae do this by turning to address the god who has been the subject of the narrative, and then usually expressing the singer’s intention to continue singing of the god (see prolegomena, 11ff.). This pattern is common in the narratives: at the end of Dem. Persephone and Demeter go to Olympus and then the tense changes to the present (485); similarly at the end of Herm. we get a description of his present actions (576ff.); cf. also 15, 20, 33. Many of the shorter hymns are in the present tense throughout. They are to a large extent aetiological: they deal with how a god came into existence, how he obtained his characteristic functions and attributes, how particular rites and cults came into being (see prolegomena, 15f.). Thus the two halves of Ap. can be seen as aetologies of the Apollo cults at Delos and Delphi. It is therefore very natural to have the description of the Delian festival at this point, since it is both the outcome of the preceding narrative and the cause of it.

140. ἄντος: this is resumptive here, after the description of Delos, but it also
seems to be conventional to use ἀυτὸς of Apollo, cf. 181; *Herm.* 234, 406; *Aph.* 151. This use is discussed by Richardson 1974, on *Dem.* 371.

This is the first time in the hymn that Apollo has been addressed by a title other than Φοῖβε. The invocation takes up a whole line, marking an important turning point in the poem (see on 120). It is appropriate for Apollo to be given several titles here to stress that he is now fully mature: the birth and development are over, and he now has all his powers. There is a chiastic structure to the line, with ἀυτὸς and Ἀπολλὸν framing the epithets; ἀργυρότοξε and ἐκατηβδόλ', two titles of Apollo the archer, are on either side of the central ἄναξ.

ἀργυρότοξε: why is Apollo’s bow silver? The equipment of the gods is usually imperishable gold, cf. χρυσόφορα 123, παχρόσεα τὸξα h. 27.5 (of Artemis) The epithet often seems to be used in the context of Apollo’s role of bringer of sudden death; cf. Il. 24.758; *Od.* 7.64, 15.410, 17.251; cf. also the uses in Il. 1, where Apollo brings the plague (1.37, 45).

ἄναξ ἐκατηβδόλ', Ἀπολλὸν: the same phrase occurs at *Od.* 8.339, where it is used by Hermes to address Apollo: this seems a slightly ponderous way for one god to address another, and it seems more natural in the mouth of a human worshipper. ἐκατηβδόλ' Ἀπολλὸν is used only once in *DAp*, but it is common in *PAp* (used at 215, 222, 229 = 239 and 277). For the meaning of ἐκατηβδόλος, see on 1 ἐκάτωτοι.

141ff. The motif of a god’s wanderings is best paralleled in h. 19 to Pan, where there is an extended description of the god’s favourite haunts; cf. especially 9-10 ἄλλοτε μὲν ρεθοροισιν ἐφελκόμενος μαλακοῖσιν, ἄλλοτε δ’ αὖ πέτρησιν ἐν ἠλιβάτοις διοιχνεῖ; cf. also *Cypria* fr. 7.8ff. Davies ἄλλοτε μὲν κατὰ κύμα . . . θαλάσσης . . . ἄλλοτ’ ἄν’ Ἡκεανὸν ποταμὸν καὶ πεῖρατα γαῖς, ἄλλοτ’ ἄν’
Hyperi ton polubolakos (of Nemesis fleeing Zeus); h. 26, where after Dionysus is brought up, foiticeske kath' oleventas enabolous. It is common to mention a god's favourite places, especially at the start of a hymn (e.g. Herm. 2; 6.2; 9.3-5; 22.3-4); this is characteristic of the style of prayers, in which it is important to be as precise as possible in naming the god one is invoking. The proem of the Theogony, with its descriptions of the Muses, provides another example of typical wanderings. Here the movement is similar to that in 20-25; a wide geographical overview is narrowed down to Delos. There, Delos was chosen by the poet as a theme; here, it is Apollo who has the preference for Delos, justifying the poet's decision to sing of it. In fact 144-5 here are the same as 22-3. This an example of ring composition: the narrative is framed by two timeless sections emphasising the extent of Apollo's domain. In 20-25 this was put in terms of the range of possible themes: now that Apollo is born, the poet can talk of his favourite haunts. The catalogue of places in 30-44 served as a transition from typical description to past narrative; this passage makes the transition back to the present. The narrative began with Leto's wanderings and ends with Apollo's. I have pointed out above (on 125f.) that the birth scene has parallels with the opening scene on Olympus. So the end of the birth story echoes its beginning: in both cases an epiphany of Apollo to other gods is followed by a description of the areas that please him, culminating in Delos. The ring indicates the end of the narrative, so Thalmann (1984, 65f.) is wrong to suggest that because 140-6 echo the earlier choice of theme they indicate that the poet plans to continue with a new theme. On ring composition in DAp, see also Förstel 1979, 192ff; Niles 1979.

141. allote men: this shows a movement away from narrative of particular events to repeated, typical actions. The verbs are still in the past at this point, though;
and the line is connected with the foregoing narrative by the fact that the god's travels start on Delos.

ἐβήσαο: this (read by all MSS) is an odd form of the verb, not found elsewhere. The aorist (ἐ)βήσατο is used in Homer, and there is often a v.l. (ἐ)βήσατο. This is the lectio facilior and the -σατο forms seem firmly established in the text. If Homer used the thematic form, then, what are we to make of ἐβήσαο? Other possible examples of such an aorist are Sc. 338, where MSS vary between ἐβήσατο and ἐπεβήσατο, and ibid. 33, where all MSS have προσβήσατο. Perhaps the original reading was ἐβήσαο here, and it has been altered to the easier ἐβήσαο. Gemoll (1886) prints ἐβήσαο. It is not certain whether the forms in Homer are imperfects or aorists (cf. Chantraine 1948-53, 1.416ff.); perhaps the former is more natural here, coming after ἄλλοτε, with ἡλάσκαζες in the following line.

παπαλδέντος: cf. on 39. The separation of Κόσθου and παπαλδέντος here might suggest adaptation of a formula.

142. ἄλλοτε δ' αὖ ... ἡλάσκαζες: the change of αὖ to ἀν for ἀνὖ), first made by D’Orville and followed by most editors, is unnecessary. There is no reason why ἡλασκάζω should not be able to take the accusative alone. It only occurs otherwise at Il. 18.281, Od. 9.457: in the first case it takes ἀπό (with the accusative), in the second the accusative, though there it must mean "flee" and there is a v.l. ἡλυσκάζει. As Càssola (1975, ad loc.) points out, the verb is related to ἀλάσματι, which can take the accusative, as at e.g. Soph. O.C. 1686; Eur. Hel. 532; Theoc. 13.66; cf. on 175 στρεφόμεσθα πόλεις. In any case, ἄλλοτε δ' αὖ is natural after ἄλλοτε μὲν; cf. II. 18.472, 602; 24.10f.; h. 19.9-10; Th. 830-1.

νῆσον τε καὶ ἀνέρας: this phrase has caused some difficulty. "Islands and
"men" is not an obvious pairing, and so Baumeister (1860), followed by Gemoll (1886), emended to νῆσονς. This is unnecessary, and islands seem more likely in the context of wandering than temples. Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, ad loc.) take the view that the expression is equivalent to the νῆσον/μείρος of 21. P. Ol. 6.10 οὕτε παρ’ ἄνδρας ὡκ’ ἐν ναῦσι κολχικὸς should not be used to support this view, since, as Baumeister (1860, ad loc.) points out, this refers to battles by land and sea, and not the difference between mainland and islands. I do not see why "men" should mean the mainland as opposed to the islands, since this would imply that the latter were uninhabited. There is nothing wrong with the simple explanation "islands and their inhabitants". Allen and Sikes (1904, ad loc.) see it as a hendiadys, "inhabited islands", but this is not necessary.

143-5. 144-5 are a repetition of 22-3, except for the change of τοι ἄδων to τε φίλως (the former has a neglected digamma). Those who believe that 20-24 are spurious, e.g. Baumeister (1860), naturally hold that the lines there are copied from here. Others take the view that the lines are interpolated here, and may have replaced something else. Certainly 144-5 are unnecessary here, and 146 would follow on rather more smoothly from 143, with its mention of temples and groves. West (1975, 167-8) believes that 144-5 have displaced the lines which are 179-80 in our texts, and that this was the result of the Persian conquest of Ionia, after which the lines no longer seemed appropriate; a similar view is taken by Humbert (1936). 179-81 certainly do not fit well in their present place, and the sequence of thought is similar to that of 143-6; if they do really belong before the description of the festival then they cannot precede 146 unless one leaves out 181, as West does; the alternative, which if they are to be inserted seems to me preferable, is to replace 144-6 by 179-81. Van
Groningen (1958, 311f.) sees 179-81 as a variant for the whole of 140-6, a variant which he believes to be of Milesian origin, since it praises Miletus but only says that Apollo rules over Delos, not that it is his favourite place. Another reason for suspecting 143-5 is that it is possible there was a version of the hymn without them; the main evidence for this is Thucydides’ quotation of 146-50, on which see below, on 146. In spite of all this speculation, however, there is no compelling reason to alter the lines as they stand in the text; slightly awkward they may be, but the sense is perfectly clear. The theory that 179-81 really belongs in this passage is tempting, but purely speculative.

143. With this line we definitely move into the present; in this and in the following two lines εἰσὶ must be understood. Janko (1981a, 18) rightly suggests that the omission of verb forms in these lines facilitates the transition between the past tenses of 141-2 and the present of 146 (see on 30ff.); he also compares Th. 75-9. However, it is also true that 143-5 are present, and would not be made more so by the addition of the verbs that are easily understood.

νησὶ τε καὶ ἀλσεα δενδρῆντα: see on 76. The mention of temples here is appropriate since it recalls the preceding narrative, and in particular 76. Delos was right to fear that Apollo might have temples and groves elsewhere, but in fact they are subordinate to his preference for Delos.

144. τε φιλαξ: this is a more traditional form of expression than the τοι ἔδον of 22, cf. on 131.

146-50. These lines are quoted by Thucydides (3.104), with several variations from the text of the MSS. These discrepancies raise questions about the transmission of this poem and of oral poetry in general. There are several suggested explanations
for the difference:

(a) these are genuine oral variants, introduced by the bards who sang the hymn in a period of oral transmission;

(b) Thucydides was quoting inaccurately from memory;

(c) Thucydides had a version of DAp that differed from ours in some respects;

(d) the variants are due to textual corruption in one or both traditions.

The variants seem too numerous for the last to be the cause (especially in 148, where Thucydides has a completely different line). Some of the variants could be due to quoting from memory, e.g. of δὲ σε and ἐνθὰ σε, ὀρχηθμὸς and ὀρχηστυῖ. Again, though, 148 is the obstacle: it is hard to believe that Thucydides would have misremembered the straightforward αὑτοῖς σὴν παιδέσσι καὶ αἰδοίης ὀλίχοισιν as σὴν σφοίσιν τεκέσσι γυναιξὶ τε σήν ἐς ἀγριῶν, where σὴν ἐς ἀγριῶν is hard to explain. However, the variants do seem just the sort of thing one might expect to arise from oral transmission: the sense is pretty much the same, but a different word or formula is used to express it. This is supported by Janko (1982, 2-3), except in the case of 146. Suggestion (c) I discuss below, on 146. Thucydides himself no doubt had a written version in front of him, so we can perhaps imagine two (or more) rhapsodes independently writing down or dictating their version of the poem when writing became widespread. Another scenario could be that there was a written text from the start, which a singer heard performed and himself performed in a slightly different form. So one should not necessarily prefer the readings of the MSS to those given by Thucydides; but in the cases where there is nothing to choose between the two it seems reasonable to follow the MSS.

146. The ἀλλ' ὅτε of Thucydides is difficult. If ὅτε means "when", then the past
tense ἑτέροθης is hard to reconcile with the present ἥγερεθοντα in the following line. It is unlikely that ὅτε could mean "since" here, since in that sense it only occurs twice in Homer (Il. 20.29; Od. 17.461) and then with δὴ on both occasions. In any case the sense would be rather weak ("since your heart delighted in Delos, the Ionians gather there"); Förstel (1979, 129ff.) argues that "since" is right, and that the variant comes from Thucydides himself. I find it hard to make sense of Burkert's explanation (1979, 60 n.35) "but when you took most pleasure in Delos - well, here we are ..."). Cf. the remarks of Van Groningen (1958, 310 n.3) and Janko (1982, 233f.). The former concludes that as ἀλλὰ ὅτε cannot be made sense of here, the correct reading must be ἀλλοτέ, parallel to 141-2. This necessitates seeing 143-5 as an interpolation, since otherwise the ἀλλοτέ in 146 would be too far from the others (and the insertion of these lines might be the cause of the change to ἀλλὰ καὶ σὺ in 146). However, 146 could hardly follow 141-2 directly, since this produces the order "Sometimes you walked on Delos, sometimes among islands and men, and sometimes you delighted in Delos." Van Groningen, then, postulates an earlier version which consisted of 140, 142 and 146 with ἀλλοτέ. This seems a great deal of tampering with the text. Janko (loc. cit.) suggests that 179-81 and 140-2, 146 were doublings, in some texts in the order 140-2, 179-81, 146, and that 179-81 were moved to their current position after 178, and replaced by 143-5 (which were borrowed from 76 and 22-3) after the fall of Croesus. These changes were made by the creator of the combined hymn, perhaps Cynaethus in 523/2 (see prolegomena, 132ff.). On this view, Thucydides had a text that preserved the original version, 140-2 followed by 146. But the passage reads better with 143-5 (or at least 143) in between. This puts more room between the two mentions of Delos, and the list of favourite haunts leads neatly to Apollo's preference
for Delos. As I argued above, the variants in 146-50 are best explained as due to oral transmission, and this ought to be the explanation for Thucydides' different version of 146, rather than a different version of the hymn. Another objection to reading ἄλλοτε in 146 is that it does not go easily with μάλιστα ρε (so Gemoll 1886, ad loc.): this objection also applies to the possibility that δεε here could be the adverb "sometimes" (cf LSJ s.v. C), often used in conjunction with ἄλλοτε. It seems then that Thucydides' text cannot be made sense of as it stands, while the simplest change, that to ἄλλοτε, necessitates an undesirable number of changes to the previous lines. However, some emendation of Thucydides' text seems necessary: the obvious possibility is to read ἄλλα συ, but the corruption is hard to explain. West (1975, 170) suggested that a scribe's eye slipped from 141 or 142 to 146 (in the text of Thucydides) because of the homoearchon of ΑΛΛ-; Janko (1982) 234 rightly objects that Thucydides would not have quoted 141ff., since they are not relevant to his purpose. Professor Janko now suggests to me that a rhapsode (or Thucydides) misremembered the start of 146 under the influence of 141f.

If we accepted that Thucydides knew a different version of DAp (as was also suggested by Wilamowitz 1916, 442), this would support the theory that this part of the hymn once existed independently, and that whoever added PAp made some alterations to it. As I have indicated, I do not think the variants in Thucydides' version of 146ff. provide any real support for this view, which I have (tentatively) rejected in favour of the theory that DAp is an addition to PAp (see prolegomena, 116ff.). The statement that Apollo's favourite place is Delos sounds more like the work of a poet who is singing only of Delos than of one who intends to go on and sing also of the founding of Delphi.
147ff. For discussion of the festival on Delos, and Thucydides’ mention of it, see prolegomena, 123ff. By describing it here in its full glory, the poet shows that the promises made earlier in the hymn have been fulfilled: Delos has become famous and honoured, and many people come to her from the whole Aegean. This is her reward for accepting Apollo and his mother in their hour of need. Since Delos is pleasing to Apollo (146), and the festival delights him (149-50), then the poet’s description of it will presumably be pleasing to the god (cf. Miller 1986, 58). So in 19ff. the ideas that places are pleasing to Apollo and that they are suitable subjects for a song about him are linked together. The description is also natural in the circumstances, if we regard the poet as being actually present at the festival he is describing. For discussion of this, see prolegomena, 19f. Performance on Delos is supported by 165-78 in particular, where the poet bids farewell to the Delian maidens and asks them to remember him. It is all very well to say that the χορήγει of 166 is literary, a farewell to the maidens as a topic (so Miller 1979, 1986), but what we have here is a very different affair from e.g. Θ. 963 ὑμεῖς μὲν νῦν χορήγει, which is quoted as a parallel. The poet’s mention of himself, and his request to be chosen by them as the best of poets, definitely read like requests to be awarded the prize in a particular competition, such as we find in e.g. h. 6.19-20, and possibly 25.6. There is no reason why a poem written for a particular occasion would not survive. Presumably this poem was recited by others, in spite of its personal reference to the blind man of Chios: it may have often been recited at Delian festivals.

The depiction of the festival exhibits the qualities for which DAp has often been praised: it is vivid and lively, with the graceful picture of the godlike Ionians followed by the praise of the famous Delian maidens and the reference to the blind man from
Chios. The poet emphasises the delight that all take in the festival, and the beauty and wealth of the participants. The description captures something of the attractions of such an occasion; no doubt at such times the participants really did feel in some way godlike, lifted up to a more exalted level than their everyday lives. Herington (1985, 6) sees this passage as a paradigm for festivals, "a festival as it should be".

There are several parallels between this scene, and that on Olympus in 187ff. There is dancing and singing in both, and the onlookers rejoice (154f., 204). The Ionians are actually compared to gods in 147, and the description of the song of the Delian maidens (158-61) is like that of the Muses at 189ff. Some unitarian scholars have emphasised the parallel as an argument in favour of the hymn’s unity; in particular, the Muses’ song about the helplessness of mortals is seen as a qualification of the praise of the Ionians here (see Kakridis 1937, 105; Heubeck 1972, 143f.; Thalmann 1984, 66; Clay 1989, 55; Lonsdale 1995, 32f.). However, the parallels between the two scenes are not so striking as to make this line of argument particularly persuasive; moreover, I think it is wrong to talk of one perspective being corrected by the other: both are valid. Human beings may be helpless in the face of old age and death, but they can still at times achieve glory that can be compared to the divine. This is so in Homer too; the Iliad conveys both the glory and the tragedy of war and the heroes who fight in it. On Homeric views of the greatness and insignificance of mortals, see Griffin 1980, 195ff.; Edwards 1987, 317ff. We might also compare Pindar’s famous lines at the end of Pythian 8 (95-7):

επόμεροι· τί δὲ τις· τί δ’ ὀδ τις· σκιάς δναρ

ἄνθρωπος. ἀλλ’ ὑπὲν αἰγλα διόσδοτος ἔλθη,

λαμπρὸν φέγγος ἔπεστιν ἄνδρων καὶ μελιχος αἰών.
As I have noted above, the feeling of being in some way godlike, of participating in divine celebrations, was an important aspect of the festival.

147. τοι: this is reminiscent of 57 ἀνθρώποι τοι πάντες ἀγνήσουσ' ἐκατόμβας, but there it was Delos being addressed, not Apollo. The focus has changed now that the poet is describing a scene in the present. The personification of Delos was appropriate to the narrative set in the mythical past, but not to the description of the festival. Delos has played her part, and is no longer the centre of attention; though the festival is taking place on Delos, it is the worshippers and the god that we are really interested in, not the island.

ἐλκεχίτωνες Ἰδονες: the same epithet is used of the Ionians at ll. 13.685. This is the only occurrence of the Ionian name in Homer. On the word Ἰδονες see Janko 1992, on ll. 13.685. ἐλκεχίτωνες is inappropriately applied to soldiers there, but is apt in the context of a festival. It is used at the line end in the Iliad, which is more likely to be the original usage than its medial position in the hymn. The χιτῶν was worn by both men and women (cf. LSJ s.v.), so the epithet is apt for both, unlike the similar ἐλκεσίπεπλος, which is restricted in Homer to Trojan women. On the association of long robes with the Ionians, cf. Asius fr. 13 Davies; Thuc. 1.6.3; Democritus of Ephesus, FrGrHist 267.1; Xenophanes 3.1ff.; Strabo 466.

148. αὐτοῖς σὺν παίδεσσι: this was emended by Hermann (1806) to αὐτοῖσιν παίδεσσι, but the σὺν can be retained in this idiom: cf. ll. 14.498, Od. 13.118. However, it is tempting to read αὐτῷ σὺν with Gemoll (1886); he quotes ll. 21.460, where σὺν παισὶ καὶ αἰδοῖς ἀλόχοισι is a self-contained phrase. Cf. also Od. 3.381 αὐτῳ καὶ παίδεσσι καὶ αἰδοῖς παρακολουθησε, 14.264f. ἐκ δὲ γυναίκας ἄχον καὶ νήπια τέκνα, / αὐτοὺς τ' ἔκτεινον (on this use of αὐτός, cf. Chantraine 1948-
53, 2.156). Either ὁτοῖς or ὁτοῖσιν would get rid of the short dative plural.

ὁδοιπός ἀλόχοισιν: this is a common formula, cf. e.g. II. 6.250, 21.460.

Thucydides has a rather different line, σὺν σφοίσιν τεκέσσι γυναιξί τε σὴν ἐς ἀγυίν. The sense is the same but σὴν ἐς ἀγυίν is added.

σὺν σφοίσιν τεκέσσι: cf. Th. 398 σὺν σφοίσιν παίδεσσι; both phrases are metrically equivalent to ὁτοῖς σὺν παίδεσσι, but only with the use of n-mobile making position, so the hymn's phrase may be earlier.

σὴν ἐς ἀγυίν; the meaning of ἀγυία here is difficult. In Homer it clearly means "way, street", apparently without exception. It is usually in the plural, but is found in the singular, e.g. at II. 20.254 μέσην ἐς ἄγυιον τούσα. This is the closest Homeric parallel to our passage (could σὴν ἐς ἄγυιον be an echo of μέσην ἐς ἄγυιον?). LSJ say that ἀγυία can later mean "city", but the two examples they quote from Pindar (Ol. 9.34, Nem. 7.92) need not be taken in this way; Farnell (1930) translates it in these two passages as "highway" and "way" respectively. So there is no evidence for taking it as anything other than "way" here, which rules out the interpretation "place before the temple" given by Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, ad loc.); cf. Humbert's (1936) translation "sur tes parvis". It is unlikely to mean "procession", as Baumeister (1860) suggests. The best view is that of Cassola (1975), who takes it as the "sacred way" on Delos. Possibly the line preserved by Thucydides is preferable to that in the hymn's MSS, since it is more likely that the straightforward line was substituted for the more difficult (the priority of Thucydides' line is supported by Breuning 1929, 67f.; van Groningen 1958, 302f).

149. The variants in this line, ol δέ / ἔνθα and Ὀρχηθιμόν / Ὀρχηστὶ are minor. In the first case ol δέ is better, since it avoids the repetition of ἔνθα after only two
lines. ὄρχηστι καὶ ὠιδῆ is Homeric (Od. 8.253; 17.605); ὄρχησμῷ καὶ ὠιδῇ occurs at Sc. 282, Thgn. 791, so in this case Thucydides has the earlier formula. However, in a hymn the post-Homeric usage is more likely to be correct, and Thucydides’ variant may be later, from a time when Homeric influence was stronger than that of the continuous epic tradition.

The contests of the Ionians are reminiscent of the recreations of the Phaeacians in book eight of the Odyssey. They too have song, athletic contests and exhibitions of dancing (234-65).

150. μνησάμενοι: this reminds us that all the activities are in honour of Apollo. "Remembering" is important in this passage: at 160 the maidens sing their song μνησάμεναι ἀνδρῶν κτλ.; at 167 they are asked by the poet to remember him in the future. The poet himself also promised at the outset to remember Apollo (see on 1). μνησάμενοι seems to be slightly left hanging in this sentence, since σὲ is presumably the object of τέρπουσιν; but of course Apollo is easily supplied as the object. μνησάμενοι is also used without an object at Od. 5.6, 12.309.

τέρπουσιν: this is also an important motif in the scene: the Ionians delight Apollo, as does Delos herself (146); the hypothetical onlooker takes delight in the Ionians (153); the maidens charm their audience (161), and delight in the poet himself (170). So the relationship between all those involved is one of mutual delight: everyone -- Apollo, the Ionians, the maidens and the poet -- both gives and receives delight. At Il. 1.473f., the Greeks sing a paean to Apollo, and ὃ δὲ φρένα τέρπετ' ἄκος. See on 169 below.

στήσωντας: this is more traditional than καθέσωσιν (Thucydides) here. καθίζω is used at Od. 2.69 of bringing about an assembly, ἀγορᾶς λαῖς ἤδε καθίζει.
αγώνα: this is probably just "gathering" here rather than "contest", in spite of the preceding line. "Gathering" is the primary meaning, and through being used for gatherings at contests it comes to mean the contest itself; it is first so used at h. 6.19, or possibly Th. 435. However, in the context of this sort of meeting to hold contests the two concepts might not have been clearly distinguished in the poet's mind.

151ff. Here the statement that the poet wants to make -- that the Ionians are lovely and graceful -- is strengthened by bringing in a hypothetical observer, a sort of impartial judge. For this device, cf. Od. 5.73-4 ξενός κ' ἐπειτα καὶ ἀθανατός περ ἐπελθὼν / θησαυρός ἱδὼν καὶ τερφεῖν φρεσίν ἤσιν, 1.288f., 23.135f.; II. 4.539-42, 13.343f., and also Odysseus' reaction to the city of the Phaeacians at Od. 7.43f.

See De Jong (1987, 57ff.) on such "anonymous focalisers".

151. φαίνη: this or φαίνης is often used in this type of expression: cf. 163; II. 3.220, 392; 4.429; 15.697; Od. 18.218, 23.135. In such contexts its meaning is closer to "think" than "say"; cf. LSJ s.v. ΙΙb, Janko 1992 on II. 13.83-90.

ἀθανάτους καὶ ἀγήρως: ἀγήρως is only used in this phrase in epic. Hoekstra (1969, 25) points out that ἀγήρως is irresolvable here, a sign of lateness. The fourth foot is its usual position, but it is mostly in the nom. and acc. singular, which can easily be resolved into -αος, -αιον; there is one Homeric parallel, Od. 7.94 ἀθανάτους δντας καὶ ἀγήρως ημωτα πάντα, but this also has Attic δντας and may well be interpolated; cf. Hainsworth (in Heubeck, West and Hainsworth 1988) ad loc. On the history of the formula, see Janko 1981b; 1982, 104. It is not necessarily pleonastic, since it is possible to be immortal but not ageless, as in the case of Tithonus. These are qualities that divide gods from mortals, so to say someone is ἀθανάτος καὶ ἀγήρως is to say they are divine; cf. Clay 1981-82. It is common to
praise people by comparing them to the gods (cf e.g. Il. 3.158; Od. 8.145); sometimes
people of outstanding appearance can be mistaken for gods, cf. the uncertainty of the
Cretans in 464ff., and of Anchises in Aph. 92-106: at Od. 6.149f. Odysseus affects to
mistake Nausicaa for a goddess. There is doubtless flattery in the hymn too: the poet
may have had his eye on the prize in the contest.

ξημενοι αἰεῖ: only elsewhere at 299. ἀνήρ is read for αἰεί by some MSS., but
the latter is supported by its use with ἀγήρῳ τῷ ἀθόαντῳ τῷ at Il. 12.323, and the
usual ἡμιστα πάντα expresses the same idea.

152. The reading ἐπαντιάσει’ (suggested by Martin in 1605) seems pretty certain
in this line; ἐπαντiardω is not found elsewhere, but the compounds ἀν-, ἐν-, ὑπαντiardω are attested (the last is in Homer, Il. 6.17).

153. ἰδοῖο: of course the poet himself, if he was really blind (172), could not
see any of this, which adds a certain poignancy to the description. This may be
another reason for the introduction of this observer, to see what the poet could not.

χάριν: often used of outward beauty, e.g at Od. 2.12 χάριν κατέχειν Ἀθήνη.

τέρψαιτο δὲ θυμῶν: it seems best to follow the punctuation of Allen, Halliday
and Sikes (1936), who take this with what follows, rather than parenthetically: cf. 204;
Od. 16.25-6 σε θυμῷ / τέρψωμαι εἰσορῶν.

154. εἰσορῶν: cf. 204. The reception of the spectacle is important; at 12f. too
Leto’s joy in her son is stressed.

καλλιξόνους τε γυναικας: καλλιξόνους is used three times in Homer (Il.
7.139, 24.698; Od. 23.147), and each time precisely as here, paired with άνδρες and
before τε γυναικες; it seems to be used of women in general, as opposed to men,
rather than of any particular woman. Slightly different is 446 Κρισατων άλοχοι

155. νήδας τ’ ὀξεῖας: ὀξύς is used as an epithet of ships also at Il. 8. 197; Od. 7.34 and 36, 9.101.

αὐτῶν: Allen and Sikes (1904) say that this contrasts the people with their ships and possessions, that it is "emphatic" here. The comment in the second edition (Allen, Halliday and Sikes 1936), "almost pleonastic", is, I think, more accurate. It is perhaps rather inelegant here, but no more so than Od. 2.154 ἠμέριον διὰ τ’ οἰκία καὶ πόλιν αὐτῶν.

κτήμοια πολλά: this is always paired with "wives" or "wives and children" in Homer (Il. 5.481, 13.626; Od. 9.41), so the use here is similar. The phrase is also used at 266. Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, ad loc.) suggest that the mention of possessions "indicates a fair such as in all times and countries tends to grow up at religious gatherings".

156. πρὸς δὲ: πρὸς is adverbial here, "and besides". When used in this way, it is always πρὸς δὲ (see LSJ s.v.). This is the climax of the poet's praise of the festival and worshippers.

μέγα θαύμα: in Homer this is only used in the phrase ὃ πόλιον (ὁ πᾶτερ, Od. 19.36), ἠ μέγα θαύμα τὸδ’ ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὑδάμοι; it is used outside of this phrase at 415 (Apollo's appearance on the Cretan ship); Herm. 270; Dem. 240, 403; Sc. 218. Elsewhere it is used of genuine miracles and it seems an exaggerated way to describe the maidens; no doubt it is part of the poet's strategy of flattery.

δοὺ κλέος ὁποτ’ ὀλέται: the same phrase is used at Il. 2.325 (κλέος ὁποτ’ ὀλέται also at Il. 7.91, Od. 24.196). On the form δοὺ for ἄδο, cf. Chantraine 1948-
53, 1.45, 82. The poet would have said ὅ in everyday speech, and ὅου is formed from this by diectasis. Part of the reason the maidens’ glory will never perish is perhaps their inclusion in this poem. The poet himself says that all his songs will be the best (173) and that ἡμεῖς δ’ ὑμέτερον κλῆς οἴσομεν etc. (174), where the repetition of κλῆς is significant. So in praising the maidens, the poet indirectly praises himself. See on 174 below.

157. The choir of Delian maidens was famous in antiquity (Euripides compares his chorus to them at *Herc.* 687ff., *Hec.* 461f). At a later date, and possibly already when the hymn was composed, they performed at various festivals, according to the Delian temple accounts from 279; see Homolle 1890, 500ff. They are recorded as performing at the Apollonia, Letaea, Artemisia, Britomartia and Aphrodisia, and for θεωρία from Cos, Rhodes, Siphnos and Carystos. This suits the skill with which they are credited here: cf. Allen, Halliday and Sikes 1936, ad loc.; Calame 1977, 1.203ff.

'Εκατημελέτω θέραπνα: 'Εκατημελέτης is probably an extension of ἐκατημελός. It is also found at *ll.* 1.75, *Sc.* 100, also in the genitive, though only here is it a substantive. θέραπνη is a syncopated form of θέραπανα. Only the masculine θέραπων is in Homer; this seems to be the first occurrence of the feminine in syncopated or unsyncopated form. The maidens are introduced straight away as servants of Apollo, stressing that their song is in his honour and inspired by him. Similarly, poets are the servants of the Muses (*Th.* 99f. ἀκοῦσε / Μονσάκων θέραπων).

158ff. As pointed out above, this is rather like the description of the Muses’ song in 189ff., and also *Th.* 44-52. So they are by implication compared to the Muses, and
also to poets (cf. Th. 99ff.). The order of their song, in which gods come first and then men, is the same as in all these passages. It was probably the same as that of the poets of the hymns, if they are, as is usually thought, preludes to epic recitation (see prolegomena, 20ff.).

158f. πρῶτον μὲν . . . αὕτης δ’ αὐ: cf. Th. 44ff. θεῶν γένος . . . πρῶτον κλείουσιν... δεύτερον αὕτε Ζηνα... αὕτης δ’ ἀνθρώπων. The order is obviously natural for a festival of Apollo; he comes first on his own, then Leto and Artemis, who have to share a line.

ἐπεῖ ὁρ: z reads ἐπεῖ ὁν, but ὁρ is preferable; Od. 20.86 also has ἐπεῖ ὁρ with the subjunctive.

ὑμνησωσιν: this word is used by the poets of the hymns for their own work (e.g. 177-8), and similarly by Hesiod (Th. 33). It is also used of the Muses in the passages quoted above, and of nymphs (h. 19.27). It is used without distinction of songs about both gods and men, so clearly the definition of ὑμνος as a song in praise of the gods is a later development (see prolegomena, 7, and on 19).

159. αὕτης δ’ αὐ: this looks pleonastic, but is also used at Th. 237 (see West 1966, ad loc. for other parallels). LSJ s.v. αὕτης say that it is frequently strengthened, e.g. by πάλιν.

Ἀρτεμίν ἱοχέϊαιον: see on 15.

160. μνησώμεναι: this is best taken with what follows, rather than with what precedes, pace Baumeister (1860, ad loc.). The latter construction is very clumsy, and the use of πρῶτον μὲν . . . αὐτῆς δ’ αὐ suggests that 158-9 should be parallel in syntax. Moreover, μνησώμεναι takes the genitive elsewhere in this hymn (1, 167). On "remembering" in this hymn, see on 1, 150.
\(\alpha\nu\delta\rho\delta\nu\ \tau\epsilon\ \pi\alpha\lambda\alpha\imath\alpha\imath\nu\ \eta\delta\varepsilon\ \gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\kappa\iota\nu\): this suggests subject matter similar to epic poetry (cf. \textit{Th.} 100 κ\lambda\varepsilon\alpha\iota\\pi\rho\omicron\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu\ \alpha\nu\theta\rho\omicron\rho\omicron\pi\omicron\nu; \ h. 31.18f., 32.18f.). Less plausible is the view that this is a reference to the Hyperboreans. Burkert (1987, 52f.) suggests that the performance of epic themes by a chorus is an example of the new "Stesichorean" style designed to replace the traditional epic. However, this may not be such a novelty, since in the \textit{Theogony} the choir of Muses are described singing of similar themes on Olympus (see on 158ff.), and descriptions of divine song and dance mirror the practices of mortals. The songs the choir sang may well have been traditional, repeated every year. Hymns by the Lycian Olen were sung on Delos, cf. Hdt. 4.35; Call. \textit{h. Del.} 304-5; Paus. 5.7.8.

161. \textit{δινον}: see prolegomena, 7, and on 19, 158f.

\textit{θέλησις}: this is a word used of poets; here it reinforces the comparison of the Delian maidens with \(\alpha\omicron\iota\delta\iota\). Cf. e.g. \textit{Od.} 17.514, 521 where \(\theta\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omega\) is used in comparing Odysseus to a poet, because of his skill as a story teller. The word has magical connotations, and suggests that oral poets had great power over their hearers. The \textit{locus classicus} for the effects of poetry is \textit{Th.} 98-103. Cf. Russo (in Russo, Fernandez-Galiano and Heubeck 1992) on \textit{Od.} 17.514; Havelock 1963, ch. 9; Segal 1974, and see on 169 below.

162ff. The exact nature of the maidens' performance here is not clear: \(\kappa\rho\epsilon\mu\beta\alpha\lambda\alpha\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\nu\) in particular is difficult. Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, ad loc.) suggest that the reference is to singing in the different dialects of the various pilgrims; this is supported by Tschiedel 1975; Burkert 1985, 110. This would be a rather curious practice and there are no other references to it. Since the performance is clearly mimetic in some way, it is possible to see a reference to the hyporcheme,
which was sacred to Apollo. This is hard to define precisely, but it clearly involved a mimetic element: see Smyth 1906, lxix-lxxv; Diehl 1914; Färber 1936, Abh. 34f., 55f., Texte 41f.; Koller 1954, 166ff.; Calame 1977, 1.154f. n.217. It is defined by Athenaeus I.15D: καὶ ἐστιν ἡ τουαστη δρακησίς μύμησις τῶν ὑπὸ τῆς λέξεως ἐρμηνευομένων προσμυστούν. This suggests it was a mime, but clearly we are not dealing with a simple mime here, as the reference to φωνᾶς shows. Possibly the maidens sing and also mime to their own song. They might imitate the speech of the characters in their song, and perhaps mime the appropriate actions in their dance. This is more likely than the imitation of the speech of the audience. In favour of this view, see Calame 1977, 1.195, who says that the maidens sing of "exploits des hommes et des femmes . . . dont elles savent imiter les voix"; Burkert 1987, 54 (rejecting his earlier view). In this case the ἐκκοστὸς of 163 would refer to these characters, φαίη implying "if they were present".

κρεμβολιαστῶν: this means something like "castanet-playing", i.e. the marking of time in a dance with the beat of castanets (cf. Hesych. s.v. κρεμβολιαζεῖν). This seems appropriate to the context, but it is hard to see how the maidens can be said to imitate the κρεμβολιαστῶς. If, as I have argued, their skill is in the imitation of the speech of characters, then perhaps the reading βαμβολιαστῶν (ETLΠ) is preferable. This means something like "chattering of teeth", or perhaps "stammering", cf. II. 10.375 βαμβογνών; similar words are βαμβοκος (Hipponax 32.3 West, where West accepts Schneidewin’s emendation βαμβοκός); βαμβολός, βαμβολεῖν (Hesychius), all apparently to "chatter with cold". This reading is supported by Humbert (1937, 225-8) who takes it as a reference to the incomprehensible speech of barbarians: cf. also Evelyn-White 1914, 336f.; Breuning 1929, 70; Cassola 1975, ad
loc. Cassola suggests that the maidens sing non-Greek hymns by Olen (see on 160).

163. μμμείσθ' Ἰσάσιν: this is Barnes's emendation of the MSS μμμείσθαι Ἰσάσιν, and is a necessary change, though Cassola (1975, ad loc.) attempts to defend the reading of the MSS. He claims (following Wilamowitz, 1916, 450) that the initial iota of such perfects is more often short: but of the sixteen cases of Ἰσάσιν(ν) in Homer, in ten the first two syllables are scanned, and in six: there is no justification for the scansion which μμμείσθαι would require. The phrase in the MSS. has a strong neglect of digamma; this line also has another neglect, and mobile making position, so seems clearly post-Homeric in diction (see Hoekstra 1969, 24ff.). Janko (1982, 105) points out that, apart from Theognis 370, the root μμμ- is not otherwise attested before Pindar and Aeschylus.

φοιν.: see on 151.

164. κολή συνάρησεν άοτη: the phrase is also used at Th. 22 κολήν ἐδιδοξάσαν άοτην, where it has the same place in the verse. Again a phrase used of poets is also used of the maidens. συνάρησεν may mean well-fitted to what they are imitating (Evelyn-White 1914 translates "so close to truth is their sweet song"), which is plausible because the οδόω refers back to the preceding clause; but it could also mean simply "well-fitted together", with no reference to any external comparison. It seems most natural to assume this άοτη is the same as that described in 158-61, which favours the view that 162ff. refer to this and not to a new performance.

165-78. The poet says farewell to the Delian maidens, and asks them to remember him if anyone asks who their favourite singer is, and reply that he is a blind man from Chios. In return, the poet promises to spread the maidens' fame
wherever he wanders, and to continue singing of Apollo

This is the most quoted and discussed passage of the hymn. There are two main reasons for this: its importance to the question of the hymn’s unity, and its enigmatic reference to the blind singer from Chios. I discuss the latter on 172; on its bearing on the problem of unity, see prolegomena, 103ff. There I conclude that the usual view that the passage is an ending is correct, but that it is not a wholly typical ending for a Homeric hymn, and may also be intended to serve as a transition to PAp; if so, this is in favour of the theory that DAp was composed as an addition to PAp. However, I would emphasise that it is the sense of closure that is strongest in these lines, and that 165-78 are a perfectly satisfactory ending.

In 165ff. the poet asks for the favour of Apollo and Artemis, and addresses the maidens directly. It is common to ask for the blessing of a god or gods at the end of a hymn, either in a general way, as here, or with a particular request. This follows the pattern of prayers, in which praise of the god is followed by a request of some kind: it is a reciprocal arrangement, in which the god, it is hoped, will grant the request in return for the praise received. In the longer Hymns, the narrative element has come to predominate, and there is only a short request if any at the end. On all this, see prolegomena, 11ff.

Particular requests are found at h. 6.19f.; 13.3; 22.7; 25.6; 26.12. The χαίρε used at the end is more than a salutation; it "expresses the wish that the god may feel pleasure rather than pain as a result of the suppliant’s sacrifice, offering, dedication, prayer, praise or the like" (Bundy 1972, 49). Bundy points out that the equivalence of χαίρε and ἔλημι is illustrated by 15.9 and 20.8, both of which say ἔλημεν δ’
Άρετήν τε καὶ διάβον, the one preceding this with χαίρε, ἔνοικε, Διοῦς υἱὲ, and the other with ἄλλη Ἡμηθ', Ὑφαίστη. In 165ff. the poet is seeking the favour of both the gods and the chorus of maidens. He in turn, he says, will spread the fame of the maidens wherever he goes. This bargain is parallel to the requests usually made of the gods; the maidens are to favour him in return for his praising them in his song, just as the gods are asked to favour poets for the same reason (cf. Dem. 494, 19.48).

In fact the praise of the maidens beginning at 156 could be seen as a small hymn, with third-person description followed by apostrophe, leave-taking, the request and the promise to sing of them in the future. This point is made by Miller (1986, 61), who sees it as an argument in favour of the view that in 165-78 the poet is only taking leave of the maidens as a theme, not ending the whole hymn.

The addressing, or even the mentioning, of the audience and the circumstances of performance is not something that occurs elsewhere in early epic poetry (at 11.5 δὸς δ' ἡμι, 26.12 δὸς δ' ἡμᾶς the audience may be included, or it may be singular for plural, like ἡμεῖς in 174). Many of the hymns were no doubt composed for performance at particular places and festivals, but do not mention them (e.g. at 13.3 the poet speaks only of τῆνδε . . . πόλιν; cf. 24.4); there is nothing to parallel the description of the Delian festival in our hymn. The self-reference in 172f. is also alien to the Hymns and Homer; Hesiod, however, does talk about himself (Th. 22-35, Op. 650-662), and this could have influenced the hymn. In general, though, this sort of "signature" is a development of lyric poetry; cf. e.g. Theognis 22ff., Alcman fr. 8 Calame (possibly not autobiographical; see Calame 1983, 357f.). Pindar frequently refers to himself and his art (these self-references are much debated; see e.g Lefkowitz 1991). Both lyric poems and this passage show the increased importance of individual
poets. Homer never mentions himself; and in the picture of Demodocus’ performances in book eight of the *Odyssey*, it is the topic of song that matters, not the identity of the performer. But in 165-78 here we have the concept of a favourite poet. Moreover, he claims that his songs will always be the best; this shows that he expects his songs to survive under his name, and presumably not to change. This implies a fixed, presumably written, text. Burkert (1987) suggests that this change occurred first with Homer, who was made into a fixed classic by rhapsodes responding to the challenge of Stesichorean poetry, which performed epic stories in a new way. The description of a chorus of maidens is also reminiscent of lyric; one thinks, for instance, of Alcman’s Partheneion. It is possible that the whole passage from 146-78 has been influenced by developments in lyric poetry (see also on 174).

Another possible, though more shadowy, influence may have been the citharodic nome, on which see prolegomena, 20 n.50. The last part of this was the **σφραγίς**, which suggests some sort of personal section or "signature". This and the apparent influence of lyric poetry provide some support for the theory that *DAp* is relatively late; in the prolegomena (123-35) I have argued that it was composed in the second half of the sixth century, perhaps in 523/2.

165-72 are quoted by Thucydides (3.104). See on 146-50 for discussion of his quotations from the hymn. This quotation is less problematic than that of 146-50, since Thucydides’ version differs very little from that of the MSS of the hymns. The most notable variation is in 165, where it is clear that our MSS are corrupt, and that the MSS of Thucydides have preserved the correct reading. The crux at the end of 171 is also the result of corruption in one or both traditions. The only place where it is likely that Thucydides had a different version in front of him, and which is likely
to be an oral variant, is in 168, where the hymns' MSS have ξείνως ταλαπεῖριος ἐλθὼν, and those of Thucydides ταλαπεῖριος διλλος ἐπελθὼν. The controversial aspect of this second quotation concerns not the words he quotes, but how he introduces them. On this, and its relation to the problem of unity, see prolegomena, 95f.

165. The hymns' MSS of 165 read ἀλλ' ἄρε δὴ λητῶ μὲν (ἀλλά γε λητῶ μὲν καὶ M), which makes no sense with what follows. It seems certain that the original reading is that preserved in the MSS of Thucydides.

ἀλλʼ δήθε: cf. Dem. 490 ἀλλʼ ἄγ', with Richardson 1974 ad loc. ἀλλʼ ἄρεθε is common in Homer (see Lfgre s.v. ἀλλά 534, 35-73). Here it seems to be used awkwardly, in that those addressed with δήθε are not those whose favour is requested by the wish ἦλθοι. There are instances in Homer of this idiom being followed by a third person imperative (e.g. Il. 20.355 ἀλλʼ ἄγ' ἀνήρ ἐκτο ἄνδρος ἴω; Od. 8.204, 542); but our passage is the only example in early epic of an optative after it. In Homer the person or persons addressed are able to carry out the command or ensure that it is carried out; in the hymn, however, neither the poet nor the maidens can ensure the favour of Apollo and Artemis -- hence the verb in the optative -- and so the exhortation is pointless. χαδρεθε in the next line is perfectly natural after ἀλλʼ ἄρεθε', but awkward in parallel with ἦλθοι.

ἦλθοι: this verb is always used of gods showing favour; and because it is used by worshippers requesting such favour, it always occurs in the optative as here, except for the one Homeric instance of the verb, Od. 21.364f. ε ἐ κεν Ἰππόλλαον / ἴμιν ἦλθησι. Cf. Arat. Phaen. 637 Ἀρτεμίς ἦλθοι; Dion. Perieg. 447 ἀλλʼ ὁ μὲν ἦλθοι (in most examples the verb is in the second person). LSJ see ἦλθοι and
ιληκισι in Homer as parts of a verb ἵληκω = ἵλασκομαι; more plausible perhaps is the view that they are instances of a perfect with κ and thematic declension (so Fernandez-Galiano in Russo, Fernandez-Galiano and Heubeck 1992, on Od. 21.365). In this case the aspect of the verb would suggest the meaning "may Apollo and Artemis be favourable (already) to us", i.e. it is a wish that the gods may be in a favourable state of mind, rather than showing favour on one particular occasion or in one particular way.

'Απόλλων 'Αρτέμιτι ξύν: the mention of Artemis in the request for favour at this point might seem surprising, given that this is a hymn to Apollo and Artemis has not featured in the narrative, but in a hymn recited on Delos the linking of the two would be natural in any prayer, as their cults were so closely related (cf. Farnell 1896-1909, 2.465f.). The phrase is also used at Od. 15.410, so is no doubt formulaic, and may have been used in Delian cult.

166. ὑμεῖς πᾶσαι: this is also used at 171. The repetition perhaps underlines the reciprocity of the arrangement: they are all pleased by the song, so should all praise him in return.

ἐμεῖο: this shows that it is the poet himself who is the subject of 172, and that it is not a reference to Homer as the great poet of the past (though this does not mean the reference is not to Homer at all; see on 172).

μετόπισθεν: see on 173.

167ff. The device of bringing in a hypothetical stranger to ask who the maidens' favourite poet is allows the poet to put the praise of himself in the mouth of others (cf. Theognis 22f.). There is also no doubt a suggestion that he should receive the prize in the poetic contest (cf. 6.19f. δός δ' ἐν ἄγωνι/ νήκην τῷδε φέρεσθαι).
Thucydides seems to have understood the passage in this way, since he quotes it to show that there was a μονεσκής ὁγὼν. On poetic contests at festivals, see Herington 1985, 161ff.; Förstel 1979, 139 and 383f. n.357.

167. μνήσωσθ' : this is probably not just "remember" here, but, as often, "mention, tell of"; cf. on 1. Just as they "remembered" the subjects of their song there, so they are to remember the poet now, perhaps implying that they are to sing of him too (they have already been compared implicitly to the Muses and to poets, cf. on 158, 161).

ὅπποτε κέν: this is not "whenever" here, as that is indicated by the subjunctive without κέν or ὄν. ὕπποτε κέν with the subjunctive (or optative in past time) refers to a single event that will happen at an indefinite time (e.g. Il. 4.40, 9.702, 14.504, 18.115f.); cf. Chantraine 1948-53, 2.256f.

ἐπιχονίων ἀνθρώπων: this is a common formula, found in Homer, the Hymns and Hesiod, always at the line-end (e.g. Il. 4.45; Od. 1.167; Dem. 480, 487; Th. 231). This is one of the things that separate men from the gods, who are οὐρανώνες.

168. ἐνθάδε?: this is a common word in Ap.: naturally both parts emphasise the idea of place, as both are concerned with a particular site (cf. 58, 80, 178, 248, 258 etc.).

ἀνείρηται: see on 50. The verb is only used absolutely here and at Od. 7.21.

κεῖος ταλαπείριος ἔλθων: cf. Od. 7.24f. κεῖος ταλαπείριος ἐνθάδε ἵκτων / τηλόθεν ἐξ ὠπίσω γαῖης; κεῖος ταλαπείριος also occurs at Od. 17.84, ἰκέτην ταλαπείριον at 6.193, 14.511. All these refer to Odysseus, who is the ταλαπείριος man par excellence. So the phrase suggests someone like Odysseus, who had travelled far and suffered much. The etymology of ταλαπείριος is from τλάω and πείρα,
hence the meaning "who has undergone trials" (cf. Hainsworth in Heubeck, West and Hainsworth 1988, on *Od*. 7.24).

The stranger is described in this way so as to give him a motive for asking for the ἠδιστος ἀοιδῶν, to ease his sufferings. *Th.* 98ff. describes the soothing effect of poetry on those who have suffered.

Thucydides reads ταλαπεφτιος ἄλλος ἐπελθὼν. This is perhaps equally traditional; ἄλλος ἐπελθὼν is used at the line end at *Il.* 4.334, and belongs to a common formula-type with ἐπελθὼν, cf. *Il.* 10.40, 24.418, *Od.* 2.246. However, it is hard to explain the ἄλλος in this context. Who else is ταλαπεφτιος? Perhaps the poet himself, if he is blind; but this is not at all clear. In Thucydides’ line ταλαπεφτιος is in the position it always occupies in Homer, before the bucolic diaeresis; this is used as an argument in favour of his reading by Breuning (1929, 70f.). Because of the oddity of ἄλλος here, Van Groningen (1934-5) suggested reading ἄλλοθεν ἐλθὼν; cf. Isocrates *Peace* 141 τίς γὰρ ἄλλοθεν ἐπελθὼν κτλ.; *Paneg.* 133 εἰ τινες ἄλλοθεν ἐπελθόντες κτλ. (in both cases the point is that any visitor would think that the Athenians were mad).

For another example of telling somebody what to reply when asked a certain question, cf. *Aph.* 281ff. ἢν δὲ τις εἴρητοι σε καταθνητῶν ἀνθρώπων κτλ., which is similar in wording to 167-8. There too the addressee (Anchises) is told to remember the injunction (μυθείσθαι μεμνημένος). In *Aph.* the command is from a goddess, and so is accompanied by a threat of punishment if he does not obey (286ff.); the poet here cannot command or threaten, so his request is accompanied by a promise to give them glory in return. As a poet, his greatest asset is his gift of song, and he promises to use this to their advantage.
The terms of the question are interesting. The stranger asks who the sweetest bard is, and whom they most delight in. In other words poetry is seen as essentially something that gives pleasure, soothes and delights, and so the best poet is the one who excels in these qualities. This is the usual way in which early epic poets describe themselves and their poetry; cf. *Th.* 98-103; *Od.* 1.347, 8.91, 368, 429; 17.385, and see on 161 ἡλιοστὴν. In Homer, however, giving pleasure is not seen as the sole function of poetry; at *Od.* 1.337f. Penelope desires to hear a song that will not bring her grief, and is rebuked by Telemachus; on all this, see Macleod 1983, 1ff.

It is stressed that it is the maidens’ opinion that the stranger seeks on the subject. They are themselves in a sense poetesses, as has already been remarked (see on 157ff.), and so their judgement should be authoritative: they know what they are talking about. Their opinion gains still greater authority from the fact that they are the ἐκκατημβέλεται θεράπνων, and so inspired by him; it is from him that they receive their gift of song, cf. *Od.* 8.488; *Th.* 94-5 (= h. 25.2-3). This is no doubt the reason that the poet puts the answer to the question into the mouths of the maidens; if the statement comes from them, it is inspired by Apollo, the god of poetry and prophecy himself, and so must be true. The identification of the maidens with their divine patron may be emphasised by τέρπεσθε μάλιστα, since this echoes 146 ἄλλας σὺ Δήλος, Φοίβε, μάλιστ' ἐπιτέρπεσαι ἄτορ, and Apollo takes pleasure in Delos as a subject of song. Also in 165f. the maidens' favour is requested along with that of Apollo and Artemis. The question the stranger asks shows that poets regularly came to the island, presumably to take part in contests (this is no doubt what Thucydides had in mind when he quoted these lines to show that there was a μουσικῆς ᾠγῶν at the festival).
169. τίς δ': for δε in questions of this type, cf. Denniston 1954, 173ff. It is used elsewhere after apostrophe, e.g. Od. 19.500 μαία, τί δε σὺ τάς μυθήσεσαι; Il. 15.244, 17.170; Soph. O.C. 332 τέχνον, τί δ' ἥλθες;

δημιν is an "ethic" dative; it modifies the whole question and means something like "in your opinion" (on ethic datives in Homer, cf. Chantraine 1948-53, 2.72).

مهارات: the only other occurrences of this superlative in early epic are Od. 13.80 and possibly Dem. 13 (see Richardson 1974, ad loc.). Ἡδυς is often used of song, e.g. Th. 39-40; Od. 8.64. Here the sweetness is transferred from the song to the singer.

170. ἐνθάδε: cf. on 168 above.

πωλεῖται: this is an appropriate verb here, since it is properly a frequentative of πέλομαι (LSJ s.v. πωλέομαι; see Chantraine 1968-80, s.v. πέλομαι) and so means "come or go frequently, regularly". This is shown clearly by e.g. Od. 4.384 πωλεῖται τις δεύρο γέρων ὀλίος νημερτής. Here it suggests that rhapsodes came frequently to Delos, where there were regular festivals and contests.

171. εἰ μάλα πᾶσαι: Baumeister (1860) ad loc. points out that εἰ μάλα and μάλα πᾶσαι are both in Homer, but for a full parallel one has to look to Theocritus 25.19 εἰ μάλα πᾶσι. The effect is to emphasise that they should answer in unison, which in turn emphasises the truth of their statement.

The end of the line is a difficult crux. The reading of the majority of the hymns' MSS is ἀφ' ἡμέων (ET have ἀφ' ἡμέων); those of Thucydides have ἀφ' ἡμών or εὐφήμως; and those of Aristides mostly ἀφ' ἡμών. Attempts to make sense of ἀφ' ἡμών are unconvincing. The scholiast to Thucydides glosses it ἤσπερα, ἀθρόδως, and similarly Hesychius has ἀφ' ἡμώς: ἐν κόσμῳ, ἦσυχος. ἀθρόδως would be a satisfactory meaning, with the prefix α- linked to ἡμώς; but compounds of φήμη are
always connected with speech of religious significance or with the meaning "fame, report" (see Humbert 1938, 277); so "unanimously" is not a likely meaning for ἀφημως. The explanations given by the scholiast and Hesychius are clearly conjectural; they probably know no more than we do about its possible meaning. A better attempt is to explain ἀφημως as ἄνωνῆμως, which would certainly fit the context. This was first suggested, and rejected, by Wilamowitz (1916, 454); it has been defended cautiously by Burkert (1979, 161), and less cautiously by De Martino (1982). This meaning too has support from Hesychius, who has ἄφημως, ἄνωνήμως, ἀκλεῖς and ἀφήμωνες, ἄρρητοι, οὕκ ὄνομαξημένοι. This would be a possible sense for a compound of ἄφημι, and Wilamowitz (loc. cit.) pointed out that Plato used ἄφημι twice in the sense of δρομα (Leg. 704a; 935a). A problem is that "reply anonymously" is not the same thing as "reply without mentioning a name (of someone else)"; but ἄνωνήμως is used with this latter meaning at Menander Rh. 391.6 Russell and Wilson. ἀφημως = ἄνωνήμως, then, cannot be ruled out; but the word is a hapax that is hard to explain, and we should consider if sense can be got out of the more straightforward readings.

Some of the MSS of Thucydides have a reading εὐφημως; this was adopted by Ruhnken and most nineteenth century editors, and is supported by Wilamowitz (1916, 453ff.) and Càssola (1975, ad loc.). One Ms. of Aristides (R) has .φ..ως; the original reading might have been εὐφημως, which was changed to ἀφ’ ἦμων under the influence of the hymn MSS. If so, Aristides may originally have written εὐφημως; he is almost certainly quoting the hymn from Thucydides (see prolegomena, 96f.), and this means the reading εὐφημως in Thucydides dates at least as far back as Aristides (see Carey 1980). Yet every other variant in the traditions has an initial α: if
εὐφήμως is right, this corruption of a straightforward word must have occurred independently in three traditions (or two if Aristides' MSS have been contaminated from those of the Hymns). Moreover, I am not convinced that εὐφήμως does make good sense here. If taken in the commonest sense of εὐφήμως, it would mean "in words of good omen, auspiciously" but this does not suit what follows (unless in some way it is auspicious not to give the poet's name). "With words of praise" (as Cassola interprets it) would make good sense, but εὐφήμως in the sense "praising" is only found at Polyb. 31.14.4, not a good parallel for an archaic poet.

The suggestions considered so far have been based on the readings in Thucydides. Others take the hymn MSS as their starting point. Marx (1907), followed by Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936) and Humbert (1938), conjectured ὧμφη ἡμέων, meaning "about me". ὧμφη meaning "about" is not difficult (cf. Od. 8.266f. ἀειδεῖν ὧμφῃ Ἀρεως φιλοτήτος; Herm. 172; Pi. Ol. 1.35; Aesch. Septem 1017; Eur. Supp. 642). Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936, ad loc.) quote parallels for the omission of μ before φ. Again, though, we have to believe that the same corruption occurred in all three traditions. It is easier to believe that one branch has preserved the correct reading; having rejected the readings in the MSS of Thucydides, this leaves us with the reading of most of the hymn MSS, ὧφη ἡμέων. This has been defended by two of the more recent writers on the hymn, Fordeiner and Förstel, and I believe they are right. Förstel (1979, 136ff.) points out that ὧποδ appears in some passages, mainly in Herodotus, to mean "about, concerning". The usage is recognised by LSJ (s.v. III.7). Herodotus has a transition formula ταῦτα μὲν τὰ ὧποδ, cf. 4.54; 4.195.4; 7.167.2; 8.94.2. At 7.195 the Athenians question some prisoners about "τὰ ἔβοϊλοντο πυθέσθαι ὧπο τῆς Ξέρζεω στρατηγῆς." Other possible examples are Il. 22.126; Ar. Frogs 761f.
Forderer (1971, 103f., 182-4) takes ἀπὸ in a different way, as emphasising that the answer to be given to the stranger originates with the poet himself. This was first suggested by Clarke-Ernesti (1764), where it is explained "ut ego vobis nunc praescribo vel subiicio". In English we can say "tell him this from me". Neither of these explanations is wholly convincing, but reading ὁφ' ἤμεων seems the least unsatisfactory solution. Carey (1980) conjectures σαφὴνεως; this is less plausible palaeographically, and the sense is not satisfactory. σαφὴνεως ought to mean "clearly" but surely the most obvious thing about 172 is its suppression of the poet's name. It was no doubt clearer to the original audience, but the line undoubtedly has a "riddling" quality which σαφὴνεως does not suit.

Wilamowitz (1916, 453), followed by Altheim (1924, 438) and Schwarz (1940, 4) suggested that the poet's name could stand at the end of 173 (ὢμηρος would fit), but this would make the direct speech start in the middle of a line. There is only one case of this in early epic, ll. 23.855, but this is different as it is a shift from indirect to direct speech.

172. This is a famous line, which at least since Thucydides (3.104) has often been seen as a reference to Homer. Thucydides, of course, believed that the poem was really by Homer and he was simply referring to himself here; this is still maintained by De Martino (1982), but can hardly be true. It has been suggested that the line does refer to Homer, but the author is not speaking of himself; he is a loyal Homerid, claiming that Homer is the best poet. The problem with this is that the poet tells the maidens "Remember me when a stranger asks, etc.", and the present tenses οἰκεῖ and πολείτοι are also against this theory. Dyer (1975) suggests that ἤμεως in 174, and ἤμεων in 171 if that is the right reading, show that the poet sees himself as
a member of the Homeridai here. A better explanation is that ἡμεῖς is plural for singular (see on 174). Burkert (1987, 54ff.) ingeniously argues that Homer, although a poet of the past, can still be said to "live" on Chios where the Homerids are based, and to come to the contests (in the same way that Heraclitus said Homer should be thrown out of the contests). This still does not explain ἐμεῖο in 169; he could just be telling them to remember what he said, but this is weak.

A simple solution is that the lines originally had nothing to do with Homer: they are simply the boast of an anonymous Chian singer who was later thought to be Homer. This is the view of Raddatz (1913, 2200); Wilamowitz (1916, 453); Abramowicz (1935). I find this implausible. Burkert (1979, 57) comments: "What a strange claim for an obscure, anonymous author! The best poet of all times, the absolute classic: this is meant to be Homer." Cf. Bowra 1961, 432ff. It is against convention for an epic poet to refer to himself, let alone boast that his songs are the best. However we take it, the passage is peculiar; and the peculiar fame and position of Homer might be the cause of this. Why is the poet not named? The stranger who questions the maidens is expected to recognise the poet from the description that he is a blind man and comes from Chios. This suggests a poet of great fame, as does the following line about his songs being the best. The description reminds us of Simonides’ reference to the Χῖος ὁ νῆρ and Theocritus’ to the Χῖος ὁ οἰδής (see below).

If the blind poet is meant to be Homer, what is going on in the passage? I have argued that the poet is referring to himself, that he is referring to Homer, but that he is not Homer. One conclusion that makes sense of this is that this "signature" is a forgery; the poet is putting forward his own work as Homer’s. This matches what the
scholiast to Nemean 2.1 tells us about Cynaethus: that he composed the hymn to Apollo and attributed it to Homer. If he composed the combined hymn for Polycrates’ Delian festival, the purpose may have been to show that Polycrates was merely reviving an earlier festival, at which Homer himself had sung. This sort of "forgery" is unusual in an archaic poem, but on any view this passage is unusual. Janko (1982, 114f.) accepts that this is a reference to Homer, and calls it a "pious fraud" by a Homerid. One problem with this theory is that the passage gives the impression of having been composed to be performed on Delos in a particular situation. Is this an imagined situation, at which Homer was present? Or perhaps the past and present are somehow combined. It is likely that there was a chorus of maidens at the festival, possibly that of Polycrates; to an audience it would not be apparent until 172 that the poet was reciting a poem by Homer, and not simply referring to himself and the current festival. Another possibility is that the poem’s composer was blind and came from Chios: whether or not he was Cynaethus, it is very likely that he was a Homerid from there (cf. the praise of Chios in 38). If so, 172f. might be a joke playing on his similarity to Homer in this respect; this would be obvious to the original audience, but not to later generations.

I have argued that the line refers to Homer, and therefore the traditions that he was blind and came from Chios were already established when the hymn was composed. Others have seen this passage as the source of these beliefs. On Homer’s life and name, see Wilamowitz 1884, 328-80; id. 1916, 356-76; Jacoby 1933b; Schwartz 1940, 1-9; Schadwaldt 1959, 87-129. Abramowicz (1935) examines in detail all the possible sources for the legend of Homer’s blindness and after rejecting them concludes that DAπ must have been the source. In most cases she is right to reject
the stories (e.g. the statements that δυνάρτης means "blind" in one dialect or another). One source that perhaps she is wrong to reject is Homer's picture of the blind singer Demodocus in *Od.* 8. It is very likely that the ancient biographers would have seen this as a self-reference. Their usual method, faced with the lack of autobiography in the Homeric poems, was to see incidents and characters in the poems as reflections of Homer's own life; so in the *Vita Herodotea* Mentes, Mentor and Glaucus appear.

There is, though, no real need to find a single source for the legend. The association of blindness with poets and prophets is widespread; this is no doubt partly based on fact, as this was one way blind people could make a living, but also "symbolises that he is guided more by inner sight than by what he sees directly with his eyes" (Stanford 1961-62, on *Od.* 8.64). Other Greek examples are Thamyris, Stesichorus and Teiresias. See Bowra 1961, 420f; Buxton 1980. So we should hardly be surprised at the belief that Homer, the supreme poet, was blind.

Homer's birthplace was widely disputed in the ancient world: it might be easier to give a list of cities that did not claim him than of those that did. The *Suda* s.v. "Ωμηρος, for example, lists among others the following candidates: Chios, Smyrna, Ios, Cumae, Lydia, Athens, Ithaca, Cyprus, Salamis, Cnossos, Argos, Mycenae, Egypt, Thessaly, Italy, Rhodes and Rome (cf. Thomson 1949, 542ff.). The motives for many of these claims are clear: some are simply patriotic, e.g. Cumae, which was suggested by Ephorus; others seem to have been chosen because of a connection with the poems, e.g. Ithaca, Mycenae (Homer makes it important), Egypt (he shows knowledge of it in the *Odyssey*), Thessaly (home of Achilles), etc.

Chios and Smyrna, however, are clearly the best attested. Chios is named in the earliest references: Semonides or Simonides (West 1974, 179f. prefers the latter; it is
Simonides 19.1 West) refers to Homer as the Χῖος ἀνήρ. The lives attribute this opinion to the fifth century Damastes of Sigeum (FrGrHist 5 F11) and the fourth century Anaximenes of Lampsacus (FrGrHist 72 F30). Presumably Thucydides (3.104) also took this view, since he believed the hymn was by Homer. The earliest mention of Smyrna is attributed to Pindar (fr. 264), who is supposed to have said that Homer was Chian and Smyran. Smyrna has another fifth century authority in Stesimbrotos of Thasos (FrGrHist 107 F22). The lives of Homer, which are late compositions but contain material going back at least to the classical period, have Homer born on Smyrna but brought up on Chios (172 is compatible with this). Chios, though, seems to have remained the generally accepted place, since Theocritus (7.47, 22.218) could still in his time refer to Homer simply as the Χῖος ἀνήρ.

The theory that the hymn caused, rather than reflected, these beliefs about Homer assumes that the poem was generally accepted as Homer's at an early period. The earliest references to it, in Thucydides (3.104) and Aristophanes (see on 114), both ascribe it to Homer. It is debatable what works were attributed to Homer in the sixth and fifth centuries: Wilamowitz (1884, 328-80) argued that initially all epic was attributed to Homer, and this was narrowed down as time passed; for a lively statement of the opposite view, see Scott 1921, 1-38. The picture is complicated, but it seems clear that the Iliad and Odyssey were set apart from other epics; the hymns, however, seem to have been more widely accepted as Homeric than the Cyclic epics. Yet there must have been scepticism: the claim that Cynaethus was the author of Ap. survived, and places that claimed Homer for themselves must have disputed the hymn's authorship. Strabo (14.645) and the Certamen (13) both say that the Chians claim Homer, and point as evidence to the fact that the Homeridai were based there.
Why not point to Ap. 172, if its authorship was not disputed? Thus it seems unlikely
that the hymn could have been responsible for the beliefs that Homer was blind and
came from Chios.

παπαλόεσση: see on 39. The epithet is used of Chios at Od. 3.170.

173. This sort of self-praise (if it is self-praise) is alien to Homeric poetry, but
Hesiod and Theognis refer to themselves in a complimentary way (though Hesiod
refers to himself in the third person, and Theognis, like our poet, puts the reference
to himself in the mouth of a third person); Pindar is often boastful (e.g. Nem. 3.80-2,
and see the passages cited on 174), and it has been pointed out that this praise of the
poet also indirectly praises the subject of the poem, since it shows he is worthy of a
poem by a good poet and ensures that he will be praised as he deserves. To claim
that your work will be immortal is of course a common motif in later poetry; it is a
safe claim to make, since if it does not come true, then by definition nobody will
know.

Wilamowitz (1916, 453) argued that the lines must refer to a poet of the past
whose songs were well known, as otherwise the poet could hardly credit the maidens
with knowledge of all his poems, and certainty as to their future success. But this is
unduly pedantic: the poet, in putting the statement into the maidens’ mouths, would
not have worried about precisely what they could or could not know - it is a poetic
device. This device makes the claim bolder as it makes it seem as if his pre-eminence
is something generally admitted. As noted above, the poems are seen as belonging
to the poet, and will continue to belong to him after his death. This seems to assume
that the songs will be transmitted in their present form, not that they will be re-created
at every performance and by every singer. Does this imply a written text?
μετόπισθεν ἀριστεὶσον: the MSS. all read the present tense here, and this is printed by Allen, Halliday and Sikes (1936) and Càssola (1975), but surely the future (Barnes) is necessary here. μετόπισθεν can be used with a present tense when it means postea, as at Il. 1.82; but here the reference must be to the future, as at Od. 24.84 οἱ μετόπισθεν ἔσονται. Allen, Halliday and Sikes claim that the meaning is that "his songs are famous as soon as he has sung them", but I do not think the Greek can mean this. Förstel (1979, 139) defends the present tense in a similar way. ἀριστεὶσω is only used in Homer of people, not things; the idiom is not "his songs are best", but "he is best at song." Here, though, the songs are the subject since they will still be pre-eminent when he is dead. For ἀριστεὶσω used of things, cf. Pi. Nem. 1.14; Aesch. P.V. 890.

ἀοιδός: in Homer this normally means "song" in general, not a particular song. The first example of the latter use is Od. 1.351, τὴν γὰρ ἀοιδὴν μᾶλλον ἐπικλεῖσον ἀνθρώποι; in the hymns it is common in the closing formula αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ σεῖο καὶ ὄλλης μνήσωμ' ἀοιδῆς.

174. ἡμεῖς: here this must be plural for singular; on this in Homer, see Floyd 1969. Poets often seem to use the plural of themselves, perhaps to claim special dignity, cf. Od. 1.10; Il. 2.486; Th. 36; Pl. Ion 530b.

ὑμέτερον: this makes better sense than ἡμέτερον, which is read by Θ. The point is that the poet will praise the maidens in return for their praise of him: the corruption could easily have arisen through assimilation to ἡμεῖς. Cf. the bargains proposed at Od. 7.331ff., 8.496ff., 17.415ff. in all of which Odysseus offers someone fame if they give him what he wants.

κλέος: The poet has the power to bestow κλέος; in this respect he resembles the
gods; cf. Od. 7.332f., where Odysseus prays to Zeus to grant Alcinous κλέος. For the idea of widespread κλέος, cf. Il. 7.451, Od. 19.333. It is the poet’s praise of them that guarantees their fame will not die (156). The idea that the poet can confer fame on someone is common in lyric poetry: cf. Theognis 237ff.; Ibycus fr. 263.46-8 PMG; Bacch. 3.90-2, 9.82-7; Pi. Ol. 1.115f., Nem. 5.1ff., and see Goldhill 1991, 69-128. The line may imply that the poet is intending to sing this hymn, with its praise of the maidens, in other places; this is used by some as an argument for the poem’s unity, since it suggests that poems about Delos and Delphi could be suitable for performance anywhere, and so there would be no reason why a hymn should not praise both sanctuaries (see prolegomena, 106). However, the fact that a poem could be reperformed in other places does not invalidate the statement that archaic poems were generally composed with a specific performance in mind; many poems that were designed for a particular occasion must also have been performed on other occasions, or they would be unlikely to survive (see Herington 1985, 48-50).

δισσόν ἐπ’ ἀλών: rhapsodes were usually itinerant; we are told that Cynaethus of Chios recited Homer in Syracuse (schol. Pi. Nem. 2.1), and Ion in Plato’s dialogue is a travelling performer. 169f. also suggest this: no doubt they performed in contests at various festivals. The wandering minstrel or storyteller is of course a familiar figure in many cultures. The biographies of Homer depict him as an itinerant singer: this has no value as evidence for the activity of the real Homer, but it shows that this is what a bard was expected to do. The poets Homer himself depicts, Phemius and Demodocus, are different: they are court poets, attached to a particular place. It is debatable whether this is simply Homer’s picture of poets in the past, or whether he himself may have been a poet of this type. Not all poets were itinerant; Hesiod tells
us that he had sailed no further than Chalcis (Op. 650ff.), though he may have
travelled overland, and it is possible that in Homer's time poets travelled less than the
later rhapsodes.

οια only occurs at the end of the line in early epic, and the accusative is always
after ἔπι as here. The phrase may be an adaptation of πᾶσαν ἔπι ὀσαν (Il. 8.1 etc.).
οια in Homer seems to function as a metrical alternative to γαία, as is shown most
clearly by the genitive πατρίδος αῖμας of the formula πατρίδα γαίαν. οια = "earth"
may be connected to οια = "grandmother", i.e. the Earth Mother, and some see γαία
as a combination of this and γῆ; see Chantraine 1968-80, s.v. Against this, see Janko
1982, 234ff.

175. στρέφομεσθα: on verbs of motion with a simple accusative of direction,
see on 142 and cf. Chantraine 1948-53, 2.45f. It is commonest with ἵκνομαι,
ἵκανω, less so with other verbs of coming or going. στρέφομαι is not otherwise so
used. Cf. Od. 15.82 δέστεα δ' ἀνθρώπων ἵπποςομαι. The verb is present for future
(see Chantraine 1948-53, 2.191); this is used with εἷμι and verbs of similar meaning.

πόλεις εὐ νοατάδοςς: this use of νοετάω is rather puzzling. It is quite
common in Homer, and seems to be synonymous with εὐ νοαίμεννον πτολεμευμο. 
At Il. 4.45; Od. 1.404, 4.177, 9.23 νοετάω is simply "be inhabited." Leumann
(1950, 192ff.) suggests that it comes from a misunderstanding of Il. 3.387ff. ἦ οἴ
Λακεδαίμονοι νοετάδοςη / Ἡσκεῖν εὔρις καλά, taking νοεταδόση with
Λακεδαίμονι and not with οἴ. But how could this mistake be made unless νοετάω
could already be used in such a way? This is pointed out by Shipp (1961, 42ff.), who
argues that "cities" is used by metonymy for their inhabitants, and quotes examples
of the similar use of οἶκος in Attic. This may be right, but if so what does εὐ
ναπεταόσια mean? The usual translation is "well-situated", but if we accept Shipp’s explanation, "prosperous" would be better. This seems the most appropriate meaning at Od. 4.95f. καὶ ὑπάλεσα ὅλον / εὖ μᾶλα ναπετάοντα, κεχανότα πολλά καὶ ἐσθλά. See also Frisk 1960-70, Chantraine 1968-80, s.v. ναίω.

The form ναπεταόσις is in the MSS. and printed by all editors except Gemoll (1886), who prints ναπεταόσις, probably rightly. In Homer the MSS. vary between ναπεταόσια, ναπεταόσια and ναπεταόσια. The first and last are acceptable: the form with -οσια is the original uncontracted form, and the -οσία form is the result of diecastis (see Chantraine 1948-53, 1.79). Aristarchus preferred this last form. At Od. 1.404 all MSS. read ναπεταόσις, but the editors print ναπεταόσις or -οσις, and our case is no different. See S. West 1988, on Od. 1.404; Shipp 1972, 34f. As was pointed out by Cauer (1921, 108), -οςις was written -ΟΣΑΣ in old Attic and Ionic script, so ναπεταόσις is likely to be right.

176. This line is not wholly logical: why should they believe the poet more because he is telling the truth, if they did not already know it for themselves? Their belief would depend not on whether the poet’s song was actually true, but whether it was plausible. Poets have the skill to make falsehood plausible; cf. Th. 27 ἵδιεν ψεύδει πολλὰ λέγειν ἑνμοισιν ὁμοία (the Muses are speaking); Pi. Ol. 1.29; Nem. 7.20-4, and the proverbial πολλὰ ψεύδοντα άκοιδο (Paroem. Gr. i.371.17). On lies and truth in archaic poetry, see Pratt 1993.

καὶ: this might be an instance of the use of καὶ in causal clauses whereby "καὶ marks an addition, not to the content of the main clause, but to a general, unexpressed concept: "in addition to everything else"" (Denniston 1954, 296ff.). However, this would be odd here, where the fact that it is true seems to be the only reason for
believing the poet’s statement, not an extra one. Perhaps, then, καὶ goes with ἔτητυμὸν and emphasises it (Denniston 1954, 316ff.).

ἔτητυμὸν: elsewhere in early epic (including 64 above) this word always comes before the bucolic diaeresis. In the phrase ἔτητυμὸν ἔστιν it is presumably the maidens’ κλέος that is true; cf. Pi. Nem. 7.63 κλέος ἔτητυμον αἰνέσω.

177. οὐτὰρ ἔγὼ: this also occurs in the common closing formula οὐτὰρ ἔγὼ καὶ σεῖο κτλ. (as at 546). ἔγὼ is also used in the other standard ending σὲ ἔγὼ ἀφεξὸς κτλ. (e.g. Aph. 293); this may be why the poet uses ἔγὼ here after ἡμεῖς in 174.

οὐ λῆξω: λῆξω is often used of the end of an epic song, cf. 1.18; Od. 8.87; Th. 48. Miller (1979, 178f.) argues that its negation here shows the poet is not ending at this point. However, there is no reason not to take it as a general promise for the future: cf. Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum 8.548.25 οὐ λῆξω μεγάλην δύναμιν σου ἀείδων, from the concluding section of a hymn to Isis (I owe this parallel to Professor R. Janko); Theognis 1f. ὃ ἔνα Λητοῦς οἶε, Δίῳ τέκος, οὔποτε σεῖο / λήσομαι ἀφεξός σοῦ ἀποσωμάτω. It also seems natural to take it as parallel to the immediately preceding futures, the promise to spread the maidens’ fame wherever he goes. He says that he will praise the maidens, but will not cease singing of Apollo; this parallels the usual promise at the end of the Hymns to remember the god while moving on to another subject.

ἐκηβδολον: see on 1. Here the digamma is neglected.

178. ἀργυρότοξον: see on 140.

δὲ ἡδκομος τέκε Λητῷ: see on 101. This is a Homeric formula (2x Il., 1x Od.). It is an appropriate ending to the Delian poem, since it sums up its subject, the birth
of Apollo to Leto.

179-181. These three lines seem out of place here: the Delian hymn has apparently ended, and they do not fit well with what follows. They are usually seen as an insertion to try and ease the transition from the Delian to the Pythian hymn. They are similar in content to 143-6, and it has been suggested that in origin they are a variant of that passage (see on 143-5). Unitarians naturally take a different view of the lines: they argue that the similarity of the lines to 143-6 is a sign of ring-composition; the passage on the Delian festival is an amplification of the idea of Apollo's preference for Delos (146), after which we return to the same point. 140-6 and 179-181 both serve as introductions to typical descriptions, one of a festival on earth, the other of one on Olympus. See Unte 1968, 47-52; Heubeck 1972, 140f.; Baltes 1982, 28-30; Thalmann 1984, 65f.; Miller 1986, 66f. The abruptness of the transition between 181 and 182 is against a unitarian view. We shift from Asia Minor and Delos, the milieu of the Delian hymn, to Delphi, and Delos is not mentioned again. There is also a shift from addressing Apollo to describing him in the third person: this is paralleled in DAp (119-20, 129-30) but nowhere else is it combined with such a complete change of subject.

The list of places under Apollo's dominion recalls the earlier lists at 20ff., 29ff. and 140ff. In each case Delos is the culmination; here specific places are named, whereas 20ff. and 140ff. refer only to geographical features. The catalogue in 30ff. is more problematic, since it also serves as a list of places passed through by Leto (see commentary on 30-44). Here the emphasis is on Asia Minor more than in the rest of DAp; it has been suggested that these lines were replaced at 143ff. because they
became inappropriate once Lydia and Ionia fell to the Persians: see Humbert 1936, 85 n.1; van Groningen 1958, 311f.; West 1975, 168. But if so, why reuse them after 178?

In any case, it seems clear that 179-81 belong with DAp rather than PAp. It is even possible that they are the original ending of DAp. Hymns 1 and 18 continue after they seem to have ended; and perhaps the poet felt it necessary to have a final apostrophe of Apollo combined with praise of Delos.

179: ὅ ἄνω: ἄνωξ is a title especially associated with Apollo. He can be called simply ἄνωξ, as at II. 1.390 ἐγούστι δὲ δώρα ἄνωκτι. The irregular vocative ἄνω is only used in addressing gods, and in early epic only in the phrases ὅ ἄνω (only here and at 526), and Ἁεὶ ἄνω (only in Homer).

κοιλ...κοιλ: this construction is hardly found in Homer, if at all. II. 13.260 is the most persuasive example, and even this does not mean "both...and". In the Hymns it also occurs in the common closing formula οὐτὸ ἐγὼ κοιλ σεῖο κοιλ ἄλλης μνήσομ' ἄοιδῆς. See Denniston 1954, 323f.

Λυκήν: on Apollo’s connections with Lycia, see prolegomena, 48f. He was said to spend the six winter months at Patara in Lycia, and the summer at Delos (Serv. ad Aen. 4.143).

Μηνήν ἐροτεινήν: this is the Homeric equivalent of Lydia. For the cults of Apollo in the area, see Wernicke 1895, 82. The same epithet is used of Μηνήν at II. 3.401, 18.291. It is a common place epithet, and is almost always used at the line end and with feminine nouns (e.g. 124 ἐμβροσσήν ἐροτεινήν).

180. Μήλητον: the eponymous founder of Miletus was a son of Apollo (Schol. Ap. Rh. 1.185; Apollod. 3.1.2.; Ovid Met. 443ff.; Paus. 7.2.5). The most famous cult
of Apollo in the area was the nearby oracle of Didyma (Branchidae). Van Groningen (1958, 312) claims that the lines are "manifestement d'origine milésienne", because of the complimentary epithet ημερόθεσσαν given to the city. It is true that Miletus is given a full line, but the complimentary epithet proves nothing, since most epic epithets are complimentary; and there is no doubt that Delos is the climax of the list. Apollo merely "possesses" Lycia, Maeonia and Miletus, but Delos he "rules greatly".

Ενώλον: this seems more appropriate for an island than a city by the sea (the reverse is true for ἀμψιδάνη in 32); cf. e.g. h. 6.2-3, 10.5; Soph. fr. 255.1f. Radt; Eur. Phoen. 6. For its use of a city cf. Pi. Ol. 9.150 (Eleusis); Critias fr. 2.7 Diels-Kranz. In early epic the form εἰνόλιος is otherwise universal; later ενόλιος becomes the commonest form; on the εἰν-/-ἐν- variation, see Hainsworth (in Heubeck, West and Hainsworth 1988) on Od. 5.67.

Ημερόθεσσαν: this is only used of a place here and at Hes. fr. 43a.62 Merkelbach-West. It is not a natural epithet for places, since its basic meaning is "arousing desire" and hence it is usually used of things connected with music, dancing and sex. Its use of a city shows a shift to the vaguer meaning "lovely".

181. οὐτὸς δ' οὖ: there is disagreement on the meaning of οὐτὸς here. It is unlikely to mean "alone" as Förstel (1979, 391, n.380) suggests, since that would be a strange contrast to make with the other places. Gemoll (1886) and Allen and Sikes (1904) suggest "in person" but this would imply that he did not possess the other places in person, which would be odd. It is probably simply resumptive, to avoid repeating the name. οὐτὸς is also used as almost a title of Apollo; see on 140. For the form of expression, cf. Il. 13.642 οὐτὸς δ' οὐτ', 3.200 οὐτος δ' οὐτ'; Od. 6.158 κείνος δ' οὖ.
Δήλωτο περικλάστον: the only other epic occurrence of this adjective is Th. 199 περικλάστῳ ἐνὶ Κύπρῳ (see West 1966, ad loc.). Here its use recalls the description of Delos in 25ff. Cf. also Archestratus fr. 27 Brandt ἐν περικλάστῳ Δήλῳ.

μέγ' ἀνάσσεις: on the neglect of digamma, see Hoekstra 1969, 22. He suggests there was an older prototype with an adjective ending in -οτο, and in fact περικλάστον may be original here, since Π has a superscript -οτο. Hoekstra’s statement that "in Homer only the old instrumental Ἰφι is allowed to enter the ubiquitous ἀνάσσειν formulae" overlooks Il. 10.32f. δὲ μέγα πάντων / Ἀργείων ἦνασσε, and cf. also Th. 403 αὐτῶς δὲ μέγα κράτει ἢ δὲ ἀνάσσει. μέγ' ἀνάσσεις recalls 29 πᾶσι θυντοίσιν ἀνάσσεις and 68 μέγα δὲ πριν τανευσέμεν. The power predicted at his birth is made actual in the present, and the parallel with 25ff. could be seen as a ring marking the beginning and end of the Delian theme. This interpretation should not be ruled out if we do not take a unitarian view of these lines, since it is legitimate to interpret the hymn as it stands in the MSS; any other version of it is conjectural (see prolegomena, 122).
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