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Abstract

This dissertation is a study of the Epigraphical Hymn to Apollo that was found at Delphi in 1893, and since attributed to Athenaios. It is believed to have been performed as part of the Athenian Pythaïdes festival in the year 128/7 BCE.

After a brief introduction to the hymn, I provide a survey and history of the most important editions of the text. I offer a new critical edition equipped with a detailed apparatus. This is followed by an extended epigraphical commentary which aims to describe the history of, and arguments for and against, readings of the text as well as proposed supplements and restorations. The guiding principle of this edition is a conservative one—to indicate where there is uncertainty, and to avoid relying on other, similar, texts as a resource for textual restoration.

A commentary follows, which traces word usage and history, in an attempt to explore how an audience might have responded to the various choices of vocabulary employed throughout the text. Emphasis is placed on Athenaios’ predilection to utilize new words, as well as words that are non-traditional for Apolline narrative. The commentary considers what role prior word usage (texts) may have played as intertexts, or sources of poetic resonance in the ears of an audience.

The final chapter proposes a way of reading poetry that emphasizes comparison. I call it *an aesthetics of difference*, and I argue that poetic artistry in ancient Greece relied
heavily on subtle modification of already well-established and well-known poetic forms and narratives. As a result, I argue that later texts, which have often been derided or neglected as “derivative” may in fact be some of the best texts for exploring Geek poetic technique, and may, in fact, constitute significant artistic achievements.
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Text and Translation
[παίαν καὶ ] ἐἰς τὸν θεὸν ὁ ἐ[πόησεν Ἀθ]ήναιος

_FRAGMENT 2_

1 ] ΑΠΕ [  
2 ] ΡΑΤ [  
3 ] ΟΣΥ [ vel Τ ]

_FRAGMENT 3_

1 ] . Α . . [  
2 ] ΠΙΝΑΟ [ vel Τ ]  
3 Τ ] ΕΟ [
[Paean and ] which Athenaios made for the god

[ Come forth! ] You who have Deep-Wooded Helikon as your allotted portion,
   Fair-Armed daughters of Loud-Roaring Zeus!
Come! So that you may celebrate your Blood-Brother with songs,
   Bright-One, Golden-Hair;
Who, above these rocks, split-cragged seats of Parnassus,
   Along with the Famous Delphian women,
Visits the streams of Kastalia, abounding-in-water,
Arriving at Delphi, above the headland, prophetic hill.

[ See here ] — The Famed Great-Polis of Attica!
Dwelling on the plain of Arms-Bearing Tritonia
   Through prayers, Unbroken—
On holy altars Hephaistos kindles into flame the thighs of young bulls.
   Joined with this, Arabian vapor rises up to Olympos,
The shrill Lotus-reed, roaring with nimble numbers, plays a song,
   And the golden, sweet-voiced, kithara, with hymns raises up its strains.

The whole swarm of [ ] who have Attica as their allotted portion
   They [ ] the Famed Son of Great Zeus
   [ ] this snow-peaked hill, immortal [ ]
   to all mortals he shines forth prophecies [ ]
Prophetic Tripod, as you took [ ]
The drakōn guarded, when you [ ]
   twisting coils [ ]
   hisses you shot, implacable [ ]
   and the Galatian Ares [ ]
   piercing through, unholy [ ]

But Io! Offspring [ ]
   young-shoot [ ]-loving [ ]
   deme [ ]
Chapter 1: Introduction

The most recent in-depth studies on the Epigraphical Hymn to Apollo by Athenaios are A. Bélis (1992), E. Pöhlmann and M.L. West (2001), and W. Furley and J. Bremer (2001). These are fine and valuable pieces of scholarship, but in these editions (and in the earlier texts as well) there have been significant gaps in scholarly attention. This dissertation attempts to address three of them:

1) To produce a new critical edition of the text, one equipped with a rich and complete critical apparatus. This project leaves aside matters of musical notation and melody (brilliantly treated by Bélis) in favor of emphasizing an historical approach to editions of the text. This edition aims to provide a critical apparatus complete enough to render consultation of older editions much less necessary—it is an unfortunate (albeit often necessary) fact that editions that are more recent have thinned the apparatus, losing something of the history of the text and readings. The edition is joined by an extended epigraphical commentary that hopes to provide a history of editions that may serve as a guide to understanding how we have arrived at current readings.
2) To provide a philological commentary in a manner helpful for thinking about the text as a performance. In this commentary, I prefer to engage the text as an auditory experience, exploring how an audience might have responded to the vocabulary, considering what sort of intertextual or semantic resonance might occur, rather than offering is as a mere aid to translation. Interpretive issues are not neglected, but the commentary builds from the assumption that readings of a text are varied and plural, and that exploration of possible readings likely will be more productive than an attempt to establish necessary readings.

3) And finally, in the last chapter, to hazard some theoretical thoughts and arguments regarding how such works often derided as ‘late’ and ‘derivative’ might be better appreciated as the significant artistic achievements that they are. I propose and demonstrate an Aesthetics of Difference that attempts to show how comparative philology may enable us to appreciate texts in new ways.

The Find

In 1893, new epigraphical texts were discovered by l'École Française d'Athènes in the course of excavating the Treasury of the Athenians at Delphi. Among these texts were new hymns to Apollo. This find was significant enough to occasion a formal announcement by Th. Homoll, director of the École at the time, in his update letter published in Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-
The importance of this find cannot be overstated, as three of the hymns that were uncovered happened to be hitherto unknown poetic compositions, two of which featured interlinear musical notation. These hymns were at the time, and remain, the oldest and best-preserved examples of Greek cultic song. While damaged and fragmentary in places, these texts also serve as the lengthiest examples of Greek musical composition. Other cultic hymns are preserved (epigraphical, copied, or theatrical), but they either lack their musical accompaniment or are so fragmentary as to present serious problems for study.

**Description**

Engraved on two marble blocks, the Delphic hymns were originally positioned on the exterior South face of the Treasury of the Athenians, along the Sacred Way of Delphi. The Athenians covered this wall of the edifice with honorific inscriptions. Athenaios’ hymn was located on the second block from the right end of the wall, set above both the first and second orthostate stones from the end. The second hymn, by Limenios, was

---

1 Homoll (1894); Reinach (1909-13), 148, indicated that it was L. Couve and M. Bourguet who provided the first transcriptions of the stones that were then provided to H. Weil and Th. Reinach for publication.

2 For the most recent and complete catalog of extant Greek music, cf. Pöhlmann and West (2001). They catalogue a grand total of 61 melodies, most of which are fragments, from the entirety of the Greek and Roman periods.

3 Before this time, the Song of Seikilos was the best example of a complete work. Discovered by Sir William Ramsay in 1883 at Aydin, the inscribed grave pillar offers a hauntingly beautiful melody, yet it is only four lines in length and dates (through lettering) from the 2nd c. CE, significantly later than the Delphic hymns. While it is true that bits and pieces of music potentially dating to earlier times have been transmitted down to us, the sheer amount of melody as well as the inarguably authentic and original nature of an epigraphical text makes these hymns unparalleled as our best samples of ancient Greek music.

4 Cf. Furley and Bremer (2001), 2 vols. This work offered a very useful, and surprisingly unprecedented, collection of cultic texts, most of which have no music. The musical documents extant provide a very slim volume; cf. Pöhlmann and West (2001) for the most edited collection.
upon the second orthostate, below and slightly to the left of center of the block carrying Athenaios’ hymn. All visitors ascending to the temple of Apollo would have walked immediately by these inscriptions; with their position being at roughly eye-height, facing visitors as they turned the corner, the hymns would have been quite visible. In spite of significant damage and loss, sufficient fragments and larger portions of the blocks have remained to allow reconstruction of the greater portion of both texts and their melodies. The originals are on display in the museum of Delphi.\(^5\)

Sixteen pieces constitute the remains of the two blocks. The sorting of fragments is possible by means of comparing musical notation—the two hymns make use of different notation systems (vocal and instrumental). While association is possible, exact placement remains uncertain. Of these remains, two large blocks and two small fragments (Delphic inventory nos. 517, 526, 494, 499)\(^6\) are believed to belong to Athenaios’ hymn, with the remainder belonging to that of Limenios. This dissertation is concerned specifically with Athenaios’ composition, but due to the history of scholarship, and certain historical and epigraphical matters, it will be necessary at times to include that of Limenios in the discussion.

The block originally measured roughly .38m high by .95m wide. The text of the hymn was engraved in two columns, with a continuous title line, beginning at the left margin and extending across both columns.\(^7\) The lines are of irregular length, with a

---

\(^5\) They have been set into plaster and mounted on the faces of a pedestal located in the middle of the room labeled ‘Treasury of the Athenians.’

\(^6\) Earlier texts used other designations for the pieces. Delphic Inv. no. 517 = frag. B; Inv. no. 526 = frag. A; Inv. no. 464 = 3; Inv. no. 499 = frag. 4.

\(^7\) Early confusion over positioning led some editors to read the title line as part of the hymn’s text, so early line numerations differ from more recent, as they counted the title as line 1.
varied number of letters. Word-breaks appear to follow rules for syllabification. Column 1 appears to have measured .35m in length and (at maximum) .40m wide, being 18 lines long (including the title-line). Column 2 measured .33m in length and (at maximum) .295m wide, being perhaps 17 lines long (including the title-line). The letters are of uneven width and spacing, but are roughly 6mm in height.

The hymn consists of four distinct sections, or strophes, of varying lengths. Each deals with separate topical matters, identified in some cases by visual indications on the stone, as well as by harmonic changes. The 4th and final strophe is largely missing, but if we may rely on Limenios’ hymn as a *comparandum* (caution must be exercised), it would seem that this last strophe was likely a break from the preceding material in terms of melody, meter (possibly glyconics), and topic. Here the chorus broke into a prayer to Apollo (at least, Limenios’ hymn also invokes Artemis and Leto) asking the deity to act favorably for the worshipers, the rest of the Athenians at home, the inhabitants of Delphi, and the Romans.

Music notation is found floating between the lines of lyric text. Not all syllables carry note-symbols, indicating that these syllables would carry over the preceding pitch. Word accent carefully follows the melodic line, with raises in pitch corresponding with acutely accented syllables. Rhythm (duration) is not notated, and must be derived from the lyrics. It is assumed that long and short syllables may be treated roughly as quarter and eighth notes. Certain long vowels and diphthongs are written twice, with the notation

---

8 Greek musical notation consists of alphabetic signs, with additions. Most of what we know about their notation comes from ancient treatises on music theory, not actual songs. Two distinct notation systems were in use—vocal and instrumental. However, with the exception of Limenios’ hymn, extant texts favor the vocal notation. On Greek musical notation, see West (1992b), 254-273.

9 Some extant examples of Greek music demonstrate a system of dots used to indicate duration.
above indicating that the syllable length was to be subdivided metrically, with the
syllable only pronounced once, but with a transition in pitch in the middle.\(^{10}\) Very little
remains of the final segment of Athenaios’ hymn, Strophe 4, but it appears that the meter
might have changed from crotics to glyconics at this point. The overall modality of the
hymn seems to alternate between Phrygian and Hyper-Phrygian by strophe,\(^{11}\) but the
composer makes free and frequent use of chromatic alterations.\(^{12}\)

Athenaios’ text has often been referred to as a _paean_, a specific kind of cult song
typically performed to honor Apollo. While it is likely that this term is fitting, I resist
using this label throughout this text, preferring the more generic _hymn_. There are very
complex matters of form and content tied up in considerations of genre, and it is beyond
the scope of this dissertation to address the matter adequately. The reality is that a _paean_
is not so fixed a form as we would like to think, and assumptions about this genre have
often led editors to supplements and interpretations that are far from certain.\(^{13}\) For the
sake of simplicity, I prefer the most generic of musical cult genres, the _hymnos_, which is
suitable for _any_ song in praise of a deity.\(^{14}\)

---

\(^{10}\) E. Martin (1953), 27-35 preferred to divide both hymns into measures counted in 6/8 time, but there is no
need to treat it as such. Instead, it is better practice simply to read the crotics as they are—cf. West and
Pöhlmann (2001), 72.

\(^{11}\) West and Pohlmann (2001), 73. They were of the opinion that the avoidance of certain pitches would
have given the song an “archaic pentatonic effect.”

\(^{12}\) Extended discussion of great technical detail regarding the notation, scales, harmony, etc. may be found
in scholarly works, but most notably in West (1992b) and Bélis (1992).

\(^{13}\) E.g. Some editors have felt a very strong compulsion to restore a “_Hie Paean_” to the text where there is
no epigraphical justification.

\(^{14}\) The _Homeric Hymns_ do not serve as a model for _hymnos_ as a genre – they are properly _epic_ in form.
However, _all_ song types that honor a god or goddess, whether _paean_, _dithyramb_, etc. may also be called
_a hymn._
Authorship

Both of the epigraphical hymns with notation have title lines which attribute authorship. Unfortunately, they are both significantly damaged. While it was possible to restore the name Limenios to the second hymn, the first hymn has been more problematic.\footnote{Limenios the son of Thoinos appears in one of the Pythaïdes inscriptions (FD III, 2 no. 47) dating from 128/7 BCE, and provided a good match for the extant remains of the title line. He is listed as a kithara player. There is little doubt that the two inscriptions refer to the same man, as Limenios is rare name. Cf. Osbourne and Byrne (1994), s.v. Λιμήνιος where we find that this is the only occurrence of this name associated with the entire region of Attica.} The matter of authorship cannot be separated from the question of dating and performative context, as will be seen. It is helpful to begin with the epigraphical remains of the title line. For most of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century it was assumed that the remaining text at the end of the title (ἩΝΑΙΟΣ) provided the ethnicity of the author, naming him an Athenian. However, in 1988, A. Bélis made the argument, based on the space available in the inscription (8 characters at maximum being able to squeeze into the lacuna), that the proper name Athenaios was presented here, rather than an ethnicity.\footnote{Bélis (1988).} Moreover, the name “Athenaios son of Athenaios” is to be found in the same Pythaïdes inscription as Limenios. These observations, combined with the fact that both hymns appear to have been inscribed by the same hand made for a compelling solution, and it has been widely accepted.\footnote{Cf. Osbourne and Byrne (1994), s.v. Ἀθήναιος. By their count, there are 20 instances for Athens alone, and a total of 147 for all of Attica. It was a reasonably common name. This, of course, raises the problem of assuming that the two inscriptions refer to the same Athenaios. However, this is a problem for dating, less so for textual restoration. In FD III, 2 no. 47 Athenaios son of Athenaios appears among the singers in the chorus.} There remain some difficulties however, as the identification of the author is tied to assumptions about dating, as well as the troubling fact that Bélis’
reading of the title line leaves no room for a patronymic, which Limenios’ text *does* have. Attribution to Athenaios is perhaps better than to an “anonymous Athenian,” but Limenios’ title-line raises worrisome issues. There has been no challenge to her argument regarding the author, nor has anyone doubted that the Athenaios of the Pythaïdes inscription is, in fact, the author.

**Festival**

While there was some initial confusion over the context of performance, the association of the author of the second hymn (Limenios) with one of the Pythaïdes inscriptions has convincingly placed both hymns in association with these festivals. There is some uncertainty as to which celebration of said festival each hymn should be dated, a matter that will be briefly treated. Very little is known of this festival from ancient literature, but there is a rich trove of inscriptions associated with the embassies sent to celebrate them.

The first time we hear of the festival is 326/5 BCE. Details are sparse, but Strabo refers to certain *Pythaistae* who would, for three months, for three days and nights

---

18 Most editors have added a purely supplemental ethnic adjective at the end of Limenios’ title-line as well. This is even more problematic, if we are to take the inscriptions as a pair, but see the first as having a very short title, with one identifier of author, and the second text as having a long title-line with both patronymic and ethnic adjective.

19 The inscription dates from the Pythaïdes of Dionysios in 128/7 BCE, *FD III*, 2 no. 47.


21 Cf. *SIG* 3 296 notes a certain Lycourgos and nine other serving as *hieropoioi*. In addition, one may note a brief reference in Isaeus, *On the Estate of Apollodoros* (7).27, wherein the speaker mentions having returned from the Pythaïdes: ἐκ τῆς Πυθαΐδος. This speech has been dated variously, ranging from 357-350, suggesting that the festival was celebrated earlier, but it is unclear whether the text should read as
in each of those months, look in the direction of a place called Harma, near Phylê in Attica, in order to watch for lighting flashes. In the years in which lighting was sighted, in accordance with an oracle, Athens would send a *theoria* to Delphi, on an overland route bearing first-fruits, in order to offer sacrifice in Delphi, and return bearing fire from the sacred hearth of Apollo’s temple. The festival would seem to have been celebrated at irregular intervals. The practice must have failed at some point, because the festival was revived again in the second half of the 2nd c. BCE. The Athenians would celebrate the festival four times over several decades before the practice failed once more: in the years 138/7, 128/7, 106/5, and 98/7 BCE. Inscriptions recording the participants were placed upon the South wall of the Treasury of the Athenians at Delphi. It would appear that the first occasion in 138/7 was impressive enough, but the scope of participation in 128/7 and 106/5 was truly grand with 300-500 individuals joining in the sacred embassy.

---

Πυθιάδος or Πυθα, the one referring to the Pan-Hellenic Pythian festival, and the latter to the uniquely Athenian embassy.

22 Strabo, *Geography* 9.2.11. He notes that there was a proverb: ὁ πόταν δ’ Ἀρματος ἀστράψῃ, when lightning flashes in Harma. They stood, so he says, near the altar of Zeus Astrapaeos (of lightning), between the temples of Pythian Apollo and Olympian Zeus, within the city walls.

23 G. Daux was of the opinion that something similar had been celebrated regularly in the intervening period by the Tetrapolis, and it was in the aftermath of the eviction of the Aetolians from Delphi in 189 BCE and the subsequent rise in influence of Athens in the newly reestablished Amphictyonic authority that led to the revival of an Athenian version. Cf. Daux (1936), 532-40, ff.; Mikalson (1998), 269-70.

24 The inscriptions give us some sense of the scale of the festival. Daux (1938), 708-710 provided a helpful summary of the relevant texts that can be found in *FD* III, 2 for each occasion. Each festival included several lists (categories) of participants. E.g. in 128/7, The Pythaïdes of Dionysios, there are at least 8 lists of participants, 5 decrees, as well as the two epigraphical hymns (which are most commonly associated with this year).

25 Participants included the nine archons, the herald of the Areiopagos Council, the hoplite general, the priest of Apollo, a mantis, two *exegetai*, the full corps of *ephebes* and cavalrymen, the *archetheoroi* of various sub-*theoria*, female *kanephoroi* and *pyrophoroi*, representatives from the noble families and the Marathonian Tetrapolis, as well as other selected by lot. Additionally, and perhaps most relevant to the hymn, is the fact that the guild of the *Technitai* of Dionysus sent a delegation to provide for artistic performances of all sorts. For the *Technitai*, cf. Pickard-Cambridge (1968), 297, 317-8; Ghiron-Bistagne (1976), 2-3, 67, 75, 169-71, 174-5, 203, 205-6; Le Guen, B. (2001); Lightfoot, J. (2002), 209-224.
theoria seems to have shrunk in size, and Athens’ political difficulties with Rome prevented further embassies.

**Dating**

It is largely accepted that 128/7 BCE is the most likely date for the performance of Athenaios’ hymn. The reasoning behind this is very simple, but touches upon a tangle of complicated uncertainties. Each of the four occasions upon which Athens sent a theoria to Delphi to celebrate the Pythaïdes is commemorated by inscriptions which hung originally upon the South wall of the their Treasury along the sacred way. Most notable among them are decrees honoring the Technitai Dionysae for their participation. The inscriptions are formulaic, and state that copies were also sent for keeping and display in Athens. The names of both Athenaios and Limenios are found in the list of technitai present in 128/7, and it is this list (FD III, 2 no. 47) that has supplied the restored authors for the two hymns.

Due to the early association of Limenios’ hymn with the 128/7 inscription, it had been assumed that the anonymous text (Athenaios’) dated to 138/7 and Limenios’ to 128/7. However, Bélis’ argument in 1988 for assigning authorship to the first hymn relied on the 128/7 list as well. She also noted that the technitai mentioned in both hymns were

---

26 Cf. FD III, 2 no. 47 (128/7 BCE), no. 49 (106/5), no. 48 (98/7); there is no list for the technitai in 138/8, and the list of paides, no. 11, is taken as presenting the list of performers.

not listed as present/performing in 138/7 in the lists.\textsuperscript{28} Hence, she put them both in same year. S. Schröder found this problematic, as the 128/7 list refers to only a single \textit{paean}.\textsuperscript{29} His solution was to down-date Limenios’ text to the 106/5 festival.\textsuperscript{30} Schröder’s re-dating of Limenios’ hymn has largely been rejected. However, none of this effectively makes a difference in the dating of Athenaios’ hymn. Scholarly consensus has preferred to retain the 128/7 BCE dating.

Some options remain unexplored, however. There is no reason that Athenaios could not have been present at two Pythaïdes. Just because we have no list of \textit{technitai} who participated does not mean that they were not there. The lists of \textit{technitai}, it is important to remember, function not to catalogue official \textit{theoria} participants, posted by Athens, but rather as records of decrees regarding thanks and honors granted to this guild by city of Delphi. It is not impossible that the \textit{technitai} were also present in 128/7 to sing a \textit{paean}, that of Athenaios. It would have been the second occasion in 128/7, conducted on a grander scale, that initiated the honorific decrees, and it seems possible that in the light of the decrees, Athens decided to reach back and honor Athenaios’ hymn as well, when they had Limenios’ hymn set up. Regardless, the matter of dating is surrounded by uncertainties and neither solution (138/7 or 127/7) is certain or fully satisfactory. In either

\textsuperscript{28} NB, the presence of the \textit{technitai} in Athenaios’ hymn line 15 is due to a textual restoration. There is no certainty to this reading.

\textsuperscript{29} Schröder (1999). He considered dating options systematically; he found little basis for backdating Athenaios’ text to 138/7 (no \textit{technitai}, and the melody is not suited for the \textit{paides} chorus of that year) yet he was deeply troubled by the mention of \textit{tòv paean} in the 128/7 inscription. He rejected the idea that both texts were described as a singular, as well as the notion that only one was properly a \textit{paean}.

\textsuperscript{30} While acknowledging that Limenios does not appear on the list from that year, he asserted that 20 years might easily fit with the career span of a professional musician. He also preferred to see the engraving occurring at separate occasions, in spite of the \textit{δὲ} particle in the opening line of Limenios’ text. He found limited variation in the epigraphical hand, and noted the quite different forms of attribution to be found in the title-line.
case, one must wonder, “Where are the hymns from the other years?” This is particularly troubling with respect to the grandeur of 106/5 BCE. One additional possibility may be that the inscriptions date from this year, commemorating the prior performances—perhaps the hymns were even re-performed?

**History of Scholarship and Editions**

H. Weil published the first transcription of Athenaios’ hymn in the 1893 edition of the *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*. Weil’s text dealt only with the lyric content. He provided an introduction to the materials, content, and context with some discussion of meter and notation, as well as an explanation of the system of vowel-doubling. His transcription lacked musical notation (Greek or modern), but made full use of editorial notation, including brackets, line-delineation, sub-linear dots, and printed vowel-doublings (N.B. The earliest editions of the hymns predated the Leiden Convention’s establishment of consistent editorial practices for critical editions). Brief epigraphical and literary remarks are included. Seeing as the texts had just been discovered, and that the initial publications relied on reproductions rather than first-hand examination of the stone, errors were made. At this stage, there was confusion over the original placement and ordering of columns and hymns, as well as some difficulties in assigning the larger fragments to the correct hymns. The title line of Athenaios’ hymn was thought wrongly to be part of the poetic text, from the *middle* of the hymn.

In the same volume of *BCH*, Th. Reinach offered the initial transcription of the musical notation and melody. An extended commentary on the notation and melody is

---

31 Weil (1893). 569-83; Plates XXI.1-2 (photographic reproductions of the two columns).
included, and a number of unplaced fragments are also treated. The hymn is offered in a mostly modern score, with the Greek notation floating above the treble staff. The order of the two columns is reversed. Editorial brackets are used and vowel-doublings are printed, but there is no use of line-delineation or sub-linear dots as Reinach’s primary concern in this article was the music rather than the lyric text.\textsuperscript{32}

Both Weil and Reinach offered some minor revisions to their readings the following year, when they published the first transcriptions of the other epigraphical hymn, that of Limenios.\textsuperscript{33} Most notably, Weil reversed the ordering of the columns, due in part to conversation with his colleagues F. Blass and Th. Reinach,\textsuperscript{34} The same year saw O. Crusius publish the first monograph length treatment of the hymns, “Die Delphischen Hymnen.”\textsuperscript{35} This work collectively treated all of the recently discovered ‘Delphic Hymns,’ including those by Aristonoos, Athenaios, and Limenios. Athenaios’ hymn is printed as an epigraphical edition, a textual edition, and a musical score. These three differing editions each used a variety of editorial marks, but each edition (with some inconsistency) differed in which it used. Crusius included a somewhat detailed commentary on unusual or problematic words as well as justification for some of his supplements. An extended consideration of musical, rhythmic, and performative matters

\textsuperscript{32} Reinach (1893), 584-610.

\textsuperscript{33} Weil (1894), 359-362; Reinach (1894), Plates xxv-xxvii. In this edition, Reinach added editorial brackets and vowel-doublings, but still made no use of sub-linear dots or line-delineation. He also restored the columns to their correct order; however, neither scholar yet recognized the true nature of the title line.

\textsuperscript{34} Reinach noted the reversal as well in (1894) \textit{L’Ami des Monuments}, 235; it seems that H. Pomtow came simultaneously to this conclusion as well, cf. Pomtow (1894), 577.

fills out the volume. The order of the two columns was still reversed, and Crusius’ work was hindered by having to work from reproductions.

The first collection of Greek musical texts to include Athenaios’ hymn was that by C. Jan. A great number of specialist works on ancient Greek music rushed to include Athenaios’ hymn (as well as that by Limenios)—to the extent that the hymns are often found as appendices, since they were run across too late to feature centrally in the work, but too important to leave out. Examples include: D.B. Monro’s *The Modes of Ancient Greek Music*, a work primarily interested in ancient Greek musical theory; F.A. Gevaert’s *La Mélopée Antique dans le Chant de L’Église Latine*, a work broadly

---

36 Jan (1895), 432-443. He offered a very brief introduction, followed by two editions of the hymns: the left-side pages offer the text with Greek notation floating above, while the right-side pages presented a modern musical score. In spite of the date of publication, the order of the columns is still reversed—Jan even noted Pontow (1894) on the correct ordering. He made use of Crusius (1894), in addition to Weil (1893), Reinach (1893), Weil (1894), and Reinach (1894). Some very limited critical apparatus was placed below the editions. Vowel-doublings were printed, but no use was made of line-delineation or sub-linear dots. Rather than editorial brackets, Jan elected to print restored and supplemental text with a somewhat lighter font-weight. The textual edition includes the extended supplements by Crusius (1894), but Jan left them out of the musical edition. He printed reconstructed potential melody in the musical score over the more supported supplemental text. The text ended abruptly with Λαχών. No discussion of melody, epigraphy, or text was offered beyond the critical apparatus. This information is worth noting as it is often by means of ‘collected editions’ that non-specialists are introduced to texts, and the editions which they print frequently serve as the foundational texts from which they work. Jan reprised his work in 1899 with a new supplemental edition, and this work was enduring enough to be reprinted in 1995. This supplement contained updated texts, not only additional ones. Athenaios’ hymn was included with an improved edition (pgs. 8-19). An introductory discussion was offered on the history of the text, as well as the basics of ancient Greek musical theory as applies to the melody. The edition was similar in format to the 1894 edition. The left-side page presented the text with Greek notation floating above the lines, while the right-side page had a modern musical score with the Greek text, but not the notation. No editorial marks were used beyond a visible change in font weight to indicated restored text. Vowel-doublings were printed, but there was no consistent line-delineation. A very limited critical apparatus is attached. No commentary was provided.

37 Monro (1894), 134-141. The appendix included the then recently discovered Delphic hymns; they were (and still are) the longest, best-preserved, extant melodies from ancient Greece. This is one of the very earliest publications of the hymns in English. Modern scores followed a brief paragraph introduction, albeit with Greek notation floating above the treble staff. As Monro only had the 1893 *BCH* articles by Weil and Reinach to work with, there was significant confusion regarding order and fragments, and Limenios’ hymn is mostly absent. There is some limited discussion of the modality of the melody. Editorial brackets were used; however, there was no use of the sub-linear dot or line-delineation, and the editor did not print the doubled vowels. Some supplements were included, but no extensive restoration of the more fragmentary lines was attempted.
addressing the early history of European music;\textsuperscript{38} H.W. Smyth’s \textit{Greek Melic Poets}, a study covering the breadth of Greek song-poetry, more focused on form and genre, less on the music itself;\textsuperscript{39} and A. Fairbanks’ \textit{A Study of the Greek Paean}.\textsuperscript{40}

The next important critical edition was published as part of \textit{Fouilles de Delphes} III.2 (ed. M.G. Colin).\textsuperscript{41} While useful, Crusius’ work had suffered from a lack of clarity regarding dating and performative context, as well as confusion over column placement and title lines. In his extended treatment, “Hymnes avec Notes Musicales,” Th. Reinach managed to reexamine the stones, and ‘clean up’ the field with this edition. He provided a history of discovery and scholarship (including bibliography), with a detailed description of the physical stones and the inscriptions. The commentary is quite limited. Reinach presented two kinds of editions for Athenaios’ hymn, as he treated both lyric and music:

\textsuperscript{38} Gevaert (1895), 395-408. The appendix included transcriptions of the newly discovered Delphic hymns. They are introduced by a discussion of their rhythm and melody, and printed in roughly modern scores, with the Greek notation floating above the treble staff. Editorial brackets were used and vowel-doublings were printed, but there was no concern for line-delineation or use of sub-linear dots. Gevaert not only retained supplements (those of Weil and Reinach), but invented likely melodic lines to accompany them. A careful analysis of the music followed, but with no epigraphical or literary discussion.

\textsuperscript{39} Smyth (1900), 529-532. This work was important enough as a reference to be reprinted in 1963. The introductory section treats various forms, including that of the \textit{prosodion} (xxxiii-xxxvi) and the \textit{paean} (xxxvi-xlii), informed to some degree by his new acquaintance with the Delphic hymns, which he printed in the appendix. The hymns were presented with modern musical score, with Greek notation floating above the treble staff. Editorial brackets are used, but there was no use of the sub-linear dot or line-delineation. Vowel doublings were, however, printed. He relied on Crusius’ (1894) \textit{appendix} musical edition [which Smyth oddly cited as 1895], and Weil’s 1894 \textit{BCH} article. Supplements were included, but the text breaks off part-way through column 2, at \textit{λαχών}. No discussion was offered.

\textsuperscript{40} Fairbanks (1900). 119-129. In the appendix, he included the text and Greek notation, of the Delphic hymns. No modern musical score was included. Editorial brackets were used, vowel-doublings were printed, and proper line-delineation was followed, but there was no use of sub-linear dots. Supplements were commonly included, except for the very fragmentary lines in column 2. He included some limited commentary on epigraphical and literary concerns, followed by a discussion of melody and performative context. Fairbanks relied on Weil (1893), Weil (1894), Reinach (1893), Reinach (1894), Crusius (1894), and Pomitow (1894).

\textsuperscript{41} Reinach (1909-13), 147-69; Plate x. This edition, while helpful, was limited by Reinach’s inability to properly examine the stone. He had access to it, but (as he comments on page 147, note 3) the lighting in the museum in the room where the stone blocks had been installed for public display hindered adequate examination and photography.
1) An epigraphical text, with full editorial marks, including line-delineation and vowel-doublings; the Greek musical notation floated above the lines of Greek text (152-153); this was followed by a reasonably thorough apparatus/commentary on epigraphical matters, and 2) A modern musical score (156-158), albeit with Greek notation floating above the treble staff; here editorial brackets were used and vowel-doubling were printed, but there was no line-delineation or use of sub-linear dots. Plate X, at the end of the work, offered reproductions of squeezes made of both hymns. However, the size and resolution of the reproductions limits their usefulness. Upon publication, this edition became the primary critical treatment of the hymns for decades.

It was Reinach’s (1909-13) edition that served as the basis for that published by J. Powell in his widely disseminated *Collectanea Alexandrina: Reliquiae minores Poetarum Graecorum Aetatis Ptolemaicae 323-146 A.C*, a valuable work, and one still on the shelves of many classicists. It is through Powell that many have encountered the hymns. His work was a collection of critical editions of Greek poetry of the Hellenistic period; the Delphic hymns included. The text of Athenaios’ hymn was printed three times: 1) The Greek lyrics, with editorial brackets, but no line-delineation, sub-linear dots, or vowel-doublings. 2) A proper critical edition, which included full editorial markings, as well as Greek musical notation floating between the lines. This text was followed by an extended apparatus detailing previous scholarship and history, as well as

---

42 Powell (1925). 141-8.

43 As an example of its broad use as a reference, it seems likely that it is Powell’s edition, which M.L. West relied on when he quoted from Athenaios’ hymn in his 1982 work, *Greek Meter*. By way of example of cretic-paemonic meter, he made use of lines 14-22 of Athenaios’ hymn (Pgs. 145-6). Since it was not a critical edition, no editorial marks were used beyond brackets, and vowel doublings were not printed. The text was not that of Pöhlmann (1970), but rather appears to be that of Powell (1925).
some limited epigraphical and literary commentary. 3) A modern musical score, with Greek musical notation floating above the treble staff. In this text, vowel-doublings are printed and brackets are used, but there are no sub-linear dots and no line-delineation. His editions follow those of Reinach (1909-13) quite closely.

An important, and often overlooked, doctoral dissertation, De Twee Delphische Hymnen met Muzieknoten, was produced by P. Moens in 1930. It should have been quite useful, as she was the first to explore seriously the philological and literary material found in the hymns, as well as being the only scholar for decades to earnestly challenge the transcriptions and supplements of Reinach and Crusius, offering her own alternative. Unfortunately, being a Dissertation rather than a published monograph, moreover in Dutch, her ideas and contributions seem to have been somewhat overlooked. This was a full, focused, study of the text of the Delphic Hymns, with little attention paid to the music. She wrote a brief introduction to the texts, and the bulk of the work consists of line-by-line commentary on epigraphical and philological matters, with extensive discussion regarding proposed supplements and restorations. Epigraphical considerations appear to have been based on limited access to reproductions, but the author discussed the reading of prior editions in some detail. She offered new supplements (as alternatives to those of Crusius). Moens also offered a significant amount of literary/philological discussion, particularly for unusual and unexpected words and forms. She was not very interested in the musical notation, but did print it above each line of text serving as ‘headers’ for discussion. These epigraphical ‘headers’ seem intended to represent prior editorial consensus, and not her own preferred reading. Her own preferences are to be

44 Moens (1930).
found in three places: embedded in the prose discussion, in a reprise printed at the end of commentary for each strophe, and again printed as a whole at the end of her work. The ‘headers’ made use of sub-linear dots, but only print letters which were actually visible on the stone. Moens’ commentary was somewhat inconsistent with the use of editorial marks, excepting the summaries, which made use of full editorial markings. The strophe reprisals also made full use of editorial markings, and paid careful attention to proper line-delineation. The full edition was printed in the appendix, accompanied by a metrical analysis; however, here Moens only made use of editorial brackets, and removed vowel-doublings; no line-delineation was indicated here.

In 1934, P. Doutzaris published a short study on meter and rhythm in Greek music, in which the Delphic hymns were treated. A brief introduction to the texts was followed by extended discussion of rhythm and melody. Modern musical scores followed, with Greek notation floating above the treble staff. He made use of editorial brackets and printed vowel-doublings, but line-delineation was followed inconsistently and no use was made of sub-linear dots. Supplements were printed, but the most fragmentary section of column 2 was left out, with the text ending at [φυαν... While this was not properly a critical edition, Doutzaris did make some of his own suggestions and indicate his preferences regarding certain textual problems. In spite of the publication date, his awareness of critical scholarship on the hymns seems to neglect Crusius (1894) and Reinach (1909-13), relying instead on the very early editions of Weil and Reinach.

Many other technical works on Greek music have been published, wherein the Delphic hymns are treated, but not as central texts. The discovery of these hymns offered

45 Doutzaris (1934), 315-340.
scholars of ancient music their first real opportunity to test their ideas of how Greek musical composition worked (from a theory standpoint) as they had not actually had songs from the time period up to this point. As such, any scholarship on Greek music after their discussion must treat them to some extent, even if limited. Some of these works have made minor adjustments to the readings, but largely have tended to follow one or the other major critical editions.

E. Pöhlmann published the next important revision of the text as part of his valuable collection of the extant Greek musical corpus in 1970, *Denkmäler altgriechischer Musik.* Pöhlmann reviewed the entirety of extant Greek musical documents, making a fresh examination of stone or papyrus/parchment (where possible),

---

46 For example, cf. Reinach (1975), 175-192; Winnington-Ingram (1936), 33-38; Barbour (1960), 2; Pöhlmann (1960), 59-71; Comotti (1989), 2, 11, 14, 100, 106, 113-4; Landels (1999), 218-247.

47 Cf. Chailley (1979), a work broadly interested in ancient Greek forms and texts. Both Delphic hymns were included as examples of *paean*. He offered a brief paragraph introduction, and then treated the hymns (154-158, Athenaios’ *hymn*). The hymns were present in modern musical scores. Line-delineation was neglected; however the editor retained vowel-doubling, brackets, and the use of sub-linear dots. Chailley relied on Reinach (1909-13) and Pöhlmann (1970). Extensive supplements from Crusius (1894) were printed. Cf. also Käppel (1992), a full-length study of the ancient Greek *paean*. In the appendix, numerous *paean* were printed for reference, including the Delphic hymns (387-389, Athenaios’ *hymn*). The edition was preceded by a very brief bibliography of editions. He followed that of Pöhlmann (1970). However, while brackets and sub-linear dots were used, there was no line-delineation, and vowel-doublings were not printed. He stripped most of the extended supplements from the heavily damaged column 2, but in the very terse and limited critical apparatus, provided Crusius’ (1894) supplements for lines 27-30. There was no epigraphical or literary commentary, and neither Greek notation nor modern score were provided. Cf. also West (1992b), a work which surveyed the entire field of ancient Greek music, from instruments to musical theory as well as extant texts. Both Delphic hymns were treated. A very brief paragraph introduction was offered, and then a detailed musical analysis (288-293, Athenaios’ *hymn*). The texts were presented as modern scores, with a phonetically transliterated text. There was some (inconsistent) use of brackets, but no line-delineation or sub-linear dots. Vowel-doublings were removed. The extended supplements of Crusius (1894) were printed. Cf. also Hagel (2000), a technical work on Greek music theory, based in part on extant texts. It included an extended discussion of the melody of Athenaios’ *hymn* (38-93) but only a brief consideration of that of Limenios (94-98). The score of Athenaios’ *hymn* was included (124-125); the version printed was non-critical and seems to be reproduced largely from West (1992b), a surprising choice as the following epigraphical commentary specifically devoted to the notation (126-131) relied on Pöhlmann (1970) and Bélis (1992). Editorial brackets were used, and vowel-doublings were printed, but neither sub-linear dots nor line-delineation. The extended supplements of the second column were removed.

48 Pöhlmann (1970), 58-67; Plates 17, 18, 22.
and producing a new critical edition for each. A brief introduction and musical commentary accompanied each text. In the case of Athenaios’ hymn, Pöhlmann made a fresh examination of the stone, finding some difficulty in verifying earlier readings due to wear and tear. Full editorial marks were used, but the critical apparatus remained quite limited. There was some discussion regarding the music, and only brief literary/philological commentary as related to dating/authorship issues and musical matters. The primary focus of the work was the musical notation and melodies. For each text, the left-side page presented the text as an epigraphical edition, with Greek notation placed above each line of properly delineated text. On the right-hand side, a modern musical score was printed, accompanied by Greek lyrics, but no Greek notation. Editorial marks were retained, but line-delineation was disregarded. Photographs were included as glossy plates – the photographs were of the pieces as embedded in the museum display—and he included a photograph of the small fragments. Upon publication, this became the primary critical edition of the texts. This reevaluation of the stones stands as a significant moment in the history of these editions, as earlier scholars had primarily had to work from photographs and other reproductions as they did their work. As an example of the difficulty these early epigraphers faced, one can read in Pōmtow (1894) of how he made estimations of letter-height and spacing based on ratios to scale using a ruler and a photograph. Pöhlmann’s edition put the text on a much sounder epigraphical footing in clear, well-formatted, and broadly useful collection of the musical documents. It would be decades before his edition was improved upon.

49 Pōmtow (1894), 586.
Two important pieces of scholarship on the Delphic hymns were published in 1992. The shorter piece was a valuable assortment of helpful textual observations and arguments published by M.L. West in *ZPE* under the rather unassuming title of “Analecta Musica.” This article was an extended and diverse series of corrections to various Greek musical texts. No. 5 dealt with several problematic readings in Athenaios’ hymn (pgs. 6-8). West specifically treated lines 1-3 and 16-27. He made full use of editorial brackets, sub-linear dots, line-delineation, and he printed the vowel-doublings. Care must be taken, however, as the printed ‘text’ is often (but not always) the traditional transcription, which he then proceeds to correct in the course of the following discussions. One must read the prose to find his suggested alterations.

This same year marked the publication of *CID III, Les deux hymnes delphiques à Apollon*, by A. Bélis, a competent, careful epigrapher and scholar of ancient music. This work was a full critical edition covering both Delphic Hymns. It included an introductory discussion (pgs. 21-27) covering the history of scholarship and editions of authorship, dating, and context as well as a section devoted to description of the physical remains of the inscriptions (pgs. 47-49). A more extended treatment of dating, authorship, performative context, and meter can be found at the end as well (pgs. 133-149). The work included little to no literary commentary beyond that which is helpful for restoration, but there was significant consideration and analysis of melody. It included a helpful section on Greek melody and notation (pgs. 31-43). Regarding the hymn of Athenaios, the work

---

50 West (1992a), 1-3, 16-27. This same year he published his monograph *Ancient Greek Music* (1992b) as well, which treated the hymns to a melodic analysis and provided a much-needed English text designed for a broad, non-specialist audience.

included sketches (pgs. 55-56), a critical edition as text (pgs. 53-54, 57, 64, 71, 78), a critical edition as musical score (pgs. 57, 64, 72, 78), an epigraphical commentary (pgs. 58-61, 65-66, 73-74, 79-80), a musical-commentary (pgs. 62-63, 67-70, 75-77, 81-83), and a transliterated musical edition (pgs. 165-167). Bélis consulted older reproductions, more recent squeezes, photographs, and the stone itself. She included copies of the reproductions at the end of the book: notably plates II.1 (the museum display), III.1 (an old excavation photograph of the first hymn, pre-1911), III.2 (an old excavation photograph of the smaller fragments, pre-1911), V.1-2 (modern photograph and squeeze of column 1), V.1-2 (modern photograph and squeeze of column 2), and X.1-2 (modern photographs of two small fragments of the first hymn). Upon publication this became, and remains, the primary critical edition for these texts.

While Bélis’ work remains the most recent detailed scholarly monograph on the texts, a new critical edition was published in 2001 by E. Pöhlmann and M.L. West. Documents of Ancient Greek Music was meant to update, expand, and replace Pöhlmann (1970). Fresh critical editions of the collected extant corpus of ancient Greek musical documents were made newly accessible in English. The importance of this publication cannot be overstated, as it has made both texts and bibliography easily accessible to younger and junior scholars in the English-speaking world, particularly those not trained as classicists, in an unprecedented manner. Each edition was accompanied by an introduction, history of editions, and brief musical commentary. The left-side page offered an epigraphical edition, making full use of editorial marks. The Greek notation floats between lines, as on the stone in the case of Athenaios’ hymn. In this edition, no

---

52 Pöhlmann and West (2001), 62-73.
word-spacing is applied, and proper line-delineation is followed. The editors included an abbreviated, but useful critical apparatus of the notation. On the right-hand page, a modern musical score was printed; Greek musical notation was absent, and the brief critical apparatus addresses the lyrics. Editorial marks were used, but line-delineation was abandoned. Vowel-doublings were printed. Some discussion of authorship and performative context is included, but there is no literary commentary. The authors appear to have relied on reproductions of the stone printed in previous editions, but this in no way reduced the care with which they produced their edition. The work offers no reproductions of its own, referring the reader to Bélis’ text. While useful, and slightly more up-to-date, the brevity of the edition prevents it from displacing Bélis (1992) as the primary critical edition of the hymns.

Also in 2001, scholars of Greek religion, W. Furley and J. Bremer published a tremendously valuable two-volume work, *Greek Hymns: Selected Cult Songs from the Archaic to the Hellenistic period*, which included the Delphic hymns. While their edition did not aim to be a critical text *per se*, they did provide a limited critical apparatus and exercised a degree of personal judgment regarding various supplements. Their project aimed to collect cult songs (actual or imitative) from ancient Greece. Volume 1 contained English translations and discussions on authorship, dating, and performative context. Volume 2 contained Greek texts with limited critical apparatus, history of editions and scholarship, with brief literary/philological commentary for each text. Due to the nature of their project, this work provides a great deal of helpful discussion regarding matters of author, dating, and performance, as well as a significant amount (nearly

---

unprecedented) of literary commentary. It is a happy fact that there now exist such sources in English. A great deal (nearly all of the early scholarship) of work on Athenaios’ hymn has been published in French, German, and even Dutch. Classical scholars (and many who study ancient music) may be expected to be conversant with the necessary research languages, but as there is a predilection for young scholars to catch interest in topics already (to a reasonable degree) accessible in their own language, one may hope for a fresh surge of interest in ancient Greek music due to the publication of these texts.

My own edition that follows aims to provide a rich and dense reading of the text, providing a critical apparatus that includes the full history of readings. The various previous editions present difficulties of language, access, and obscurity to those who wish to engage with text in a close manner. My edition is cautious, conservative, and hopes to be thorough enough not only to present what is legible on the stone, but also to catalogue the readings of prior editors exhaustively. The following epigraphical commentary presents their varied rationales along with detailed pagination, if one were to wish to check for his or herself. I include my own conclusions and justifications as well.
Chapter 2: Critical Edition

Title Line and Strophe 1

Title: [παιὰν καὶ] εἰς τὸν θεὸν ὃ ἐ[πόησεν Αθήναιος

1. [Προμόλεθ’ Ἀλικ]φῶνα βαθῦδενδρον αἱ λά-
2. [χετε, Διό]ς ἐ[βρόμου]θυγατρεὶς εὐώλ[ενοι]
3. μὸλετε συνόμαιμον ἵνα Φοιοῖβον ὥδαι[ε]-
4. σι μέλψητε χρυσεοκόμαν, ὃς ἀνὰ δικόρυν-
5. βα Παρνασσίδος ταῦσδε πετέρας ἐδράν’ ἀμ’ [ἀ]-
6. γακλυταιεὶς Δελφίσι[ν] Κασταλίδος
7. ἐνοιθα[ν] Φοιοῖβον ὥδαε[ῖ]-
8. σι μέλψητε χρυσεοκόμαν, ὃς ἀνὰ δικόρυν-


54 Several of the earliest editions did not realize that this was a title line. As such, the word division reflects different goals.

55 The “?” was actually printed in the edition.


56 Editions that are not listed here simply left this text out. Due to confusion over the nature of the title line and the order of the columns, it was often simpler to print the lyrics rather than an ethnic adjective that no one knew quite what to do with.

57 The difference in accentuation reflects a change in reading. Rather than an ethnicity, editorial consensus now reads this as a proper name.

58 Reinach (1894), Plate XXV. This supplement was due to an attempt to read the title line as part of the poem.

59 Crusius (1894), 31, 34 printed this in his epigraphical edition and his transcription. On page 154 he left out the brackets here in his musical edition. In his commentary on page 40, he mentions that this restoration was, “recht wahrscheinlich, ja, nahezu sicher...” but here printed it as Ἐλικόνα.

60 Jan (1895), 438 noted Pomtow’s assertion that this is the beginning of the hymn, but Jan retained the reversed order.

61 Moens (1930), 14 credited G. Colin with this supplement, but gave no citation.

62 Furley and Bremer (2001), 85 mistakenly attributed the reading and supplement of Ἐλικόνα to Reinach—perhaps they merely presented their own their own reading in citation, but they appeared to credit him for first supplementing (Weil first proposed this supplement) and none of Reinach’s editions printed it in this editorial form. They also mistakenly cited West (1992a) as Ἐλικόνα, when he printed Ἐλικόνα.

63 Pöhlmann and West (2001), 63 misprinted West (1992a) in their critical apparatus, printing Ἐλικόνα when he had printed Ἐλικόνα.

64 Crusius (1894), 154 left out the brackets here in his musical edition.

65 Jan (1895), page 438 misprinted [λά[χε]τε, Δίος ἐ[ρ]βόμου], but on page 439 it was printed correctly.

66 Monro (1894), 136. He did not double the vowels, in spite of it being a musical edition. He simply placed 8th notes above the syllable.
68

2 εὐόλε[νοι] Weil (1893), Reinach (1893), Monro (1894), Reinach (1894), Gevaert (1895), Jan (1895), Jan (1899), Fairbanks (1900), Reinach (1909-13), Powell (1925), Doutzaris (1934), εὐόλ[ενοι] Crusius (1894),


3/4 ὠίδαεϊ[σι] Weil (1893), Reinach (1893), Crusius (1894), Reinach (1894), Monro (1894), Gevaert (1895), Jan (1895), Jan (1899), Fairbanks (1900), Smyth (1900), Doutzaris (1934), Hagel (2000),
71 ὠίδαεϊσι Reinaich (1909-13), Powell (1925), Moens (1930), Pöhlmann (1970), Chailley (1979), Käppel (1992),

4/5 δικορύν|ι[α] or δικορυν|ι[α] Weil (1893), δικορυνι[α] Reinaich (1893), δικορυνια Monro (1894), δικορυν|ι[β]α Weil (1894),
73 δικορυν|ι[β]α Smyth (1900), Moens (1930), δικορυν|ι[β]α Crusius (1894),
75 Reinach (1894), Jan (1895), Jan (1899), Fairbanks (1900), Reinach (1909-13), Pöhlmann (1970), Chailley (1979), Käppel (1992), Pöhlmann and West

67 In spite of the fact that West (1992b) did not print the sub-linear dots, it is worth noting this edition here, as his later joint critical edition with Pöhlmann also placed no dot here.
68 Furley and Bremer (2001), 85 misprinted here, leaving out the left [ .
69 Crusius (1894), 154 left out the brackets here in his musical edition.
70 Crusius (1894), 154 left out the brackets here in his musical edition, but this cannot be taken as an indication of his actual reading, as for some reason this entire strophe is lacking brackets in this edition, but the other strophes do have brackets printed.
71 Hagel (2000), 124 typically followed West (1992b), and thus it seems likely that, when he printed the doubled vowel here he failed to add brackets which had been absent in West due to the lack of vowel-doubling.
72 Käppel (1992), 388 printed ὠίδαεϊσι, but he clearly followed Pöhlmann. The fact that the [ι] was part of the vowel doubling (which Käppel did not print) explains the lack of bracketing.
73 West (1992b), 288. The fact that the [ι] was part of the vowel doubling (which West did not print) explains the lack of bracketing.
74 Weil (1894), 360 credited Blass for pointing out this reading, which he then found to be, “clair comme le jour.”
75 Crusius (1894), 34 printed δικορυν|ι[β]α, but his epigraphical edition on page 31 printed no B.


πρωδνα Jan (1895), West (1992b), Hagel (2000)

76 Powell (1925), 145 printed in his apparatus that the stone read δικορυνβα, but printed the μ in his edition on page 142.

77 Crusius (1894), 154 left out the brackets here in his musical edition. His epigraphical edition on page 31 indicates that the T is not fully legible.

78 Reinach (1909-13), 152 printed [Α] but in his musical edition on page 156 the brackets are missing.

79 Crusius (1894), 154 left out the brackets here in his musical edition.
Strophe 2:

9 [Ἡν] κλυτὰ μεγαλόπολις Αθῆς, εὔχαε[ι]-
10 [σ]ι φερότητον ναίωσα Τριτωνιδὸς δᾶ[πε]-
11 δόν ἀθραυστὸν ἄγιος δὲ βαμφοίσιν Ἄ-
12 φαστὸς αἰείθε<ι> νέον μήρα ταοῦρον· ὅμου-
13 οὐ δὲ νῦν Ἀραγν ἀτμός ἐς Ὀ'λυν'μπον ἀνακίδν[α]-
14 τα· λιγό δὲ λωτοὺς βρέμον ἀειόλοιος μ [έ]-
15 λεσιν ὀἰδάν κρέκει· χρυσέα δ' ἀδύθρου[ζ κι]-
16 θαρις ὑμνοίσιν ἀναμέλλπεται. Ὡ δὲ [


10/11 δᾶ[πε|δ]ov Weil (1893), Reinach (1893), Reinach (1894), Monro (1894), Gevaert (1895), Jan (1895), Jan (1899), Doutzaris (1934), δᾶ[πε|δ]ov and δᾶ[πε]δov Crusius

---

80 Weil (1894), 360-1 credited Reinach with the idea in a personal note.
81 It is quite likely that Monro (1894), 137, presented a misprint. While he was not in the practice of printing vowel-doublings, it is unclear if he believed this particular diphthong to be doubled or not.
82 Jan (1895), 440-1. It seems likely that his transcription is simply a reproduction of a misprint in Crusius (1894), 34 where the brackets were left out.
83 In his edition on page 34, he printed εὐχαε[ισ], yet his transcription of the stone on page 31 reads ΕΥΧΑΙΕ[ι]. His commentary on page 44 printed εὐχα[ισ].
84 Reinach (1909-13), 152 printed εὐχαε[ισ] [.σι], but on page 157 in his musical edition, he printed εὐχαεισι. In his discussion on page 154, he made it clear that he believed the stone originally, by stonemaster error, read εὐχαεισ [.σι]. “le graveur avait-il écrit par inadvertence.”
85 Powell (1925) printed the brackets in his edition on page 142, but not the musical score on page 147.
86 While their apparatus made it clear that they were aware of both Reinach’s restoration as well as Bélis’ acceptance of his reading, they chose instead to print without the extra Σ. On page 64 they printed εὐχαεισ [.σι], but on page 65 they instead printed εὐχαεισ [.σι].


13/14 ᾼ/νακίδν[α]ται Weil (1893), Reinach (1893), Reinach (1894), Crusius (1894), Gevaert (1895), Jan (1899), Fairbanks (1900), Smyth (1900), Reinach (1909-13), Powell (1925), Moens (1930), Doutzaris (1934), Pöhlmann (1970), Chailley (1979),

87 Crusius printed the Δ as visible in his transcription of the stone on page 31, but placed it with [ ] in his edition on page 34.


89 Crusius (1894), 155 left out the editorial < > in his musical edition.

90 Jan (1899), 14 printed αἰτιθε<> but page 15 printed αἰτιθε. He used font weight rather than brackets, making for easy misprints and misreading.

91 Jan (1895), 440-1.

92 All editions appear to have been aware that Ὅ/λομπον was meant, yet there was variance on whether the ‘error’ was noted, or if the transcription preferred the unusual reversal of vowels. E.g. Crusius (1894) printed ὑλομπον on pages 31 and 34, but noted on page 47 that Weil (1893) was correct to reverse the vowels, restoring the expected spelling.

93 Crusius (1894), 155 corrected the reading to Ὅ/λομπον in his musical edition, even though he retains the Y and O his epigraphical edition and transcription.

94 Crusius (1894), 155 left out the brackets in his musical edition.

95 Reinach (1909-13), 152 printed ἄ/νακιδν[α]ται, but on page 157, in his musical edition, he printed ἄ/νακιδνται with no brackets.


---

96 Jan (1895), 440-3.

97 Crusius (1894), 155 left out the brackets here in his musical edition.

98 On page 155 he printed μ[έ]λεσιν, but on page 152 he printed μ[έ]λεσιν even as he explained that all but the first stroke of the M was missing.

99 Bélis (1992), 64 printed Μ[E in her transcription but [ΜΕ in her musical edition. Noting Reinach (1909-13) as well as the squeeze and photo, on page 66 she expressed confidence in the M.

100 On page 85 they printed Μ, but on 89 it is Μ.


102 In her transcription on page 35, Moens printed Θ but her edition on page 119 she printed Θ.

103 Jan (1895), 442-3.
Strophe 3:

16 θαρίς ὑμνοσιν ἀναμέλπεται. Ὡ δὲ [ (visual strophe break)
17 ἵων πρόπας ἐσμός Λ oatha λαχῶν [v

- -

18 ἔξι κλυτόν παϊδα μεγάλου [Διός
19 ὁ' ἀκρονιφή τόνδε πάγων, αἰμ[βροτ
20 πάσι θνατοις προφαίνει[
21 τρ]ύποδα μαντειείον ὡς εἰς[λες . . . ἐ-
22 φρ]ουρειει δράκων, ὅτε τέ[
23 ἦησας, αἰόλον ἐλικτάν[
24 ἦσιας, αἰόλον ἐλικτάν[
25 δὲ Γαλαταν ἄρης[
26 ν ἐπέρρους ἀσεπτ[
27 ζ. Ἀλλ' ἰό γεένναν [


17/18 λαχ[ῶν [τὸν κιθάρι]σει Weil (1893), λαχ[ῶν [τὸν κιθάρι]σει Reinach (1893),

105 Crusius (1894), 155 printed λαχ[ῶν with no brackets in his musical edition.
106 He read either E Σ I (Z) Ξ.
107 Gevaert (1895) had the ordering of the blocks correct, but he retained the earlier accentuation of λαχ[ῶν which was due to it being the final word remaining of the poem in the reversed order.
108 Smyth (1900) printed no more of the hymn, but ended at this word. He had the ordering of the blocks correct, beginning with column 1, yet he simply printed nothing of column 2.
109 Reinach (1909-13) printed Σ on page 152 (transcription), commented on the possibility of Σ I on page 155 (the capital Z in these inscriptions, based on Ζηζόμενος in line 33 of Limenios’ hymn, would seem to take the I shape), and he printed Σ on page 157 (musical edition).


\(^{110}\) West (1982) used no sub-linear dots or line delineation, as his focus was metrical. It is reasonable, based on supplements, to assume he followed Powell (1925) here rather than Pöhlmann’s 1970 edition.

\(^{111}\) Bélis (1992), 73 commented that the Ω is only partially visible. Pöhlmann and West (2001) cited her as reading Ω (based on her commentary), while her text edition is printed Ω. Bélis was confident in her identification of the character. Pöhlmann and West’s representation of her reading suggests continuity between her 1992 reading and Pöhlmann’s 1970 reading that does not, in fact, exist. Pöhlmann and West (2001) reverted to, rather than retained, the sub-linear dot.

\(^{112}\) On page 66 in the transcription they printed Ζ but they printed Ζ in the edition on page 67.

\(^{113}\) All editions printed the correction. Certain editions commented upon the lettering on the stone.

\(^{114}\) Due to the fact that Doutzaris (1934) made no use of any delineation, and he was just as likely to have assumed the line break to be positioned as in Weil (1894).

\(^{115}\) crusius (1894), 152 left off the brackets in his musical edition.

\(^{116}\) Moens printed ΟΞ on page 44, but she printed OΞ on page 120.

\(^{117}\) Bélis (1992), 72 printed the supplement in her musical edition, but left it out of her transcription on page 71, printing only αάμ[.]


¹¹⁸ I fail to find Bélis (1992) suggesting oincinn as Pöhlmann and West claimed, in either her sketch or commentary.

¹¹⁹ Reinach (1894) lacked line delineation. It is reasonable to suppose that he here followed Weil (1893), and that Reinach (1893) had a print error that he then corrected.

¹²⁰ This is in her transcription on page 41, but she printed [τρ]πόδα in her editions on pages 45 and 120.

¹²¹ Note: Their transcription on page 66 printed [...]πόδα, but the edition on page 67 (which lacks line delineation) breaks the line between λόγια and τρόδα by necessity of layout, a formatting decision that could easily be misconstrued.

¹²² Furley and Bremer paid little attention to accurate delineation, and do not print vowel doublings, but their formatting could easily lead one to assume they follow the majority tradition rather than that of West.

¹²³ However, he printed EIEI[ on his transcription on page 33, with the final I hatched to show it only partially remained. His edition removed the comma.

¹²⁴ Thus she printed in her edition, page 45, but in her transcription she printed EIEI[ on page 41.

¹²⁵ Note: Diggle (1984) only contributed/printed the word μέγας

¹²⁶ Pöhlmann and West (2001) mistakenly claimed that Bélis (1992), pg. 74 read ειε[λες when the supplement is only present as representing that of Reinach and of Pöhlmann. I also fail to find Bélis (1992) suggesting oincinn in line 19 as they claimed.
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140 He hatched the Δ in his epigraphical edition, indicating that the letter was only partially visible.
141 He cited Reinach (1909-13) for evidence of the Δ, as Pöhlmann noted that the stone read [. . .]. E on page 60.
142 He printed Crusius’ supplement in his transcription on page 436, but left it out of his musical edition on page 437.
143 Crusius (1894), 30 In his epigraphical edition, the O was hatched, indicating that it was only partially visible; 153 he printed a variation in his musical edition: ἄσεπτος] θος ἐόντα στ' ἐγνοί φαλαί]ς.
144 He printed a supplement on page 436, but left it completely out from page 437.
145 Powell printed this text on pages 141 and 143, but left it out completely from page 148.
146 He printed Moens’ supplement in the apparatus (perhaps as the basis on which his own modification is based?), but he incorrectly attributes to her reading the sub-linear dot in ἄσεπτος.
Strophe 4:

The extremely fragmentary nature of these lines demands a slightly different approach. In the prior strophes, restoration of missing text could often be regarded as certain—not so for these fragmentary lines. Many earlier editions made creative efforts to supplement at least in part, if not in full. This critical edition will emphasize what is present on the stone, and permit only what may be considered reasonable supplement/restoration (a portion of the word must remain). As nearly all editions have uniformly attached the initial Σ to the end of Strophe 3, the reader is referred to the preceding section for the proposed supplements for the beginning of line 27. Three small fragments will then be considered, separately, as there is no real certainty to their placement. The apparatus here will intentionally be limited, leaving the more extensive (and creative) restorations to the Epigraphical Commentary. The full line is printed in each case, due to their brevity and the difficulty of any confidence as to word identification. Several editions simply do not print or address these fragmentary lines.

The exact number of characters missing at the beginning of these lines is difficult to determine, and most editors simply did not address the matter. The primary critical epigraphical editions indicate roughly two letters missing from the left side of the column.147

147 Reinach (1909-13), Powell (1925), Pöhlmann (1970), and Bélis (1992). West and Pöhlmann (2001) indicated only one character missing at the beginning of line 33. Other editions made no attempt to 'space' the lines according to their placement on the stone.

28 ἰν θάλος φιλόν[ Weil (1893), Monro (1894), ὰν θάλος φιλόν[ Reinach (1893), ὰν ὰν θάλος φιλόμ[συν Crusius (1894), 157 ]ν θάλος φιλόμ[ or Χ[ Weil (1894), ]ν θάλος φιλόχ[ορον Reinach (1894), Jan (1899), Fairbanks (1900), ]ν θάλος φιλό[χορον Gevaert

148 Weil (1893), 576 commented that, in addition, it could possibly read Σ ΔΑΛΙΩ or even Σ ΑΛΛΙΩ, but the lack of any other Doric genitive ending in Ω in the text (or of a missing iota adscript) made these readings unlikely. He referred to this line as “énigmatique.”

149 Monro (1894), 135 printed the (?) with no comment.

150 Crusius (1894), 30, 33 attached the Σ to the end of the preceding strophe. He supplemented in full: ἔγνω σ’ ἀλοῦξ. ἀλλ’ ἵω, γεένναν .

151 Thus he printed on page 436, but in his musical edition on the facing page (437) he left off the ]Σ. In his apparatus he noted καλλίω as a possible reading of the stone.

152 He printed ἵω in spite of there being now subsequent comma.

153 ἀλλ’ was printed in the lighter, smaller type-font employed to indicated reconstructed text. This is clearly a typo. The same mistake occurred on both pages 18 and 19.

154 While Bélis printed the traditional reading and agreed with the letters actually read off the stone, she expressed a lack of certainty as to the words into which it should be divided. Her concern stemmed in part from the possibility that the traditional strophe break had possibly been incorrectly read. Cf. the epigraphical commentary for further discussion.

155 West (1992b), 292 printed an English transliteration, wherein the bracketing is incorrect: asep[os All’ io gennan].

156 Moens (1930), 55, The M is uncertain, as she noted that it could potentially be a N as well. Her edition (page 120) read μ [έγαλον, but the epigraphical line (page 51) was printed Ν[.

157 His epigraphical edition made it clear that the M was only partially present, but his transcript lacks any sub-linear dot.
The initial I indicated a visible vertical stroke on the stone, but Reinach did not claim that it is, in fact, an iota. He printed the ‘?’ in his text. He noted that he felt it was possible to read a Χ, but that Colin disagreed, insisting that it was a Μ or Ν. His edition oddly forgot the sub-linear dot here.

Powell (1925), 141, 143 misrepresented Reinach’s ‘I’ by transferring to a lower-case letter. He printed the ‘?’ in his text.

She noted traces before the Θ, but could not make out a clear letter.

He commented that he could no longer make out the N himself, and relied on Reinach’s testimony.

Bélis (1992). In her arguments on pages 79-80 she made it clear that she was confident in the identification of the initial N and the final M, but she conceded that the stone currently makes it more difficult than the oldest reproductions do. She also noted that while φιλόμαχον was admissible (as well as φιλόμολπον) she felt that it was best to remain hesitant, in spite of printing the traditional supplement. On page 78 she printed Ṣ in her transcription, but Μ in her musical edition.

In their apparatus they credit Bélis (1992), 79-80 with γ and μ. Her arguments made it clear that she was confident in her identification, yet she built her argument from traces and her editions on 78 were printed with sub-linear dots.

They cited Bélis (1992) here, which is odd, considering they do not properly represent her reading of the line.

Weil’s (1893) edition lacked an accent.

Reinach’s (1893) edition lacked accents in general.

Crusius (1894), 30 printed ΛΟ in his epigraphical edition, but in the transcription on page 33, he printed λοι. On page 38, in a restoration he rejects, he prints λοι.

He commented that the supplement was that of Crusius—in general, Pöhlmann reprintsted but distanced himself from Crusius’ supplements in this strophe.

They rejected Bélis’ reading as being metrically impossible.

Bélis (1992), 80 noted that all previous editors who read ]Ε were wrong. She claimed that the squeeze in her book clearly revealed that the middle point of the character lacked the apex required for it to have been an E. On page 78 there is an odd dot following λο before the bracket in the musical edition, but not the transcription.


171 Reinach (1909-13), 153 misprinted a bracket: ]ρον ἐφὸρ[.
172 Moens misprinted the bracket on page 55: κεφ][ρον ἐφόρ[α. But on page 54 and 121 she printed it correctly.
173 Once more, he made it clear that the supplements were those of Crusius. He noted that the apex of the M was visible.
174 He noted Crusius’ supplements only in his apparatus.
175 Bélis (1992), 80 claimed that the squeeze revealed enough traces to guess either an O or Ω, with Ω more likely due to spacing. On page 78 there is some confusion regarding the initial P, as her transcription provides it with a sub-linear dot, but on the same page, in the musical edition, the P does not have the dot.
176 Pöhlmann and West (2001), 69 noted either Ο[ or Ω[ with the Ω being metrically impossible.
177 He failed to print the left bracket on page 141, but printed it correctly on page 144.
178 He commented that he could not read K (nor the following N claimed by Weil) on the stone.
179 She noted that, in the process of handling, these lines on the stone have been damaged, and therefore it is necessary to rely on older photographs.
180 She noted that the K was no longer visible on the stone, and thus she relied on Crusius’ reading.
181 They printed no more lines, but indicated with an ellipsis that the text did not actually end at this point.
182 Monro (1894), 135 wrote, “about 12 bars wanting.”
183 ένωκ is not printed on 19. It is the musical edition, and there is no extant notation above these letters. K does, however have a note, and it is printed.
184 Bélis (1992), 78 printed the sub-linear dot in her transcription, but not the musical edition.

34 Certain editions indicate that there is further text on the stone, but none offer any possible reading of the traces. Only the following texts presented edition suggesting a missing line 34. [. . .] Reinach (1909-13), Käppel (1992), Bélis (1992), Pöhlmann and West (2001)

---

185 Bélis (1992), 80 noted that while the stone no longer offered a clear reading, older photographs permitted a confident reading of ΝΘΗ.

186 His epigraphical edition indicated that the H was only partially visible.

187 Moens (1930), 54-5, only read Θ on the stone with any confidence. She saw traces of an H, M, or N following the Θ; she preferred the H as likely.

188 Powell (1925), 146 explicitly noted that he was unable to read the νθη himself, but relied on Reinach.
Fragments from Strophe 4: inv. 494, 499

Several fragments were associated with Atheniaos’ hymn by the earliest editors. Of these, only these two remain reasonably certain as belonging to the text due to 1) the presence of musical notation, and 2) the correct kind for this hymn.

Inv. 494, fr. 2 in BCH.

1 ] ΑΠΕ [  
2 ] ΡΑΤ [  
3 ] ΟΣΥ [ vel Τ


190 Bélis (1992), 82 incorrectly claimed that Crusius read only ΟΣ[.
191 Bélis (1992), 82 incorrectly claimed that Reinach read traces of the Π on the stone. She printed him as ]Π.  
192 Pöhlmann (1970), 62 cited Reinach as his source. Pöhlmann and West (2001), 69 indicated that he only read traces of the P and Τ. They printed him as reading ] . ΟΣ . [.
193 Bélis (1992), 81. On the same page she printed the Υ both with and without the sub-linear dot.
Inv. 499, fr. 3 in BCH

1 | . A . . |
2 | ] II INAO [ vel T
3 | T ] EO [


---

194 The ‘I’ represented the lower half of a vertical stroke that remained visible, rather than an actual letter.

195 Moens (1930), 49 noted that the last three letters were uncertain.


197 Bélis (1992), 82 printed it with and without sub-linear dots on the same page.

198 Pöhlmann and West (2001), 69 misprinted Reinach (1909-13) as having printed ] AI . . [. 


200 Pöhlmann (1970), 62 cited Reinach as his source.

201 Reinach (1909-13), 156 made a confusing claim when he said that the first letter of line 2 was probably Π. It is likely that he meant this line, not counting the traces on top as a proper line. Pöhlmann (1970), 62 clearly understood it this way, but Pöhlmann and West (2001), 69 preferred it to refer to the middle line, as if the T could be read Π.

Chapter 3: Epigraphical Commentary

Title Line: Columns 1 and 2, Inv. 517, 526

Title: ΕΙΣΤΟΝΘΕΟΝΟΕ ΗΝΑΙΟΣ

When first transcribed, two issues interfered with the reading of the title line: 1) The columns were assumed to be in reverse order, meaning that the top line of Column 1 was thought to be part of the poetic text, from the middle of the hymn, causing attempts at restoration and supplementation to be misguided. 2) As a result of this misordering, there was no clear recognition that there was a title line to the hymn (The earliest editions recognized the presence of what must have been Ἀθηναῖος at the top of the column, followed by blank space, but had no idea what to do with it, and so many simply omitted it, or even both portions of the title line).

203 NB: Reference is made throughout this commentary to specific reproductions found in certain of the critical editions. For reference sake, I list them here with brief description: Weil (1893), BCH, Plate XXI.1, 2 (photographs of the stones, reversed order); Pöhlmann (1970), Plates 17, 18 (photographs of the stone), Plate 22 (photographs and sketches of the fragments); Bélis (1992), pgs. 55-6 (sketches), Plate III.1 (old photograph of stones), Plate III.1 (old photograph of fragments), Plates V.1-2, VI.1-2 (more recent photograph of stones and of squeezes), Plate X.1-5 (close ups of fragments); Teitel-Paul, M. (2014), digital photographs of stones.
There is significant damage to the top of the stone block. The upper left corner is broken away, the top edge of each column is heavily worn, and the block has been split into two halves (each with a column) with the medial space largely lost. Fortunately, while there is some damage to the upper right of the right-hand column, the text of the title-line did not extend this far, meaning that we have the end of the line. Regarding the beginning of this line, H. Weil made no attempt to establish a supplement in his initial critical edition, but he did note in his commentary that possibilities included [μέ γ]ιστον, [φέ ρ]ιστον, and [ἄ ρ]ιστον. \(^{204}\) In spite of correcting the order of the columns in his 1894 addendum, he made no comment on the title line.\(^{205}\) In his first, musical edition, Th. Reinach printed [μέ γ]ιστον as part of the lyric.\(^ {206}\) O. Crusius preferred [ἄ ρ]ιστον.\(^ {207}\)

It was Th. Reinach who first published a version of the text that treated this line as a title line. He gave credit to G. Colin for recognizing it for what it was. He offered a supplement, saying that one would expect παίαν in the title, but he rejected προσόδιον and ποθόδιον as unsuited for the cretic rhythm of the hymn. Therefore, he creatively proposed [ἀ ισμα μετὰ κιθάρας (?)ε]ις\(^ {208}\). P. Moens rejected his arguments, pointing out that the title line of Limenios’ hymn had a very similar composition, and noting that his title could much more easily be restored: [Πα]ϊ αν δὲ και π[ροσό]διον. She saw no reason

\(^{204}\) Weil (1893), 756-7.

\(^{205}\) Weil (1894).

\(^{206}\) Reinach (1893), 587. He would reprint this same reading in his later updated score in 1894. The order of the columns was corrected at this point, but there was still confusion regarding the nature of the line. He printed a full supplement of of [δε το]ς’ ἀγ’ ἀμνοθμιν ν τον μέ γ]ιστον and included supplemnted melody notes as well. Reinach (1894), Plate XXV. He was followed by Fairbanks (1900), 119.

\(^{207}\) Crusius (1894), 31, 34. He was followed by Jan (1895), 438 and Jan (1899), 12.

\(^{208}\) Reinach (1909-13), 154. NB the (?) appeared in his edition. Powell (1925), 141 followed this reading.
that Athenaios’ hymn could not bear the same designations.\textsuperscript{209} E. Pöhlmann proposed instead ύπόρχημα, as he believed that the cretic rhythm of the hymn continued through the prayer, rather than shifting to glyconics as Moens had thought.\textsuperscript{210} His argument and supplement have largely been accepted by later editions, although Furley and Bremer preferred to restore προσόδιον. They were aware of the other solution, but consistently referred to Strophe 4 as a prosodion. The comparison with Limenios’ hymn is helpful, but it seems clear that there can be no certainty regarding the nature of the lost text. Perhaps even the seemingly obvious paean is incorrect. We can see at a glance that the title lines of the two hymns share certain phrasing in common (e.g. “for the god”) but the authorial attribution is handled quite differently, and the hymns themselves differ significantly.

The initial editions claimed to be able to read only the I on the left edge. E. Pöhlmann first claimed to see traces of the E.\textsuperscript{211} A. Bélis confirmed his reading, finding it sure enough to remove the sub-linear dot.\textsuperscript{212} In her photograph and squeeze, it is difficult to make out the traces. However, in the contemporary photo, I find that most of the bottom half of the Σ remains—the angle of the vertical stroke is quite visible. To its left, the I is exhibits only the bottom, horizontal stroke; however, due to its short length, and position next to the Σ, this is sufficient for sure identification. To the left of the I, one may see a longer horizontal stroke with a clear apex on the right end. It is reasonable to

\textsuperscript{209} P. Moens (1930), 6-9.

\textsuperscript{210} Pöhlmann (1970), 58. He was followed by Käppel (1992), 388; Bélis (1992), 54; and Pöhlmann and West (2001), 62-63, 73.

\textsuperscript{211} Pöhlmann (1970), 58.

\textsuperscript{212} Bélis (1992), 54.
take this as an E due to context. Nothing more remains to the left, as the stone has been damaged.

At the right end of the first column, H. Weil first printed ΩΣ̣.213 O. Crusius found the Σ more certain.214 Th. Reinach, in his FD edition, removed the Σ, arguing that the traces instead belonged to an E, but that the reading was uncertain; he printed the supplement ἐ[πόησε which has been adopted by all subsequent editors.215 In her fresh examination of the stone, A. Bélis found the reading of the E to be sure, and all subsequent editions have followed her reading.216 The reproductions in Bélis’ edition clearly reveal the bottom half of a vertical stroke of the E, as well as the lower horizontal stroke.

As for the text remaining over the second column, there has been no disagreement regarding the lettering that remains visible on the stone. H. Weil printed Αθηναίος, offering a restoration which was convincing. He was sure that this was the appropriate restoration, and all other editors have agreed with him on the reading of the stone.217 While the reading of the remaining letters has not been contested, in 1988 A. Bélis advanced an argument based on measurements of available space between the columns which claimed that there was insufficient room for this to be an ethnic, but rather must be

213 Weil (1893), 576-7. Reinach left off the Σ in his musical editions (1893), 587 and (1894), PLATE XXV, and Fairbanks (1900) followed his text.
214 Crusius (1894), 31, 34. He was followed by Jan (1895), 438 and Jan (1899), 12.
215 Reinach (1909-13), 152. He was followed by Powell (1925), 141; Moens (1930), 12; Pöhlmann (1970), 58; Käppel (1992), 388.
216 Bélis (1992), 54; Pöhlmann and West (2001), 62-3; Furley and Bremer (2001), 85.
217 Weil (1893), 756-7. He was followed by Crusius (1894), 30, 32; Jan (1895), 434; Jan (1899), 12; Reinach (1909-13), 152, 154; Powell (1925), 141; Moens (1930), 6; Pöhlmann (1970), 58; Käppel (1992), 388; Most early editions did not print this text, as there was uncertainty as to what exactly it was—there was confusion for several years regarding the title line and ordering of the columns.
the actual name of the author. The spelling remains the same, but the accent changes to reflect that the letters now read as a proper noun rather than as an adjective.218

Subsequent editors have found her argument convincing and have followed her reading.219 All reproductions show clearly that the surface of the stone is smooth to the right of ΗΝΑΙΟΣ, and none offer any traces of lettering to the left.

---

218 Bélis (1988). Her argument was strengthened by the presence of an Athenaios, son of Athenaios, listed as a member of the great chorus in the 128/7 BCE Pythaïdes inscription honoring the technitai of Dionysos for their role in the festival. Cf. FD III, 2 no. 47.

219 Bélis (1992), 54; Pöhlmann and West (1992), 62-3; Furley and Bremer (2001), 85.
Two factors caused difficulty for the earliest attempts to supplement this line: 1) Columns 1 and 2 initially were reversed in order.²²⁰ 2) Because of this, the title line was mistaken for part of the body text.²²¹ H. Weil (1894) was the first edition to order the lines correctly and to separate the title-line, albeit only in a short addendum at the end of his article on the second hymn.²²² On account of this, the line numbering in the first editions differs from those which came later (and from each other). In this commentary, lines will be numbered as the hymn is delineated today.²²³

A significant piece of the upper left corner of the stone is missing. H. Weil initially supplemented [Ἑλικόνων], which is somewhat surprising as the Ν is so damaged as to be illegible, while the preceding Ω is not difficult to make out.²²⁴ Th. Reinach, in the same year, preferred the reading of [Ἑλικόνων].²²⁵ The following year, however, Reinach corrected his reading and proposed the supplement [δ' ἀδύπνους]
ἐσμὸς Ἑλικῶνα. O. Crusius contributed the supplement [κέκλυθ', Ἑλικῶνα. He saw the reading of Ἑλικῶνα as likely, and nearly secure, but considered πρῶνα as another possibility. Crusius rejected this option due to its (re)appearance later in line 8. He expected a hymn such as this one to be kletic, and therefore expected the presence of forms such as κλῦτε, κέκλυτε, or κέκκλυθ'. Part of the rationale for his choice of κέκλυθ' was rhythmic: it is an epic form but also appears in lyric, scanning – ν ν, which with the first two short syllables of Ἑλικῶνα helped fill out the metrical group of five-eighths. O. Crusius’ supplement was largely accepted, with varying claims made as to what, exactly, remained visible on the stone. C. Jan first printed [κέκλυθ', Ἑλικῶνα, but later revised this to read [κέκλυθ', Ἑλικῶνα. In his 1909-13 edition, Th. Reinach printed [κέκλυθ', Ἑλικῶνα. He commented that Ἑλικῶν was not the only option here, particularly as the note over Ω

---

226 Reinach (1894), Plate XXV. The particular supplement derived from mistakenly taking the title-line as part of the poetic text preceding this line. Fairbanks (1900), 119 reprinted the supplement, and modified the reading to [ὁ δόξαν ἐσμὸς Ἑλικικῶνα. One might guess that the placement of the brackets is due to error, as no other editor has ever claimed to see the I, and the Ω is quite clear.

227 Crusius (1894), 31, 34, 40-1. For kletic hymns, cf. Pindar, Olympian 10.96: καφισίων ὑδάτων λαχοῖσαι ταί τε ναίετε καλλίπωλον ἔδραν... κλῦτ', ἐπεὶ εὔχομαι. For precedent of the epic for κέκλυθ' for a metrical – νν in lyric, cf. Pindar Pythian 4.13: Κέκλυτε παίδες. Crusius also argued against the proposed restorations which included the title-line. E.g. Reinach (1894) Plate XXV printed [Ἀφιτ' ἀγ' ὑμνώδους ὁ τὸν μέγ]ιστον θεὸν ὁ [. Crusius rejected ὁ τὸν] on the grounds that the author avoids using the bare article in this way; δεῖτε he felt was too close to μολέτε (appearing in line 3), and directly inserting Μοῖσαι as part of any supplement he thought would be too prosaic. Crusius’ proposal was followed by Smyth (1900), 529 and Moens (1930), 14, 25, 119.


229 Jan (1899), 12-13.

230 Reinach (1909-13), 152, 154, 156. He erroneously credited Crusius for the reading of ὉΝΑ. While it is true that Crusius (1894), 40 did print ὁνα in his commentary, both of his critical editions on pages 31 and 34 printed ᾧνα. While it is true that he did not utilized sub-linear dots, there is nothing to suggest that the placement of the bracket is intentional, rather than a mistake and he certainly made no claim that the N was uncertain or fragmentary.
could be split, and he felt that the letters ΩΝ were nearly illegible. P.W. Moens agreed that a longer supplement was required. She mentioned that Colin had proposed [δεῦρ’ Ίθ’ Ελικῶ|να], which she (in agreement with Crusius) felt was overcrowded due to the μόλετε in nearby line 3. She found Crusius’ κέκλυθ’ Ἑλικῶνα, more convincing due to Homeric precedent. P. Doutzaris questioned Crusius’ κέκλυθ’, preferring instead to begin with an apostrophe to the Muses, and so he replaced it with Μοῦσαι Ἑλικῶνα, a supplement which also satisfied the metrical requirements.

E. Pöhlmann, in his fresh examination of the stone, claimed to be able to read |ΚΩΝΑ; he accepted the traditional supplement of [κέκλυθ’ Ελικῶνα]. A. Bélis made her own examination of the stone. She measured the lacuna at around 15cm, space enough for 11 to 13 characters (by comparison with the lines immediately below). Bélis confidently excluded the reading of ΚΩΝΑ, claiming that she was able to make out the lower right stroke of what might be another Ω immediately preceding the Ω, a stroke which, being horizontal, disallowed the possibility of reading a K. Taking up Reinach’s point that the vowel might be split (doubled) between two melody notes (cf. repeated doubling of Ω in lines 1, 8, 9, and 17 in column 1), Bélis extended the previous

---

231 Reinach (1909-13), 152 and 154, but there are not sub-linear dots in his musical edition page 156. Powell (1925), 141-5, as Reinach did, he left out the sub-linear dots here in his musical edition of page 146, but kept them in his critical edition on page 142.

232 Moens (1930), 14. “Colin” here was a reference to a comment in Reinach (1909-13).


234 Doutzaris (1934), 316, 338. Crusius had earlier rejected this possibility as, “a metrical impossibility.” Crusius (1894), 41.

supplement to 12 characters in this way, a number better fitting the demands of the lacuna: [κέκλυθ’ Ἑλικ[φόνα].

M.L. West had similar problems with the size of the lacuna and the previously proposed supplement. He was of the opinion that κέκλυθ’ was two or three letters short. Due to metrical considerations, West suggested that there could be 3 un-elided syllables, not – v but rather v v v. He proposed that μόλετε in line 3 might be a reappearance, arguing that a compound verb (προμόλεθ’) followed by its simplex (μόλετε) is a well-known phenomenon. West’s argument has merit, as Bélis’ doubling of Ω (undoubtedly correct) still leaves text on the short side for filling the lacuna. West printed his new supplement in his Greek Music as well, which was then followed by S. Hagel (2000). In the 2001 joint edition by Pöhlmann and West, the more traditional [κέκλυθ’] returned. One strength to West’s proposal is that it parallels the 2nd hymn, in which Limenios asks the Muses to come, rather than listen. Any proposed supplement here,

Bélis (1992), 57-8. She noted that the stone is darkened and damaged, making reading of the musical notes very difficult, and Reinach’s photos are not sufficient to remove doubts. Oddly, Furley and Bremer (2001), vol. 2, page 85, not failed to adopt her improved reading of the text, but completely neglected to mention it in their critical apparatus. She was followed by Pöhlmann and West (2001), 62-3.


West (1992b), 288.

Hagel (2000), 124, 127. He summarized West’s and Bélis’ arguments (without properly citing them), coming to agreement with West’s supplement. He did add somewhat, by also explaining that there may be good metrical reasons to prefer West’s proposal. He argued that the lengthening of a vowel by rule of mute with a liquid is only valid in Hexameter, which this hymn is not. Cf. the measurement of the same root in line 5 as well as the exceptional treatment of the lengthened syllable in πετερας. Additionally, Limenios’ hymn begins by asking the Muses to ‘come’. He was somewhat less convinced of the doubling of Ω.


Π[νασιαν. On the other hand, supplements based on the second hymn are inherently risky as Limenios is clearly avoiding any impression of copying from Athenaios, as his choice of epithets in the first few lines makes clear. The Muses become Πιερίδες, and Helikon is rocky and snowy rather than wooded.
no matter how persuasive, must ultimately ‘give the sense’ of the passage as assumed by comparison to other texts; this allows for little confidence.

The damage to the stone is extensive enough (the entire upper left corner is broken away) and these characters so difficult to read, that absolute certainty is not possible. As for Ἑλικ[ο]να: The BCH Plate is too blurry here to be of any help, and the old photo in Bélis is also indistinct. Pöhlmann’s photo is unhelpful. Bélis’ squeeze and more recent photograph are clear, and helpful. The A is quite visible in the photographs. Of the proposed N, only indistinct traces of the lowest apices remain. The preceding Ω nearly can be read in whole, and it would seem the part of a horizontal stroke remains, at the base line, immediately to the left, lending some confidence to the reading of a second Ω. The most recent photograph offers nothing more; the left-most trace appears to have been lost due to wear.

The end of the line is damaged, as well as the beginning of the next. As a result, there is some difficulty in proper line-delination as well as supplementation. Since we do not know where the line actually ended, it is impossible to be certain how many characters are missing. H. Weil first supplemented λά[χε]τε, which was accepted by all later editions.⁴²⁴ O. Crusius noted that the supplement made good sense in light of other examples of the term in similar contexts, such as Pindar, Olympian 14.1, which resonates strongly enough with this strophe to be worth quoting in full: ⁴²³

---

⁴²² Weil (1893), 576-7. He was followed by Reinach (1893), 587; Reinach (1894), Plate XXV; Monro (1894), 136; Crusius (1894), 31, 34, 40-1; Gevaert (1895), 400; Jan (1895), 438-9 (pg. 438 misplaced the ‘bracket’: [λάχετε... but pg. 439 printed it correctly); Jan (1899), 12-3; Smyth (1900), 529; Moens (1930), 14-15, 25, 119 (Moens chose to restore Weil’s choice in line-delination here because there was “enough room”); and Doutzaris (1934), 338.

⁴²³ Crusius (1984), 31, 34, 40-1.
Καφισίων ὑδάτων | ἱαθείσαι αἴτε ναίετε καλλίπωλον ἐδραν, | ὃ λαπαρᾶς ἀοίδιμοι βασιλεῖαι | Χάριτες Ἐρχομενοῦ, παλαιγόνων Μινυῶν ἐπίσκοποι, | κλῖτ’, ἐπεὶ εὐχόμαι.

You who received the Kaphisian waters as your allotment, and who dwell in a land of handsome steeds, O song-famed queens of rich Erchomenos, Graces, guardians of the ancient Minyians (heroes) – listen as I pray!

A. Fairbanks moved the line-break, printing λά[τε]. It is likely that some earlier edition may have agreed with him, but it is impossible to tell as most did not make use of proper line-delineation in their texts. Th. Reinach adopted this line-delineation in his FD edition, and it became the standard for all subsequent editions.

The primary reason to break the line one way or the other depends on how many letters are needed to fill in the initial lacuna of line 2. The end of line 1 is not necessarily a fixed location due to damage, and changing the length of the line by two letters has little import as to its length. The initial breaking as H. Weil (1893) proposed would leave far too much space at the beginning of line 2, requiring additional or alternate supplementation. The stone appears to have room for roughly 7 letters to the left of Σ in line 3, a lacuna perfectly filled by ΧΕΤΕΔΙΟ|Σ. The supplement seems sure, but is unavoidably dependent on the certainty of the restored reading of διοζ in line 3. The BCH Plate offers no clarity here, nor is the older photo in A. Bélis any help. Her more recent photograph and squeeze (and E. Pöhlmann’s photo) clearly reveal the ΛΑ at the end of the line, and show that the stone is broken diagonally along the edge of the A in

244 Fairbanks (1900), 119.

245 Reinach (1909-13), 152, 156; Powell (1925), 141-2, 146; Pöhlmann (1970), 58-9; Chailley (1979), 155; Käppel (1992), 388; Bélis (1992), 57; West (1992a), 6; West (1992b), 288; Hagel (2000), 124; Pöhlmann and West (2001), 62-3 (they actually avoided printing any break at all, avoiding the issue); and Furley and Bremer (2001), 85, 87.
such a way that one cannot ascertain if any letter ever followed. The most recent photograph reveals the same. It must be noted that several lines extend physically well beyond this point, and 31 characters is well within bounds, as nearby line 5 is assumed to have been 34 in length. However, to move \textbf{XETE} to line 2 would require different/additional supplementation to line 3.

2 | ΣΕ [. .] ΒΡΟΜΟΥΘΥΓΑΤΕΡΕΣΕΥΩΛ [ . . ]

The beginning of line 2 is heavily damaged, as is the end, however the remaining text allows for what seems to be a confident restoration of the line. H. Weil first restored this line as reading $\lambdaυχετε\Deltaιος$ $\epsilon[\rho\mu\tau\sigma\nu\upsilon\thetaυ\gamma\alpha\tau\epsilon\pi\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\nu\omega\lambda]$. The restorations are persuasive and have not been challenged. There is, however, some limited variance as to what remains visible on the stone.

No early edition claimed to find evidence of the $\Sigma$, in spite of uniform agreement on the supplement of $\Deltaιος$. Freshly examining the stone, E. Pöhlmann claimed to be able to see part of the $\Sigma$ on the stone, and he printed $\Deltaιος$. A. Bélis confirmed this reading upon her own examination. It was later printed as certain with no sub-linear

\hfill

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{246} Weil (1893), 576-7.
\textsuperscript{247} Weil (1893), 576-7; Reinach (1893), 48; Reinach (1894), Plate XXV; Monro (1894), 136; Crusius (1894), 31, 33; Jan (1895), 438-9; Gevaert (1895), 400; Jan (1899), 12-13; Smyth (1900), 529; Fairbanks (1900), 19; Reinach (1909-13), 152, 156; Powell (1925), 142, 146; Moens (1930), 15-16, 25, 119; and Doutzaris (1934), 338.
\textsuperscript{249} Bélis (1992), 57. Bélis printed $\varsigma$ in her critical edition and musical score, but on page 58 in her commentary, she wrote that the identification of the partial character as $\Sigma$ is “assure.”
dot by Pöhlmann and West. Bélis estimated that the initial lacuna consisted of about 7 letters (the line immediately below serves as a *comparandum*), and based on the partial (but certain) reading of Σ, reaffirmed Weil’s restoration as the correct one. Looking at the stone, it is possible (and convenient) that the space could indeed be filled with 7 letters, if they were as widely spaced as in the line below, but more could conceivably fit, further complicated in that the preceding line has no firm end-point. Based on the proposed restorations of the Title Line and line 3, line 2 could very easily include all of λάχετε without surpassing either in physical length, leaving a possible lacuna of 7 to 9 letters, depending on the surety of the Σ and the spacing employed. In the absence of any other proposed supplements, those of Weil remain reasonable, persuasive, and likely, if not completely certain. The *BCH* Plate is too blurry here. The oldest photograph in A. Bélis is not incompatible with her claims of seeing the bottom horizontal stroke of the Σ as her sketch on page 55 suggests. Her own photograph and squeeze (and E. Pöhlmann’s photo) make the presence of a short, horizontal stroke quite clear. It could easily belong to a Σ, but it would also not be impossible as part of an Ω or an Ε, neither of which immediately present a likely restoration. The stroke remains clear in the most recent photograph.

Immediately following this trace is a clearly visible E, although the top right of the letter is damaged, and the following 2 letters have been completely lost. The vertical, left, stroke of the B is missing, but enough of the letter remains for the reading to be a

---

250 Pöhlmann and West (2001), 62-3. They cited Bélis (1992) for this reading. This sure Σ was also printed by West (1992b), 288 (although this may simply be due to lack of sub-linear dots), and Hagel (2001), 124 (who generally followed West’s text). Furley and Bremer (2001), 85 intentionally printed the certain Σ.

251 Bélis (1992), 58.
confident one, and the restoration of ἐριβρομομου is certain. Every edition since H. Weil (1893) proposed it has accepted this reading. The presence of this word beside the restored Διὸς is somewhat problematic, as has been noticed by nearly all of the editors. Most resolve the difficulty by equating the word with the less Dionysian ἐριβρεμέτης, but the fact remains that the reading here is secure, and this epithet nowhere else appears with Zeus. All photographs and reproductions present the same evidence.

At the end of the line there is damage and letters have been lost, but the beginning of line 4 remains, making the lacuna less difficult to restore. H. Weil claimed to be able to read traces of an E on the stone, and printed εὐόλε[νοι]. O. Crusius confused the matter somewhat, printing ΕΥΩΛ in his epigraphical transcription, but εὐόλε in his critical edition. In his fresh examination of the stone, E. Pöhlmann was unable to find any trace of an E. In her own examination, A. Bélis also found no trace of the E on the stone, and moreover, she also claimed to find no evidence for it on the available

252 Weil (1893), 576-7. Monro (1894), 136 mistakenly printed λά[χετε Διὸς ἐρἱβρόμου (he did not print vowel doublings). Smyth (1900), 529 also misplaced brackets, printing λὰ[χετε Διὸς ἐρἱβρόμου.

253 Cf. Weil (1893), 577 where he compared to Homer, Iliad 13.624: Ζηνὸς ἐριβρεμέτεω, but Moens (1930), 14-16 reminded (quite importantly) the reader of the Homeric Hymn to Dionysos, 56: εἰμὶ δ’ ἐγὼ Διόνυσος ἐρίβρομος.

254 Note: it is unlikely that a stone-carving error has occurred, as the letters are clear, and the only other option worth considering, that P ought to be Π is disproved easily by the grammar. Both ἐπὶβρομέω and ἐπιβρεμέω occur only as verbs and expect objects.

255 West (1893), 576-7. This reading was followed by Reinach (1893), 587; Reinach (1894), Plate XXV; Monro (1894), 136; Jan (1895), 438-9; Gevaert (1895), 400; Jan (1899), 12-13; Fairbanks (1900), 119; Reinach (1909-13), 152, 156; Powell (1925), 142, 146; and Doutzaris (1934), 338.

256 Crusius (1894), 31, 34. Even less helpful, he completely left out the brackets in his musical score on page 154. The placement of the bracket as εὐόλε[νοι was followed by Smyth (1900), 529 and Moens (1930), 15-16, 25, 118.

reproduced documents. In her opinion, Reinach was misled by the abrupt break in the stone.  

The final letters ΩΛ remaining on the stone are quite clear, but damage to the stone has removed any characters which might follow. No traces of the E remain. While it is difficult to see on the BCH Plate and the oldest photo in A. Bélis, her more recent photograph and squeeze (and E. Pöhlmann’s photo) make it clear that the stone is broken in such a way that no place remains for any trace to have been visible. The most recent photo reveals the same. The supplement is reasonable and gives good sense, in spite of being perhaps unusual as an epithet for the Muses (as will be discussed at greater length in the literary commentary), and no other options are readily available. It is worth noting that the proposed addition of 4 characters after ΩΛ excessively extends the line to 36 characters, making it the longest line in the poem, and also quite likely the longest in physical length, particularly as the extant ΥΩΛ is written with very wide spacing.

3 ΜΟΛΕΤΕΣΥΝΟΜΑΙΜΟΝΙΝΑΦΟΙΟΙΒΟΙΔΑΕ[   ]

This line is in fair shape. While the stone is broken on the left, most of the initial character Μ is visible. The lost portion of the lines above has a horizontal break edge just above this line. However, it is not perfectly straight and there is some damage to a few letters towards the left side of the line belonging to the first 2 words. The end of the line is broken away, but enough text remains, including the beginning of line 4, to allow for a very limited lacuna which may be restored with some confidence.

258 Bélis (1992), 57, 59. This may be the case, however it must be remembered that Weil first published the text with the E as present by traces.
H. Weil initially printed μόλετε, a reading that has been universally accepted, excepting some variance as to the visibility of the T.²⁵⁹ P.W. Moens erroneously thought ΤΕΣΥ destroyed, placing them all within brackets, but she accepted the standard restoration of the words.²⁶⁰ O. Crusius printed the stone as reading ΜΟΛΕΤΕ in his epigraphical text, indicating that TE was only partially visible, but retained μόλετε in his critical edition.²⁶¹ E. Pöhlmann, in a fresh examination of the stone, claimed to read ΜΟΛΕΤΕ, with the T a sure reading.²⁶² A. Bélis’ own examination of the stone confirmed this reading.²⁶³ The BCH Plate and earliest photo in Bélis are unhelpful here, but in her more recent photograph and squeeze one may see that the reading is certain, even with the center and right sections of the horizontal stroke of T missing. The vertical left stroke of the following Ε is also damaged, but enough of the 3 horizontal strokes remain to easily identify the letter. ΣΥ are quite clear and undamaged. Pöhlmann’s photo is more difficult to read, but the same traces can be seen with effort. On the most recent photograph, the traces of the T remain visible, but the E is now nearly unreadable.

²⁵⁹ Weil (1893), 576-7. The reading of μόλετε was followed by Reinach (1893), 587; Reinach (1894), Plate XXV; Jan (1899), 12-13; Fairbanks (1900), 119; Reinach (1909-13), 152, 156; Powell (1925), 142, 146; and Doutzaris (1934), 338. It is likely that the μόλετα printed by Monro (1894), 136 and Gevaert (1895), 400 is due to misprints.

²⁶⁰ Moens (1930), 16, 25,119. She initially misrepresented the perceived lacuna as being 2 rather than 4 characters in length (page 16), and she also forgot to mark the resulting musical lacuna above, but she did adopt the standard restoration of the line.

²⁶¹ Crusius (1894) 31, 34, 41. It would seem that Smyth (1900), 529 and Jan (1895), 438-9 followed Crusius’ epigraphical edition here, but it is also possible that the use of font-weights rather than brackets by Jan has allowed for an easy misprint here, at least for his text.


²⁶³ Bélis (1992), 57, 59. She was followed by Pöhlmann and West (2001), 62-3; and Furley and Bremer (2001), 85.
The reading of συνόμαιμον is clear and uncontested insofar as the characters are concerned. The word which they spell is somewhat more problematic. While a more detailed consideration of the philological problems will be deferred to the literary commentary, it is worth commenting briefly on it here. O. Crusius drew attention to the fact that this word is generally late, and rare—factors that lead him to wish for a reading of συνομαιμον' instead. He noted, however, that the melody requires the accent over the O. 264 Th. Reinach was of the opinion that this was the very reason the author selected the form which he did, avoiding conflict between accent and the melody which descends over the MAI; other scholars have agreed with him. 265 That the author is happy to subordinate traditional means and forms to his musical and poetic needs is a repeated phenomenon in this text. The unprecedented use of ἐριβρόμουμου with Zeus in line 2 and the unusual syllabification of πετέρας in line 5 can be taken as examples. H. Weil and all of the earliest editions printed ὠιδαε[ι]σι, indicating that they could read an I. 266 In his FD edition, Th. Reinach changed the reading to ὠιδαε[ι]σι. 267 P.W. Moens erroneously claimed that Weil had read ὠιδαε[ι]σι, a reading she favors. 268 Freshly examining the stone, E. Pöhlmann said he found no trace of the I, and printed

265 Reinach (1909-13), 154; Powell (1925), 145; Moens (1930), 16.
266 Weil (1893), 576-7; Reinach (1983), 587; Crusius (1894), 31, 34; Reinach (1894), Plate XXV; Monro (1894), 136; Gevaert (1895), 400; Jan (1895), 438-9; Jan (1899), 12-13; Fairbanks (1900), 119; Smyth (1900), 529; and Doutzaris (1934), 338. Hagel (2000), 124 seems a special case due to adding of vowel doubling when relying on West (1992b), a text that did not print doubled-vowels, and hence needed no brackets here.
267 Reinach (1909-13), 152-6. He was followed by Powell (1925), 142, 146.
268 Moens (1930), 16-17, 25, 119. She stated that the composer separates the two sounds, which both occur over the length of a syllable—the inscription visually separates them.
A. Bélis, in her own examination of the stone, agreed with Pöhlmann. Furthermore, Bélis claimed that the older photographs and reproductions also offered no evidence of the letter’s existence. She did, however, feel that the restoration was certain.

The BCH Plate is unhelpful here, as is the oldest photo in Bélis. However, Pöhlmann’s photo, Bélis’ more recent photograph and squeeze, as well as the most recent photo, reveal that while a significant portion of the final E is missing, enough of the top horizontal and left vertical strokes survive to assure the reading. The presence of a superscript melody note written just to the upper-right of the E all but assures the loss of at least one more character: the possibilities being a vowel, two vowels, a vowel + consonant, or (less likely) a consonant + vowel. However, the presence of anything other than a bare I is extremely unlikely, as the ending of the word is clear and undamaged at the beginning of line 4. Elsewhere in the hymn, AI doubles into either AEI or AIEI. While I is irredeemably absent from the stone, the restored reading is certain.

4 ΣΙΜΕΛΨΗΤΕΧΡΥΣΕΟΚΟΜΑΝΟΣΑΝΑΔΙΚΟΡΥΝ
5 ΒΑΙΠΑΡΝΑΣΣΙΔΟΣΤΑΣΔΕΠΕΤΕΡΑΣΕΔΡΑΝΑΜ [ ]


270 Bélis (1992), 57, 59. The presence of the vowel doubling may be based on a simple argument: lines may not end with a musical note; rather, the note is placed either directly above the last letter, or to its left. Cf. lines 4, 6, 11. There remains the visible trace of a superscript note just to the right of the final extant E, indicating the loss of a final vowel or syllable. She was followed by Pöhlmann and West (2001), 62-3 and Furley and Bremer (2001), 85.

271 Cf. line 5/6 ἀγακλαυταίς, line 12 αἰείθει, line 14 αειόλοιοις.
While there is some abrasion to the stone surface, there is no difficulty in establishing the reading of line 4. There was some initial difficulty in establishing the word broken between lines 4 and 5, but it has since been resolved. Abrasive damage to the first letter of line 5 caused problems for those earliest editors who relied on photographs alone. H. Weil initially read δικόρυν|ια, or possibly δικόρυν|εια, as he felt the first letter of line 5 to be uncertain. Either would be a new coinage, equivalent in meaning (in his view) from δικόρυφα. The latter half of the new form would be drawn from κορίνη. It is far more likely, however, that it is derived from κόρυμβος.\footnote{Weil (1893), 576-7. Both readings are understandable as the upright left ligature is most visible. Easy association was made with δικόρυφος, as it appears in Limenios’ hymn, line 2, in reference to Parnassos. Monro (1894), 136 followed, printing δικόρυφα. Chantraine (1968), s.v. κόρυμβος suggested that there may be a phonetic relationship with κορίνη, perhaps due to a nasal pronunciation. He also noted s.v. κορυφή, that Hesychios s.v. Κ.3732, glosses κόρυφος as κόρυμβος γυναικεῖος, οί δὲ μαλλόν, τὰ τῶν παιδίων σκυλύφια.} H. Weil initially read δικόρυν|ια, or possibly δικόρυν|εια, as he felt the first letter of line 5 to be uncertain. Either would be a new coinage, equivalent in meaning (in his view) from δικόρυφα. The latter half of the new form would be drawn from κορίνη. It is far more likely, however, that it is derived from κόρυμβος.\footnote{Reinach (1893), 587.} In 1894, Weil corrected his reading, restoring the word confidently as δικόρυν|βια; he credited his colleague Blass for pointing out the B to him.\footnote{Weil (1894), 360. Having had the B shown to him, his response was that, “cela est clair comme le jour.”} O. Crusius rejected Weil’s initial reconstructions, which he thought “unbelegbar und höchst wunderlich.” He agreed that the word must actually mean something like δικόρυφα. In Crusius’ epigraphical transcription, he simply left out the letter of difficulty, but printed it as a B in his critical edition. He asserted that the orthography had been intentionally modified due to considerations of vocal technique; δικόρυφα had been modified to be printed as δικόρυνβα (δικόρυμβα). It was also his assertion that the coincidence of melody and accent supported this interpretation. The modified form allows for the accent to be
displaced.\textsuperscript{275} Reinach, and most other editions, adopted this reading.\textsuperscript{276} Some few editions have modified their text to read \textit{δικόρυμβα}.\textsuperscript{277} P. Doutzaris saw an additional possibility in \textit{δικόρυν\|να}, a form that could be argued by the same means as \textit{δικόρυν\|βα}, and one which would also fulfill the demands of melody and accent.\textsuperscript{278} A. Bélis, however, saw no metrical reason to prefer his reading, and the clear visibility of the \textit{B} disqualifies it further—as a reading, \textit{δικόρυν\|να} is both unnecessary and impossible.\textsuperscript{279}

The \textit{BCH} Plate is too blurry here, as is the oldest photo in Bélis. The initial \textit{B} of line 5 is not visible at all on Bélis’ squeeze (Plate V.2), but it can be seen on her photograph of the stone (Plate V.1), as well as in E. Pöhlmann’s photo of the stone (Abb. 17). While the surface is heavily abraded, the engraving went deep enough that one can still make out the \textit{B}, along with the superscript musical note, and the left stroke of the following \textit{A}. The traces of the \textit{B} remain just barely visible on the most recent photo. It is somewhat curious that the engraver chose to break the word at all, as there is plenty of room at the end of line 4, perhaps even enough to include the first syllable of \textit{Παρνασσίδος}.

\textsuperscript{275} Crusius (1894), 31, 34, 41-42. In his epigraphical edition, he printed nothing for the first letter of line 5, but in his critical text he printed a confident \textit{B}. He noted that \textit{Lukian, Charon} 5. 24 reads: καὶ ἐπείπερ δικόρυμβος ὁ Παρνασσίδος ἔστι. He noted the unusual use of \textit{ν} rather than \textit{μ}, but found extant examples of similar practice in compound words in papyri and inscriptions (e.g. Herodas, \textit{Mimiambi} 6.44: τί μ’ ἐνβλέπεις γελῶσα).

\textsuperscript{276} Reinach (1894), Plate XXV; Jan (1895), 438-9; Jan (1899), 12-13; Fairbanks (1900), 229; Reinach (1909-13), 152, 156; Pöhlmann (1970), 58-9; Chailley (1979), 155; Käppel (1992), 388; Pöhlmann and West (2001), 62-3; and Furley and Bremer (2001), 85; Smyth (1900), 529 printed δικόρυν[β]α, as did Moens (193), 17-8, 25, 119.

\textsuperscript{277} Gevaert (1895), 400; Powell (1925), 142, 145 (although Powell did note the \textit{N} on the stone in his apparatus, pg. 145); West (1992b), 289; and Hagel (2000), 124.

\textsuperscript{278} Doutzaris (1934), 317, 338.

\textsuperscript{279} Bélis (1992), 57, 60. She also addressed the old proposal of Weil to read δικορόννα (a possibility due to the damage on the stone), which she disqualified by remarking that the melodic pitch \textit{falls over} \textit{ν}, the accented syllable, which is avoided by rules of melodic composition.
The rest of line 5 is legible, except for the end where it appears a single letter has been lost. However, while there is no confusion over the actual lettering on the stone, the word πετέρας offers some difficulty. H. Weil thought that πετέρας was a mistake by the engraver, and ought instead to have been written as πεέτρας. 280 The reason for this reading, as opposed to simply removing an extra E, is that the inscription appears to indicate three separate melody notes for the word. O. Crusius simply printed πετέρας without comment. 281 Th. Reinach insisted that it was no error, but rather an intentional, modified spelling of πέτρας. He saw the same necessity as Weil in preserving three syllables for the sung melody, but argued that, since short vowels (ε) followed by a mute + liquid (τρ) do not split or double, it was better to resolve the matter by reduplicating the E between the consonants. Aware that the spelling was unprecedented, Reinach still felt it necessary and justifiable. 282 J. Powell and P.W. Moens both agreed with Reinach’s reasoning. 283 This solution is not entirely unreasonable, as the poet frequently displays a

280 Weil (1893), 577.
281 Crusius (1894), 31, 34, 42.
282 Reinach (1909-13), 154. Bélis (1992), 60-61 provided a more in-depth and extended explanation: πέτρας written as it should be properly spelled scans as v- (cf. πέτρας in line 3 of Hymn 2), since the short vowel remains short before an occlusive (voiced or silent) + liquid or nasal. She offered a total of 11 analogues from the two Delphic hymns (cf. chart on page 61, derived from the work of Louchart, J.-M. (1968) Rythme et mélodie dans les hymnes delphiques, Mémoire de maîtrise, Nanterre, 7-9. As such, no argument can be made that a doubling of the short E to obtain an extra syllable is possible, while keeping the occlusive + liquid as is. Thus, Weil’s solution is in error, as is Doutzaris’, who followed Weil in his musical transcription (1934), 338. If the word is to have 3 notes/syllables, it must be read πετέρας, which scans vv-.
283 Powell (1925), 145; Moens (1930), 19.
willingness to bend the rules of orthography and spelling in order to compel the text to submit to metrical, melodic, or poetic needs.

M.L. West proposed a different explanation. He argued that the spelling was only a graphical aid to ensure that the singer correctly syllabified when singing, and did not reflect the insertion of a sung third syllable.\(^{284}\) The extra E indicates, in his view, that T and P belong to separate syllables, and thus the word should be sung \(\pi\varepsilon\tau\rho\alpha\zeta\) and not \(\pi\varepsilon\tau\rho\alpha\zeta\). This, of course, creates a melodic problem, as earlier editors had assumed three notes for this word based on the positioning of the notation above. M.L. West resolves this difficulty by re-associating the superscript notes with different syllables, even words.\(^{285}\) West comments that there had been a similar difficulty with the preceding \(\tau\alpha\upsilon\sigma\delta\epsilon\) having a single melody note positioned directly over the first A, which would then have to be sung over the second A as well. According to the rules of notation, the double printing of A in \(\tau\alpha\upsilon\sigma\delta\epsilon\) is orthographically unnecessary—there is no need to double a vowel already long for rhythm, and it cannot make sense as an indication to double the sung note, as it applies to both vowels, thus lacking any articulation.\(^{286}\) The

\(^{284}\) West (1968), 176.

\(^{285}\) He refrains from describing the (dis)placement of the notes as ‘error’ on the engraver’s part, but it is hard to see how it can be anything else if West was correct. His argument required two separate notation marks to each be placed two characters too far to the right.

\(^{286}\) Reinach (1909-13), 154. He proposed that the melody note over -\(\tau\alpha\zeta\), due to the doubling, must indicate some sort of tremolo. He noted a similar instance in Limenios’ hymn (1.26) in the case of \(\Lambda\upsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\omicron\zeta\). (Pg. 161). No notes are printed over \(\Lambda\alpha\omicron\zeta\), the pitch being taken from the note printed over the final syllable of the preceding \(\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\). Reinach (1894), Plate XXV followed the stone, printing \(\tau\alpha\upsilon\sigma\delta\epsilon\) with two 8\textsuperscript{th} notes of the same pitch over the doubled vowel. (Cf. Gevaert (1895), 459 where he commented on aspiration technique permitting a single vowel sound to audibly take up two 8\textsuperscript{th} notes of the same pitch). One alternative to a tremolo is to improvise a passing tone. Jan (1895), 439 printed a conjectured 2\textsuperscript{nd} note for the syllable, a passing tone moving to the next written note. Bélis (1992), 57, also printed a passing tone, and on pg. 60 offered an extended discussion of the matter to which a reader is referred—yet she retains a 3-syllable \(\pi\varepsilon\tau\rho\alpha\zeta\). Her solution of passing tone is as problematic as assuming carver error for either notes or text. To base a claim on the comparison with Limenios 26 is not helpful; in the case of \(\Lambda\upsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\omicron\zeta\) there is no room for a passing tone, as the melody rises by octave leap over \(\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\), and then rises a single whole step on
note must change for the doubling of the vowel to make any sense. Rather than positing a missing note lost to damage to the stone, West simply borrows the next note, assuming that the stone-carver erred in displacing the next two notes too far to the right. Rather than have three syllables sung with the same note, he simply removes the extraneous one. West’s solution has not convinced editors, or perhaps they are not aware of it, as A. Bélis printed the traditional form, providing a passing tone to ταᾶδε, and she kept the 3 syllable πτέρας—with no mention made of West’s 1968 note. Moreover W. Furley and J. Bremer retained the traditional form as well. Perhaps most surprisingly, the joint 2001 edition by Pöhlmann and West (which does print the modified melody) does not adopt a two syllable reading of πτέρας, and makes no mention that such a reading is even a possibility. As this text presents an eccentric nature in choice of word and orthography at times, it is likely best to take the stone ‘as is’ when possible rather than attempt to make it conform to editorial preference or expectations.

the final syllable of Λαατοῦς. West (1992b), 298 arbitrarily (without comment) simply shifted two notes to the left a syllable each, once again, to resolve the difficulty. When the melody does change, it then remains on the new pitch for several syllables: -τοῦς ἐρατο[...] demonstrating that it is entirely acceptable and common for melodic pitch to remain stationary for multiple syllables. Unfortunately, this leaves the problematic spelling unresolved. West’s solution, while musically appealing, presupposes considerable error on part of the mason, requires a parallel error to explain the phenomenon in Limenios 26. Pöhlmann’s reluctance to accept West’s solution can be seen in his 1970 edition published 2 years later, wherein he simply reprinted what is found on the stone (pgs. 58-9), with no mention made of West’s argument; and also, in their joint 2001 edition, the melodic correction was displaced to the apparatus for the epigraphical edition, although the ‘corrected’ melody is adopted wholesale in the musical score—this was true for both of the discussed cases.

287 Bélis (1992), 57, 60-61.
The end of line 5 is missing, but consensus has limited the loss to a single letter. Initial confusion over the reading of the first letter of line 6 led to a muddle not only over restoration, but the associated matter of word division—it is worth noting that this inscription does not print elided final vowels: cf. line 7, νάματ’ ἑπινίσται, and line 15, δ’ ᾃδοθροβ[ἱ]. When H. Weil first published the text, his edition printed ἔδρανα μ[ε] | Τα κληταιείς. However, in his commentary, he noted that one could alternatively read the first letter of line 6 as a Γ, producing the reading ἔδραν’ ἅμ’ [ᾶ] | γακληταιείς. The version Weil printed in his edition (with the Τ) was adopted by several of the earliest editions. In his 1894 edition, Weil corrected his earlier edition, now sure that the letter was a Γ. This became the consensus reading and was followed by all later editions; Reinach, Pöhlmann, and Bélis all confirmed the presence of a Γ on the stone, removing the sub-linear dot.

All reproductions reveal most of the final Μ on line 5. The right vertical stroke is missing, but the identification is secure. Neither the BCH Plate nor the oldest photo in Bélis are clear enough to be useful for the beginning of line 6, however in Pöhlmann’s photo, Bélis’ own photo and squeeze, as well as the most recent photograph, a Γ is

---

290 This is due in part at least to the fact that with the supplemented [A] the line comes in very long at 34 characters.

291 Weil (1893), 576, 577.

292 Notably Reinach (1893), 587 and Crusius (1894), 31 (the epigraphical edition indicated a degree of uncertainty regarding the T), 34, 42 (he noted Weil’s alternative reading), 154 (Crusius left off the brackets in his musical score here.). Monro (1894), 136 oddly printed [με]Γα. Jan (1895), 438-9 left out the bracketing entirely.

293 Weil (1894), 360.

294 Reinach (1894), Plate XXV; Jan (1899), 12-13; Fairbanks (1900), 19; Smyth (1900), 530; Reinach (1909-13), 152, 156 (his music edition forgot the brackets here); Powell (1925), 142, 146; Moens (1930), 19, 25, 119; Doutzaris (1934), 338; Pöhlmann (1970), 58-9; Chailley (1979), 155; Käppel (1992), 388; Bélis (1992), 57; Pöhlmann and West (2001), 62-3; and Furley and Bremer (2001), 85. This reading was printed, but without any brackets by Gevaert (1895), 400; West (1992b), 289; and Hagel (2000), 124.
clearly visible. To read a Τ would require the editor to assume that the upper left ligature
had been damaged and lost (the stone does display some abrasion here), but a quick
comparison with the Τ in κλυταιεῖς shows the proportions to favor Γ.

7 ΕΟΥΥΔΡΟΥΝΑΜΑΤΕΠΙΝΙΣΕΤΑΙΔΕΛΦΟΝΑΝΑ

There are no epigraphical difficulties with the reading of this line. The left side of
the bottom stroke of the initial Ε is broken and missing, but identification is certain.

8 [ΩΝΑΜΑΑΝΤΕΙΕΙΟΝΕΦΕΙΩΝΠΙΑΓΩΝ]

The beginning of line 8 is damaged. H. Weil first proposed [πρ]ωνα, and all
future editors have been content to accept the restoration.295 The stone is broken here, and
no trace of the missing letters remains. Comparison with the lines immediately above
suggests space for two letters. The bottom left horizontal stroke of the initial Ω is
missing, but identification is easy and certain.

The line break between 8 and 9 coincides with the presence of an aniceps syllable,
and the end of the first strophe. The ‘indentation’ at the line’s end that has been remarked
upon by several editors as potentially offering a visual indication of the end of a period
seems rather to be simple coincidence.296 As a visual cue, it is not overly remarkable,
insofar as the line’s length (28 letters) is not excessively short compared to other lines—
other lines on the stone (cf. lines 4 and 6) reach a similar physical length, and line 11 just

295 Weil (1893), 576-7.
296 Cf. Weil (1893), 571; Bélis (1992), 61.
below on the stone appears at least 2 wide letter spaces shorter. While there is merit to the idea that a free instrumental interlude might occur between strophes, Th. Reinach’s suggestion that the presence of the indentation offers any support for the practice cannot be accepted as there is a lack of regularity to the separation of strophes on the stone. In line 16, where the break between Strophes 2 and 3 occurs in mid-line, they appear to be marked by a gap of slightly less than a single character; whereas in line 27, no visual break at all is offered between the end of Strophe 3 and the beginning of the final strophe. It is likely that the ability to begin a new line concomitantly with a new strophe is simply fortuitous rather than planned, and it is inappropriate to refer to this as a significant performative marking of any kind. On the other hand, one good reason to support intentionality would be the proposed restoration of [ἵν] κλυτᾶ as the beginning of line 9. The first word could easily have fit into the end of line 8. As a compromise, it is perhaps best to allow the engraver to have taken the opportunity to indicate strophe breaks when presented, but not to read anything more from blank space on the stone.

---

297 It would have been impossible to squeeze all of Ἀφαιστος into the space remaining at the end of the line, and so the mason chose to break the word after the first syllable. One could argue that he placed the initial A at the end of line 11, rather than starting a new line with a new word, in order to portray the continuance of the strophe. However, ὁ δὲ τεχιῶν clearly begins a new strophe as well, yet the engraver chose to continue filling up the space of line 16 – perhaps he did not want to leave so much of the line (roughly ¼) blank. However, the very short line 6 ends with the completion of a word, and the engraver chose not to begin, and break, εὐδῶρον to indicate continuance; the grammatical sense would be enough to indicate that more words must follow to complete the strophe, but this example shows a lack of consistency in how space is used and words are broken.

298 Reinach (1909-13), 154.
Strophe 2: Lines 9-16, Column 1, Inv. 517

9  [ ΚΛΥΤΑΜΕΓΑΛΟΠΟΛΙΣΛΘΙΣΕΥΧΑΙ ]
10  [ ΣΙΦΕΡΟΠΛΟΙΟΝΑΙΟΥΣΑΤΡΙΤΣΣΩΙΔΟΣΔΑ ]

The beginning of line 9 is damaged with roughly 2 letters completely missing. H. Weil offered ["Ἰθι"] as a likely supplement, conceding that his interpretation (and resulting supplement) was the product of a great deal of effort—“beaucoup de tâtonnements”—but Weil thought the restoration simple and obvious once pointed out to the reader.²⁹⁹ Th. Reinach initially followed this supplement.³⁰⁰ O. Crusius preferred to restore πάρεστι, suggesting that it could be shorted to [πάρα], or even [πάρ] if necessary due to the brevity of the lacuna; Crusius noted that this expression was common in lyric, and further explained that Doric lyric in particular offered a precedent for the form πάρ.³⁰¹ H. Weil later modified his supplement. He claimed that he was tempted for a moment—“mais un instant seulement”—by Crusius’ suggestion, but insisted that the space was insufficient for four characters, or even three, explaining that Ιθι was possible only because of the iotas. Instead, Weil supplemented ["] Ην. He credited Th. Reinach with the idea, supplying the recently discovered paean to Dionysos as precedent with its invocation of

²⁹⁹ Weil (1893), 576-7.
³⁰⁰ Reinach (1893), 587. This reading was also followed by Monro (1894), 136 and Doutzaris (1934), 317, 339.
³⁰¹ Crusius (1894), 34, 44. While aware that πάρα does not typically elide, he noted that this does not apply in Doric instances. In note 53, he raised the matter of Aeschylus, Eumenides, 31: καὶ πάρ᾽ Ἑλλήνοιν τινές, where there has been some dispute as to whether πάρ’ should be read as πάρεισι here. In any case, it is Crusius’ assertion that πάρ is at least allowable. His supplement was followed by Jan (1895), 440-1.
“Ἡν, τότε βακχίαζε μὲν…”\textsuperscript{302} Fresh examinations of the stone by E. Pöhlmann and A. Bélis have yielded no gains here, except that Bélis believed that the space available not only ruled out \textit{πάρ}, but \textit{ιθι} as well.\textsuperscript{303} All editions subsequent to Weil (1894) accepted this supplement.\textsuperscript{304} While not certain, “Ἡν is a reasonable supplement.\textsuperscript{305} Pöhlmann’s photograph reveals that the diagonal strokes of the K remain, but the stone is completely broken away to the left. His is the clearest image, and the other photographs reveal nothing more.

H. Weil noted that \textit{Ἀθθίς} must stand for \textit{Ἀτθίς}, which he understood to be a feminine form for Attica—here, in Weil’s estimation, referring to a procession of Attic women.\textsuperscript{306} The spelling should be considered intentional, as line 17 of the work contains \textit{Ἀθθίδα}, and no editions have felt the need to add any concern for the spelling. The use of the double Θ is unusual orthography, particularly insofar as Limenios’ hymn line 14 read κλυτάν ΑΤΟΙΔΕΠΙ, restored to read \textit{Ἀτθίδ}’ ἐπὶ. The horizontal stroke of the Θ is

\textsuperscript{302} Weil (1894), 360-1, and note 2 on page 360. Philodeamos Scarpheus, \textit{Paean in Dionysum}, 14. An unusual hymn, as the author appears comfortable conflating the two Delphic deities: Εὐοί̓ οи [Ἰοβ][αχ]’ ὦ ι εἶ Παιάν is sung multiple times as the hymn progresses.

\textsuperscript{303} Bélis (1992), 65; Powell (1925), 145 had also found space lacking for anything more than two characters.

\textsuperscript{304} Reinach (1894), Plate XXV; Gevaert (1895), 401; Jan (1899), 14-15; Fairbanks (1900), 119; Smyth (1900), 530; Reinach (1909-13), 152, 154, 157; Powell (1925), 142, 147; Moens (1930), 26, 36, 119; Pöhlmann (1970), 58-9; Chailley (1979), 156; Käppel (1992), 388; Bélis (1992), 64; West (1992b), 290; Hagel (2000), 124; Pöhlmann and West (2001), 64-5; and Furley and Bremer (2001), 85.

\textsuperscript{305} The supplement is reasonable, and presents what surely may be meant by whichever word has been lost; therefore, I include it in the edition. However, as any certainty is lacking, I will exclude this word from the later philological commentary.

\textsuperscript{306} Weil (1893) 577-8. A degree of caution is merited, as assumptions as to the meaning of these lines influences the readings, supplements, and interpretation of grammar. The word is well attested; it is an adjective that often functions as a noun. Yet, for it to refer substantively to the rather than Attica proper is something of a stretch. In spite of being feminine, it is exceedingly unlikely (and unnecessary) that it refers to a procession led by \textit{women}—the \textit{theoria} itself could be referred to here, or Athens itself, poetically present.
missing, but is obvious that the more traditional orthography was intended here. A quick search of the TLG has turned up no further instances of αθθι.

The right edge of the stone is heavily damaged and most lines in this strophe require some supplementation. The actual words to be restored are rarely in doubt, but there is concern to discover where, precisely, word-breaks are made, and whether unexpected spellings are used. The end of line 9 is broken away, and there is some damage to the beginning of line 10. Weil restored εὐχαιε[ἰσι], theorizing that no letter following ΕΥΧΑΙΕ on line 9 had been lost. 307 In his first edition, Reinach printed εὐχαιε[ἰσι]. 308 D. Monro (1894) and C. Jan (1895) removed (possibly in error) the brackets entirely. 309 O. Crusius contributed to the confusion by printing ΕΥΧΑΙΕ in his transcription, εὐχαιε[ἰσι] in his edition, and εὐχαι[ἰσι] in his commentary. 310 Several early editions followed Crusius’ presumed restoration of εὐχαιε[ἰσι]. 311 In Reinach’s critical FD edition, he suggested a new supplement of εὐχαιε[ἰσσι]. Reinach claimed to be able to see the bottom of an Ι following εὐχαιε at the break (he allowed that G. Colin saw nothing there). He reasoned that there was space for two letters at the beginning of line 10, and that Weil’s [ΙΣ] would be insufficient. These factors led Reinach to suggest an inadvertent error by the stone-cutter. He confused the matter somewhat by suggesting the ΣΣ as a supplement, but actually printing εὐχαιε[ἰσι] in his transcription, and

---

307 Weil (1893), 576, 578.
308 Reinach (1893), 588. Gevaert (1895), 401 followed his reading.
309 Monro (1894), 137; Jan (1895), 400-1. Other musical editions have done similarly; cf. West (1992b), 290 (does not double the vowels) and Hagel (2000), 124 (who did double the vowels).
310 Crusius (1894), 31, 34, 44. His epigraphical representation included just the slightest hint that he might see something of the I at the end of the line, but it may also be a stray dust mark.
311 Reinach (1894), Plate XXV; Jan (1899), 14-15; Fairbanks (1900), 119; Smyth (1900), 530; and Doutzaris (19134), 339.
εὐχαίεσι in his edition.\footnote{Reinach (1909-13), 152, 154, 157.} J. Powell followed Reinach’s more tentative restoration of εὐχαίε|σι.\footnote{Powell (1925), 142. In his musical score on 147 he left out the brackets.} P.W. Moens rejected Reinach’s reading of an Ι at the end of line 9, and claimed to be able to read [,]Σ at the beginning of line 10. She restored the text as εὐχαίε|σι. Moens conceded that this was an odd way to break a word, but justified it as another example of the stone-carver’s apparently random approach to handling word-breaks at the ends of lines.\footnote{Moens (1930), 28-30, 36, 119.} This is a problematic claim on her part, as there are no extant examples in this text where stone-carver breaks a word in mid-syllable. In line 12/13 ὁμου|ον is split, but evenly divided with the doubled diphthong. It is true that many lines are damaged, preventing certainty, but Moen’s claim here has little merit. E. Pöhlmann, freshly examining the stone, read εὐχαίε|σι, following Moen’s restoration, but he did cite Reinach’s supplement in his notes.\footnote{Pöhlmann (1970), 58-9. He was followed by Chailley (1979), 156, Käppel (1992), 388, and Furley and Bremer (2001), 85 (Furley and Bremer removed the vowel doubling and line-delineation.).} A. Bélis, in agreement with Reinach’s reading of the stone and the possibility of stonecutter error, commented that the cracked edge of the stone appears as if it could present the trace of an Ι. She added that the spacing of the letters is the same as ΜΑΑΝΤΕΙΕΙΟΝ in line 8, meaning that |σι is too short to fill the lacuna at the line beginning. She estimated that the initial group of 3 letters including the final Ι would take 28.5 mm, (measuring from the assumed position of the start of the line, which is expected to remain straight, being the edge of the column). Bélis noted that this is the exact measurement occupied by the ΣΣΙ in line 5 (ΠΑΡΝΑΣΣΙΔΟΣ). Moreover, she noted that Reinach’s suggestion is preferable in terms
of the word-break occurring at the end of a syllable—the expected practice. Bélis printed εὐχαέε[|]σι. Pöhlmann and West reverted to εὐχαεί|.|σι, but confused the matter by also printing εὐχαεί|σι. They knew both Reinach and Bélis’ editions, and specifically noted them here in their apparatus. The word itself is certain, but it remains difficult to know for sure exactly how the word is broken, if an unusual ΣΣ occurs here, and whether it is either intentional or accidental.

The end of line 9 is broken, just after the E. Neither the BCH Plate nor Pöhlmann’s photograph shows anything after the E. The oldest photo in Bélis suggests the presence of blank surface after the E, but is not clear enough to be sure. Bélis’ more recent photograph is clear, and shows that the surface is broken immediately following the E. It is just possible that a slight depression might derive from the bottom left apex of an Ι, but the heavily worn nature of the stone makes it doubtful. The squeeze reveals nothing. The most recent photograph is exceptionally clear here, and reveals the same ambiguous break/mark in the stone. If, however, an Ι does follow the E, it will have been spaced considerably further from the E than the Ι that immediately precedes it. The ‘traces’ remaining are insufficient to merit a sub-linear dot. The Ι should be placed within brackets. The beginning of line 10 is also damaged, with a piece of the stone missing. The Ι is clearly visible. E. Pöhlmann’s photograph suggests what appears to be the lower horizontal stroke of a Σ on the stone. The oldest photo in Bélis is too grainy here, but her more recent photo especially makes the horizontal stroke clear. It remains visible on the

---

316 Bélis (1992), 64-5. Her sketch on page 55 indicated the base of the Ι at the end of line 9, as well as the lower stroke of the Σ at the beginning of line 10. However, Plate 5.1 and 5.2 (Photo and Squeeze) lack the clarity to verify her sketch.

317 Pöhlmann and West (2001), 64.
most recent photograph. This photograph reveals that the stone has experienced significant wear, making the strokes a bit ‘fuzzy’ but the apparent horizontal stroke is perfectly in line with the base of the rest of the letters in the row. The reproductions also make clear that earlier proposed supplement of \([\Sigma]\) would be highly unlikely to fill the lacuna adequately. \([\Sigma]\Sigma\) is the better solution, but one should be reluctant to call it an ‘error’ on the part of the stone-cutter. Mistakes are made, yes, but there are other instances of clearly intentional deviation from expected practice. The \(\Sigma\) should remain dotted, as the proposed supplement is unusual, and only a partial stroke remains visible. No other options are apparent, but the eccentricity of the ‘solution’ suggests caution.

10 \[ \Sigma\Phi\epsilon\rho\rho\circ\iota\omicron\alpha\iota\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\tau\iota\tau\sigma\varsigma\omega\iota\delta\sigma\alpha[ \]
11 Δοναθραυστοναγισελεβωμοιοσινα

One or two letters are missing from the beginning of line 10, as discussed above. While not an epigraphical issue, per se, \(\Phi\epsilon\rho\circ\iota\omicron\alpha\) offers a textual difficulty. Th. Reinach remarked that the word breaks accent rules due to a rising melody.\(^{318}\) P.W. Moens felt that the difficulty was resolved by a revision of the reading of the superscript notes.\(^{319}\)

There is damage to the end of the line, requiring restoration of characters, but again the actual word is not in doubt as the beginning of line 11 remains intact. H. Weil

\(^{318}\) Reinach (1909-13), 155.

\(^{319}\) Moens (1930), 28. Reinach felt that the melody should rise up over RO as an accented letter-group. However Moens felt that it looks as if over the first syllable is found the sign N, and over RO an M, and then over ΠΛΟΙ an O as likely as an Θ. The difficulty is resolved thus because successively N, M, O produce a melody that rises and then falls with the high point on the accent mark. Bélis (1992), 65 also remarked on the apparent infractions of the rule of accent, suggesting it was perhaps to obtain a chromatic descent of “a very beautiful effect.”
supplied δά[πεδ]|δον, which was followed by most early editions.320 O. Crusius
introduced some confusion by printing ΔΑ[   ]|ΔΟΝ in his transcription, but δά[πεδ]|δον
in his edition.321 Th. Reinach clarified the matter in his critical edition, with δά[πεδ]|δον,
but his musical edition (which did not use sub-linear dots) printed δά[πεδ]|δον.322 E.
Pöhlmann, in his fresh examination of the stone, felt confident enough in his reading of
the Δ to print δά[πεδ]|δον, which all subsequent editions have accepted.323

The photographs show that lower right corner of the Δ at the end of line 10 is
broken, but the letter is clear. Nothing more can be seen following it. At the beginning of
line 11, the Δ is clearly visible in all the photographs, including the old BCH Plate
(except the old photo in Bélis) albeit worn, particularly on the bottom horizontal stroke.

11 ΔΟΝΑΘΡΑΣΤΟΝΑΠΩΛΕΒΩΜΟΙΣΙΝΑ
12 ΦΑΙΣΤΟΣΑΙΕΙΘΕ<Ι>ΝΕΩΝΗΡΑΤΟΥΡΩΝΟΜΟΥ

The remainder of line 11 is well preserved. The initial Φ of line 12 is somewhat
worn on the left side, but remains clearly visible and complete. The choice by the stone
cutter to break the preceding line as he did is striking, as line 11 is physically very short,
especially when one sees that line 7 extends fully five characters further to the right. No

320 Weil (1893), 576; Reinach (1893), 588; Reinach (1894), Plate XXV; Monro (1894), 137; Gevaert
(1895), 401; Jan (1895), 440-1; Jan (1899), 14-15; Doutzaris (1934), 339. Fairbanks broke the line
differently, printing δά[πεδ]|δον.
321 Crusius (1894), 31, 34. The Δ in line 11 was ‘hatched’ in his epigraphical edition, indicating that it is not
completely visible on the stone, but can easily be missed. Cf. Smyth (1900), 530 who printed δά[πεδ]|δον.
322 Reinach (1909-13), 152, 157. He was followed by Powell (1925), 142, 147 (Like Reinach, the critical
and musical editions vary in their use of sub-linear dots), and Moens (1930), 28-9, 36, 119.
323 Pöhlmann, 58-9; Chailley (1979), 156; Käppel (1992), 388; Bélis (1992), 64; Pöhlmann and West
(2001), 64-5; Furley and Bremer (2001), 85. The musical editions by δάπεδον West (1992b), 290, and
Hagel (2000), 124 left out the brackets entirely.
defects are apparent in the surface of the stone which would necessitate the early break, although only enough stone for three characters remains before the fracture. The restoration/reading of the Φ is certain.

H. Weil printed Ἀ||[φ]αιστος, which all early editions reprinted.\(^{324}\) The clarity of the Φ on the stone, and the solidarity among the early editions in missing it, is a good indication of 1) the quality of reproductions from which they worked, and 2) the tendency to accept earlier readings without re-examining the stone or photographs personally. Both the BCH Plate and the oldest photograph reproduced in Bélis are too blurry to read the Φ. Th. Reinach finally corrected the transcription in his critical edition, and all subsequent editions have followed his text here.\(^{325}\) All later reproductions, starting with E. Pöhlmann’s photo reveal a highly readable Φ.

There is an orthography problem in the middle of line 12. H. Weil noted that the stone reads AIEΙΟΕ in line 12, where it ought to read AIEΙΟΕΙ.\(^{326}\) All subsequent editions have followed Weil, most noting in either their apparatus or through editorial marks that the stone presents a defective spelling. A. Bélis referred to the lack of an I as an omission.\(^{327}\) However, considering that the character is a N, the situation suggests that rather than omitting the I, it is quite possible that the stonecutter in fact cut it, but then confusedly incorporated it as the left side of the N.

\(^{324}\) Weil (1893), 576; Reinach (1893), 588; Reinach (1894), Plate XXVI; Crusius (1894), 31, 34 (he left out the brackets in his musical edition); Gevaert (1895), 401; Jan (1899), 14-15; Fairbanks (1900), 120; Smyth (1900), 531; and Doutzaris (1934), 339.

\(^{325}\) Monro (1894), 137; Jan (1895), 440-1; Reinach (1909-13), 152, 157; Powell (1925), 142-3, 147; Moens (1930), 31, 36, 119; Pöhlmann (1970), 58-9; Chailley (1979), 156; Käppel (1992), 388; Bélis (1992), 64; West (1992b), 290; Hagel (2000), 124; Pöhlmann and West (2001), 64-5; Furley and Bremer (2001), 85.

\(^{326}\) Weil (1893), 576.

\(^{327}\) Bélis (1992), 66.
Line 13 is in good shape, except for damage at the end where it appears that a single letter has been lost. There is an orthography problem in the middle of the line. H. Weil noted that the stone reads ΥΑΟΜΠΙΟΝ, but it seems apparent ΟΑΥΜΠΙΟΝ was meant. No subsequent edition has disagreed with Weil on this, but there has been inconsistency in how it has been transcribed. Th. Reinach’s first edition simply printed it as it was on the stone with no correction. O. Crusius retained the stone’s reading, but commented that Weil was correct to revert it to its usual form; Crusius considered for a moment that this spelling may reflect a dialectical form, but rejected this option. A TLG search returned no evidence of other instances, but this may be misleading, as the TLG text for this very hymn has the already corrected vowels, with no editorial indications. Reinach’s second edition corrected the spelling to ΟΫλυμπον, his critical edition introduced some confusion, as he printed both (Ὁ)λυμπον and (Ὀ)λυμπον, the latter of which is clearly an error. All subsequent editions have been content simply correct

328 Weil (1903), 576, 578; Jan (1895), 140-1; and Jan (1899), 14-15 both followed Weil, printing the corrected form, but noting the reading of the stone in the apparatus. There is a slight problem in that Jan (1895) accented the word Ὑλυμπον while Jan (1899) printed Ὄλυμπον in his text and Ὄλυμπον in his notes. A misprint is likely. Fairbanks (1900), 20 also misprinted: [Ὅ]λυμπον. Gevaert (1895), 401; Smyth (1900), 531; Doutzaris (1934), 339; West (1992b), 290; Käppel (1992), 388; and Hagel (2000), 125. simply corrected the text with no comment
329 Reinach (1893), 588. Monro (1894), 137 also printed it this way.
330 Crusius (1894), 31, 34, 47. He did reverse the vowels for his musical score.
331 Reinach (1894), Plate XXVI.
to print the corrected form, often with a note to the reversed lettering on the stone.\textsuperscript{333} None after Crusius has considered the possibility of a dialectical form, and Bélis was confident enough to declare it an “erreur du lapicide.”\textsuperscript{334} This would not be the first error by the stonecutter, but it is harder to understand how it could have occurred, and the other unexpected orthography choices found in the text ought to make one hesitate to attribute it to carelessness.\textsuperscript{335}

The end of line 13 is lost where the stone is broken. It is clear that at least one more character must have existed to the right of N, due to the positioning of the superscript melody character, which is positioned slightly off-center to the right, above the N, requiring the presence of an additional syllable. The beginning of line 15 is fully intact, making restoration simple and certain. Weil supplemented \textit{ἀνακίδν[α]|ται}.\textsuperscript{336} All subsequent editions have accepted this restoration without comment.\textsuperscript{337} The photographic reproductions show the stone broken immediately following the N, which is completely visible. No further traces are visible.

14 ΤΑΙΛΓΥΔΕΛΩΤΟΣΒΡΕΜΟΝΑΕΙΟΛΟΙΟΙΟΣΜ[ ]
15 ΛΕΣΙΝΩΙΔΑΑΝΚΡΕΚΕΙΧΡΥΣΕΑΔΑΔΥΘΡΟΥ[ ]

\textsuperscript{333} Powell (1925), 143, 147 (he left out the editorial marks in the musical score); Moens (1930), 32-3, 36, 119 (she explicitly labels this a mistake.), Pöhlmann (1970), 58-9; Chailley (1979), 156; Bélis (1992), 64, 66; Pöhlmann and West (2001), 64-5; and Furley and Bremer (2001), 85.

\textsuperscript{334} Bélis (1992), 66.

\textsuperscript{335} One must wonder if there may be a performance matter graphically represented here, as with \textit{ΠΕΤΕΡΑΣ} earlier. A modification of vowel pronunciation for a better musical fit is not an uncommon practice in either traditional or contemporary lyric vocalization.

\textsuperscript{336} Weil (1893), 576, 578.

\textsuperscript{337} Crusius (1894) left out the brackets in his musical score. Reinach (1909-13) too printed \textit{ἀνακίδν[α]} in his score on page 157, but his transcription on page 152 accurately printed \textit{ἀνακίδν[α]|ται}. The primarily musical editions of Monro (1894), Jan (1895), West (1992b), and Hagel (2000) all left out the bracket.
The end of line 14 is broken and at least 1 letter is missing. Fortunately, the beginning of 15 is intact, allowing for reasonably sure supplementation. H. Weil supplemented $\mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\iota\upsilon$, a reading followed by many of the early editions.\(^{338}\) Th. Reinach’s first edition printed $\mu[\epsilon]\lambda\epsilon\sigma\iota\upsilon$,\(^{339}\) but in his second edition, he followed both Weil and Crusius, placing the $M$ in brackets.\(^{340}\) However, in Reinach’s critical $FD$ edition, making a fresh examination of the stone, he claimed to be able to read the first vertical stroke of the $M$ at the end of the line, and printed $\mu [\epsilon] \lambda \epsilon \sigma \iota \upsilon$\(^{341}\) J. Powell followed Reinach, but P.W. Moens preferred Weil’s reading.\(^{342}\) Freshly examining the stone, E. Pöhlmann supported Reinach’s ‘cautious’ reading of $\mu [\epsilon] \lambda \epsilon \sigma \iota \upsilon$\(^{343}\) A. Bélis, in her own examination, followed this reading, but noted that it relied on use of a squeeze and the oldest photograph which she provided in her appendix—plate III.1 (from c. 1911). The reproduction in her text is insufficient for the purposes of proper verification, but it hints at the presence of that vertical stroke. Bélis’ own comments lead one to assume that she could no longer find any indication of the $M$ on the stone itself.\(^{344}\) It is worth noting that while she printed $M|E$ in her epigraphical edition, she printed $[ME$ in

---

338 Weil (1893), 576; Monro (1894), 137; Reinach (1894), Plate XXVI; Crusius (1894), 31,34; Gevaert (1895), 402; Jan (1895), 442-3; Jan (1899), 16-7; Fairbanks (1900), 120; Smyth (1900), 531; Moens (1930), 34, 36, 119.

339 Reinach (1893), 588. Doutzaris (1934), 339 also followed this reading.

340 Reinach (1894), Plate XXVI, Crusius (1894), 31, 34.

341 Reinach (1909-13), 155. He printed $\mu [\epsilon] \lambda \epsilon \sigma \iota \upsilon$ on page 152, but $\mu[\epsilon] \lambda \epsilon \sigma \iota \upsilon$ on page 157—he typically did not utilize the dot in his musical edition, but this sort of practice can lead to easy mistaking of certainty by those who rely only on the score as opposed to the full critical text.

342 Powell (1925), 143 (Powell, like Reinach, did not use sub-linear dots in his musical edition, but did use them in his critical text); Moens (1930), 34, 119. She was aware of Reinach’s edition.

343 Pöhlmann (1970), 60-1. He was followed by Chailley (1979), 156; and Käppel (1992), 388.

344 Bélis (1992), 64, 66.
her musical edition on the same page. Pöhlmann and West and followed this reading in
their recent edition, but the text of W. Furley and J. Bremer reintroduced confusion by
printing μ[έ]ΛΕΣΙΝ and μ[έ]ΛΕΣΙΝ, variously.345

No trace of the M exists in either Bélis’ photo or squeeze, as the stone shows
damage immediately following the preceding Σ. Her reproduction of the old photograph
hints tantalizingly at the vertical stroke. The BCH Plate is too blurry and Pöhlmann’s
photo is washed out from lighting here. The most recent photograph reveals nothing here,
as even the damaged surface seems to have been worn smooth at the edge. Fortunately,
the supplement seems certain. The difficulty of verifying the reading results in a strong
reluctance regarding the use of a sub-linear dot versus brackets. Only the strength of the
supplement permits the use of the dot, based on the claims of previous epigraphers.

15 ΛΕΣΙΝΩΙΛΑΛΑΝΚΡΕΚΕΙΧΡΥΣΕΑΛΑΔΥΘΡΟΥ[   ]
16 ΘΑΡΙΣΥΜΝΟΙΣΙΝΑΝΑΜΕΛΠΕΤΑΙ ΟΔΕ[   ]

The end of the line 15 is broken, with only the upper left stroke of the Y
remaining visible. The beginning of line 16 is undamaged, and clearly presents a new
word, necessitating that multiple letters be supplemented in order to complete the last
word of line 15 and to begin the word which carries over into line 16.

H. Weil supplemented ἀδόθροου[ζ κί]|θαρις, a reading followed by most early
editions.346 J. Powell printed ἀδόθροω[ζ κί]|θαρις, adding a sub-linear dot.347 However,

345 Pöhlmann and West (2001), 64-5; Furley and Bremer (2001), 85 printed μ[έ]ΛΕΣΙΝ in the edition of page
85, but on page 89 in their commentary they print μ[έ]ΛΕΣΙΝ. Some musical editions have taken the simpler
346 Weil (1893), 577. Reinach (1893), 588; Monro (1894), 137; Reinach (1894), Plate XXVI; Crusius
(1894), 31 (he did not hatch the Y), 34, 155 (He misprinted ἀδόθρωος [κί]|θαρις in his musical edition on

81
as he made no epigraphical comment on this choice, and generally followed Th. Reinach, it is worth noting that in Reinach’s critical FD edition, there is what appears to be a sub-linear dot under the Y, but it is far off-center to the right, and no comment is made. While it is possible that Powell has independently changed the reading here, it seems somewhat more likely that he has taken the ‘dot’ as intentional. It is not possible to know if Reinach intended the dot, but its positioning does not lend confidence to intentionality. P.W. Moens apparently did not see the dot as intentional, as she printed the expected ἀδύθρους [κί]θαρις.348 Pöhlmann re-examined the stone, and printed ἀδύθρου[ζ [κί]θαρις with the dot, making no comment or citation.349 A. Bélis removed the dot in her edition.350 Pöhlmann and West preferred to reinstate it, which practice W. Furley and J. Bremer also followed.351

The reading of Y is not in doubt, and the back-and-forth among editions rather reflects an inconsistency in the use of the sub-linear dot to reflect certainty of reading versus indication of partial character preservation. The end of the line is broken, but a substantial trace of the Y remains visible. The BCH Plate is too blurry, but the reproductions in Pöhlmann (1970) and Bélis (1992), as well as the most recent photograph, unambiguously show the upper left diagonal stroke of an Y. The surety of

---

347 Powell (1925), 143, 147. His musical score has no sub-linear dots.
348 Moens (1930) printed ἀδύθρου[ζ [κί]θαρις on page 36, 119, but on page 35 confusing printed ἀδύθρου[ζ [κί]θαρις, as if the Θ were in doubt.
349 Pöhlmann (1970), 60-1. He was followed by Chailley (1979), 156 and Käppel (1992), 388.
350 Bélis (1992), 64.
the identification argues against the use of the dot. The remainder of the supplement gives good sense and has never been challenged.

The final characters remaining at the end of line 16, ΟΔΕ, belong to the next strophe, and will be treated below. There is a hiatus following ἀναμέλπεται, coinciding with a visible gap on the stone between the I and the following O—not enough to fit a full character, but enough separation to serve as a physical marker, an aid to the reader, that a new strophe begins.
Strophe 3: Lines 16-27, Columns 1 and 2, Inv. 517, 526.

16 ΘΑΡΙΣΥΜΝΟΙΣΙΝΑΝΑΜΕΛΠΕΤΑΙΟΔΕ [       ]
17 [ |ΩΝΠΡΟΠΑΣΕΣΜΟΣΑΘΘΙΔΑΛΑΧΩ [       ]

The end of line 16 is damaged, with characters missing. No traces remain after the final E. H. Weil proposed the supplement [θε]ωρ[ῶν], which made good sense of the context. O. Crusius printed ΟΔΕ | |ΩΙΩΝ in his transcription (indicating that the I was only partially legible), but he chose to restore the text as ὁ δὲ [ν]ερῶν in his edition. Crusius found Weil’s proposal of [θε]ωρ[ῶν] suitable in meaning, but found that it offered difficulties, as it would violate the rules for accent and melody. Instead, he suggested [ν]ερῶν, a supplement derived from the rare form νέωρος, and cited Kallimachos’ Hymn to Apollo as a comparable example of use. Although C. Jan initially followed Crusius here, he later preferred Weil’s corrected reading. No other edition has found the supplement convincing. In the same year, Weil issued corrections based on a careful re-examination of a photograph. He claimed that he could make out

352 Weil (1893), 577; Reinach (1893), 588 followed Weil. Monro (1894), 137 followed as well, however he removed the ‘]’ around P, which may have been inadvertent, as there is no trace of a P on the stone.
353 Crusius (1894), 31, 34. While it is possible that he felt that the I should be read/restored as a P, his typical practice was to print the full character in his epigraphical edition, with hatching on the strokes that were missing or damaged. His edition here offered only a hatched vertical stroke. No discussion or explanation regarding this letter was offered.
354 Oddly, he printed [θεόρο]ων in his musical score on page 155. Other places in the text exist where similar issues with accent and melody occur, which editors have ‘allowed’ or understood to be the result of creatively modified orthography: e.g. line 3 συνόμαιμον, line 5 πετέρας.
355 He found the form comparable to εύρος and ἑξόρος. He derived νέωρον from νεαρῶν and νεόν, and cited Photius Hesychios’ Lexicon N.297.9: νέωρον· νέον in support of his reading. Crusius (1894), 48-9. He admitted it was quite possible that his supplement is incorrect.
356 Cf. Kallimachos, Hymn to Apollo 8: οἱ δὲ νεώντες μολπῆν τε καὶ ἐς χορὸν ἐντύνασθε.
357 Jan (1895), 442-3; Jan (1899)16-17.
traces of a $T$ at the end of line 16, and changed his proposed restoration to $τ[εχνι]τ[ωδων]$.\footnote{358 Weil (1894), 361. He noted that the change in word granted a specificity to the \textit{theoria}—"nous retrouverons donc ici les artistes du nouvel hymne." This line would be, therefore, self-referential with respect to the actual performance.} It is worth noting that the $Ω$'s on line 17 are unusually widely spaced, with damage to the stone between the two. However, enough of the surface remains where the upper section of any intervening character would be to say with confidence that there was never a letter between the $Ω$’s. This reading was immediately adopted by other early editions, but care must be exercised as $Τ[\tau]$ frequently became $Τ|$ in editions which made no use of sub-linear dots.\footnote{359 Cf. Reinach (1894), Plate XXVI; Jan (1899), 16-17; and Fairbanks (1900), 20. Fairbanks explicitly commented in his notes on page 21 that he relied on Weil (1894) for the $T$, but he made no indication of his text of the degree of surety.} Some editions preferred to exercise more caution, printing $[τεχνι]τ[ωδων]$, perhaps finding Weil’s reading suspect, but they embraced his supplement nevertheless.\footnote{360 Cf. Musical editions which generally eschewed editorial marks, Gevaert (1895), 402; Smyth (1900), 532; Doutzaris (1934), 339; and West (1982), 146; but also critical editions such as, Reinach (1909-13), 152, 157 and Powell (1925), 141, 143, 147.} J. Powell noted that Weil’s supplement $[τεχνι]τ[ωδων]$ paralleled lines 20-21 of Limenio’s hymn.\footnote{361 Powell (1925), 145. Cf. Limenios 20-1: $[\varepsilonμος \iota]ερός \tauεχνιτωδων$, in Pöhlmann and West (2001), 78-9.} P.W. Moens, failing to see the $T$ Weil claimed was visible, felt little need to adopt his revision, and preferred a corrected form of his first supplement. She proposed to read $[θεωρ]τ[ωδων]$, which provided a more satisfactory agreement between melody and accent, hence annulling both reasons for switching the supplement.\footnote{362 Moens (1930), 37, 44, 119. She made an odd comment on 37 about not being able to check for herself: “De laatste regel ontbreekt aan mijn afdruk van den tekst op papier.” Her copy of a photograph may have cut off the bottom of the stone here. She noted that she relies on Weil’s transcription here.}

In his fresh examination of the stone, E. Pöhlmann found no trace of the $T$ on line 16, but claimed to be able to see traces of one at the beginning of 17. He printed...
τεχνιταί|τοιόν in his edition.363 A. Bélis, made her own examination of the stone, and agreed with Pöhlmann that no traces remained of the T in line 16. Bélis also examined a copy of the photograph which Weil claimed revealed traces of the T, and saw nothing. She wondered whether he might have mistakenly referred to the ‘end’ of 16 when he actually meant the ‘beginning’ of line 17, where she insisted the remains of a T are visible. Bélis saw the right side of the horizontal bar with its apex.364 In spite of the trace appearance of the letter, her confidence in her reading led to her print τεχνιταί|τοιόν in her edition.365 W. Furley and J. Bremer preferred the more cautious τεχνιταί|τοιόν in their edition, but offered a new possibility in their notes: χορευ|τοιόν. In their reasoning, the correct supplement would depend on the still unsettled matter of dating. The Pythaïdes inscriptions found on the treasury, which are linked to the two hymns, refer to different groups of performers. If the second hymn, that of Limenios, was performed in 128 BCE, then that hymn’s use of ἑσμὸς|ἐρῶς τεχνιταί|τοιόν is completely appropriate, as the associated inscription makes it clear that the technitai performed it. However, for the preceding festival in 138 BCE, the associated inscription refers to a choir of young boys, led by two technitai. In this case, χορευ|τοιόν would be the favored restoration.


Further, if the two hymns were both performed in 128 BCE or later, then either restoration is possible.\textsuperscript{366}

The \textit{BCH} Plate shows the end of 16 as damaged, and only the \textit{Δ} is legible. Pöhlmann’s photograph (and all others, including the old photo in Bélis) shows a clear \textit{E} but nothing more. The stone is broken immediately following the letter, allowing no trace of a \textit{T} to survive.

Damage to the beginning of line 17 makes it nearly impossible to distinguish between intentional cutting and damage. The photographs all reveal a rather unusually wide gap between the two \textit{Ω}’s, with damage to the stone between. The images reveal enough smooth surface remaining towards the upper portion of the space between, however, to rule out the presence of any other character in this space. At the very beginning of line 17, the \textit{BCH} Plate and oldest photograph in Bélis reveal nothing. Pöhlmann’s photo has a suggestive mark in the stone immediately on the edge of the break where one would expect the very tip of the horizontal stroke of the \textit{T} to end. Bélis’ more recent picture and squeeze also reveal this ‘apex,’ but the most recent photo is unable to clarify—it is impossible to satisfactorily determine whether the mark is damage to the stone, or the apex of a stroke made by the stone-carver. Due to the immensely controversial nature of this supplement, it is perhaps best to place the \textit{T} within brackets. Other letters are a possibility (\textit{Γ, Ε, and Σ}), and to dot the \textit{T} unfairly advantages certain supplements. There is only room for one letter at the beginning of this line.

\textsuperscript{366} The specific inscriptions regarding the Pythaïdes embassies to Delphi are also from the South wall of the Treasury, hanging somewhat higher on the wall. Cf. \textit{FD III}’ nos. 11, 47, 49, and 48. For discussion, cf. Furley and Bremer (2001), vol. 1, pgs. 129-131.
The end of line 17, the last line of text in column 1, is broken away, with characters missing. The absence of any musical signs in the extant space below is a sure indication that this is the last line on this side of the stone. Due to the early mistake in ordering the columns, it is necessary to split consideration of the restorations to the end of line 17 and the beginning of line 18. H. Weil proposed \( \lambda \alpha \chi [\overline{\omega}] \). While various editors have gone back and forth over what actually remains on the stone, none have questioned his proposed restoration. A parallelism has been understood with the first lines of the poem; as the muses have Helikon as their allotted portion, so does this sacred ‘swarm’ have Attica. Th. Reinach first printed \( \lambda \alpha \chi \omega [\nu \ldots] \), which is likely to have been a misprint, as the next year he corrected his reading in his second edition to \( \lambda \alpha \chi [\overline{\omega}] \). O. Crusius read \( \Lambda \chi \bar{X} \) on the stone and reaffirmed Weil’s supplement; most later editions accepted his reading. H.W. Smyth and P. Doutzaris printed \( \lambda \alpha \chi \bar{\omega} \), but these

---

367 The earliest publications of the hymns assumed a reversed order for the two blocks of stone, and hence the columns. Therefore, these editions made their restorations with the assumption that line 17 (the bottom of column 1) was the end of the poem, and that line 18 (the top of column 2) was the beginning of the poem, and hence were treated separately: Cf. Weil (1893), Reinach (1893), Monro (1894), Crusius (1894), Jan (1895). This was rectified by Weil (1894), who credited Pomtow (1894) as making the same discovery independently. The matter of restorations was further complicated by the fact that the title line of the inscription was originally misunderstood as part of the text proper.

368 Weil (1893), 577.

369 Cf. Moens (1930), 38.

370 Reinach (1893), 588 follows Weil (1893) as in this edition he is concerned with the melody rather than the lyrics of the hymn. Reinach (1894), 137 returns to Weil’s reading of the stone, but leaves off the sub-linear dot, which may or may not have been intentional, as there is some inconsistency (as well as poor quality of reproduction) to his transcription regarding the use of dots.

371 Crusius (1894), 31, 34. His reading was followed by Monro (1894), 137; Gevaert (1895), 402; Jan (1895), 442-3; Jan (1899), 16-17; Fairbanks (1900), 20; Reinach (1909-13), 152, 155, 157; and Powell (1925), 141, 143, 147. Moens (1930), 38, 44, 119 reverted to reading \( \lambda \alpha \chi [\overline{\omega}] \) with no comment.
were likely misprints, as they were not epigraphical editions. In his fresh examination of the stone, E. Pöhlmann claimed to see traces of the Ω on the stone, and modified his edition to read \(\lambda\alpha\chi\omega[v\), which has become the accepted reading. In her own examination of the stone, A. Bélis commented that while the X was quite visible in the old photograph, as well as in a more recent photograph and squeeze, she found that new damage had completely obscured the Ω. She did concede, however, that in a copy of the old photograph, she was able to see the horizontal stroke of the left foot, and a bit of the upper body, albeit with damage. Therefore, she confidently printed \(\lambda\alpha\chi\omega[v\).

The X is easily made out in all reproductions. Neither the BCH plate, Pöhlmann’s photograph, nor the old photograph in Bélis offer indication of any traces following the X. Bélis’ more recent photograph, however, offers some hint of the top curved stroke of an Ω, but it is hard to distinguish between intentional strokes and damage to the stone. Her squeeze reveals nothing. The most recent picture again quite strongly suggests traces of the upper portion of an Ω, and perhaps the lower right horizontal foot as well. It would not be impossible for the letter to have been an O. It is best to print Ω, however, as the supplement makes good sense, but to add the sub-linear dot.

The beginning of line 18 is heavily damaged, with several characters broken off. In light of the fact that the supplements for this section were initially made in an attempt to begin the poem, and that the attempt was made to incorporate the remaining fragments

---

372 Smyth (1900), 532; Doutzaris (1934), 339.
373 Pöhlmann (1970), 60-61. His reading was followed by Chailley (1979), 157; Käppel (1992), 388; Pöhlmann and West (2001), 66-7; Furley and Bremer (2001), 85.
374 Bélis (1992), 71-73. West (1992a), 6 printed \(\lambda\alpha\chi\omega[v\) as well, but West (1992b), 291 mistakenly printed \(\lambda\alpha\chi\omega\nu\), which edition Hagel (2000), 125 followed.
of the title line as preceding lyric, it is somewhat astonishing that the supplements were preserved through the re-ordering of the text. Some limited attempts at variation have been tried, but some of the most recent editions still favor the original restoration made by H. Weil. He proposed that we read \([\tau\nu\ k\iota \alpha \rho i\sigma|\varsigma\varepsilon]\; he noted that he found the expression \(\tau\nu\ k\iota \alpha \rho i\sigma\varepsilon\iota\varsigma\kappa\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\) less poetic in style than \(\tau\nu\ k\iota \alpha \rho a\kappa\kappa\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\), but explained the choice as one better suited to the demands of meter. Weil also commented that the term \(k\iota \alpha \rho i\sigma\varsigma\varsigma\) (playing the kithara – without voice), which excluded the term \(k\iota \alpha \rho o\delta\iota\alpha\), (singing to the kithara), had the advantage of marking out precisely the role of Apollo as he presided over the song of the Muses, whom he accompanied on his kithara. This, he argued was portrayed on pediment of the temple of Delphi, reproducing the scene described in the Homeric hymn and reprised and aggrandized by Pindar in his first Pythian Ode.\(^{375}\) O. Crusius read \(\tau\nu\ k\iota \alpha \rho i\sigma|\varsigma\varepsilon\), and strengthened Weil’s argument by adding that in the \(paean\) of Aristonoos (also found in the treasury at Delphi), Apollo gives his oracle accompanied by the kithara; the Pythia in her ecstasy believed that she heard the kithara of the god. Crusius recommended that one understand \(k\iota \theta r i\varsigma\iota\varsigma\varepsilon\) ν to mean \(\mu\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma\theta\alpha\iota\) here.\(^{376}\)

In an addendum to his 1894 edition of Limenios’ hymn, Weil issued corrections to his edition of Athenaios’ hymn. Noting that H. Pomtow had independently

---

\(^{375}\) Weil (1893), 574-5. His reading was followed by Reinach (1893), 586 (which left out the sub-linear dot), and Reinach (1894), Plate XXVI. There is some controversy over what exactly the pediments portrayed. Current thought has Apollo seated on his tripod on the East face, and a very Apollo-like Dionysos, playing a lyre, on the West face. Cf. Scott (2014), 153. This identification proves problematic for Crusius’ argument. Cf. Homeric Hymn to Apollo, \textit{prooimia} to the ‘Pythian’ half, 182-206; Pindar, \textit{Pythian} 1, 1-4 — note that neither of these texts actually employs the vocabulary under discussion.

\(^{376}\) Crusius (1894), 30, 33, 35; cf. Aristonoos, \textit{Paean in Apollinem}, 9-16 (he did not employ this specific vocabulary). Monro (1894), 134 (although he makes no use of sub-linear dots) and Jan (1895), 434-5, followed his reading.
arrived at the same conclusion, he reversed (corrected) the order of the blocks and columns. While maintaining his original supplements, he connected lines 17 and 18, and upgraded his certainly regarding the $\Sigma$—he now proposed that the text read $\lambda \alpha \chi | \dot{\omega} n \; \tau \ddot{o} n \; \kappa \iota \theta \alpha \rho \dot{i} | \sigma e i$. Fairbanks oddly printed $\lambda \alpha \chi | \dot{\omega} n \; \tau \ddot{o} n \; \kappa \iota \theta \alpha \rho \dot{i} | \sigma e i$, but editions have uniformly preferred to limit the number of characters added to the beginning of line 18. A certain degree of confusion over the presence of the $\Sigma$ remained; Th. Reinach printed both $\lambda \alpha \chi | \dot{\omega} n \; \tau \ddot{o} n \; \kappa \iota \theta \alpha \rho \dot{i} | \sigma e i$ in his transcription, and in his musical edition he made no use of sub-linear dots and printed $| \sigma e i$. The importance of the musical score in this FD edition for later texts has led to some ambiguity in readings, depending on which text later authors consulted. Complicating matters further, Reinach commented that the letter sits just on the edge of the break on the stone, and could potentially appear as an I. He assumed that one would read this as a form of Z. There is a dearth of comparable zetas in the inscription, but one can look to line 33 of Limenios’ hymn, where $\lambda \eta \zeta \omicron \mu e \nu \varsigma$ offers an example of zeta written as I; it has long been the assumption that the same letter-carver is responsible for the texts of both hymns. It should be noted that the I, which represents the zeta, has significantly wider horizontal strokes at top and bottom. Reinach rejected the I and preferred the $\Sigma$ due to a lack of suitable $-\zeta \omicron$ verb for the

---

377 Weil (1894), 361; Pomtow (1894), 590. His reading was followed by Gevaert (1895), 402 and Jan (1899), 16-17, but it must be noted that neither of these editions include line delineation.

378 Fairbanks (1900), 20. Doutzaris (1934), 339 and Smyth (1900), 532 were less than helpful to the textual transmission. Smyth simply ended his edition with the end of column 1, at $\lambda \alpha \chi \dot{\omega} n$. Doutzaris printed $\lambda \alpha \chi \dot{\omega} n \; \tau \ddot{o} n \; \kappa \iota \theta \alpha \rho \dot{i} | \sigma e i$. The amount of inconsistency among editions, and even within (as Reinach demonstrates) is problematic.


380 Reinach (1909-13), 155. In his commentary here, more confusion can be had in that he printed the word as $\kappa \theta \alpha \rho \dot{i} | \sigma e i$. 
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context. J. Powell retained λαξ[ὁν τὸν κιθαρίσει in his edition, which M.L. West relied on in his Greek Meter.\(^{381}\)

P.W. Moens revived Weil’s concern for the awkward poetic language. While acknowledging his argument regarding Apollo’s role as accompanist for the muses, she noted that Apollo’s potential role is not limited to this particular activity. Moens referred to a wall painting in the house of the Vettii in Pompeii, where Apollo is depicted as having just slain the drakōn and taken up his kithara to sing of his own heroic deed.\(^{382}\) Additionally, she cited Euripides Ion, 905-6: σὺ δὲ κιτάρα κλάζεις | παιάνας μέλπων.

Creusa accuses Apollo of playing and singing paeans on his kithara. Rather than celebrating the famous ‘kithara player,’ Moens preferred to see the music-making in the hands of the mortal procession. Like Reinach, she felt the reading of the fragmentary Σ as less than certain, and claimed that the letter could be a Σ, Ι, Ξ, or even an Ε, which she preferred. Moens offered λαξ[ὁν Φοιοῖβο|υ[ν] ξε.]\(^{383}\) No further editors have been convinced by her supplement.

E. Pöhlmann made a fresh examination of the stone; he noted that Reinach claimed to be able to read either a Σ or Ι (zeta), but he himself insisted that he could read

\(^{381}\) Powell (1925), 141, 143, 147-8; West (1982), 146. Powell oddly credited Crusius with the supplement.

\(^{382}\) Moens (1930), 38. For the wall painting, Cf. Hermann-Bruckmann, Denkmäler der Malerei des Altertums 3.20. The painting is one of two very small mythological scenes. It measures about 9 inches wide. The dead snake is coiled around what must be the omphalos. On a pillar behind is hung a bow and quiver. To the left is a woman with a bull, carrying what looks like a hunting spear with several prongs (possibly Artemis?) , to the right is a male figure, possibly a priest. Further to the right is Apollo, crowned, wearing a crimson cape, and nothing else, while he energetically plays on his kithara. One may see a digital reproduction at http://www.ancientworlds.net/aw/Article/1264174 (accessed 10/28/14).

\(^{383}\) Moens (1930), 39, 44, 119. As further justification, she noted that EI is elsewhere doubled, as EIEI (ἐφρούρειει, also a contract verb), she pointed to comparable phenomena with αἰ in ἐγκα implode (line 9) and αἰ in ἐξαιτήσι (line 3). Seeing both options used in doubling AI, she felt confident that EI may be doubled as EEI.
a clear Σ. He printed λαχδ[ν τὸν κιθαρίσει in his edition.\textsuperscript{384} A. Bélis, on the other hand, in her own re-examination of the stone, declared that, “il n’y a pas le moindre doute” regarding the fact that both the stone, and the associated photos and squeezes all show an Ι (zeta).\textsuperscript{385} Bélis dismissed Reinach’s objection regarding the lack of a suitable – ζω verb by suggesting κιθαρίζω, which is well attested, and perfectly adapted to the metrical requirements—the measure, which should scan as a peon quatriem, requires 3 short syllables followed by a long syllable. She satisfied the need for the initial short by proposing the pronoun σε, and discarding the older τὸν, which would scan long. Bélis proposed that the text be read [σε˘ κιθαρίζω˘ ]ζει. However, she did concede that the possibility remained that the carver poorly formed the letter in question, and that Σ was intended—in Limenios’ Hymn, line 32/3 an Ε is overwritten Σ, and other errors are found in Athenaios’ text.\textsuperscript{386}

M.L. West, in his “Analecta Musica” article, printed [τὸν κιθαρίσει as the consensus. In agreement with Weil, he noted that τὸν κιθαρίσει κλυτόν was, “suspect on grounds of poetic style.” As part of his re-consideration of the stone, West noted that the accepted supplements in line 19ff only suggest enough space to permit one letter before the Σ or Ι at the beginning of line 18, effectively ruling out κιθαρίσει. He rejected the possibility of lengthening the following lines’ supplements, as it would require line 18 to be 36 letters, exceeding the normal range of 30-35 characters per line. Based on further modifications he made to the following lines, he required a verb, and therefore

\textsuperscript{384} Pöhlmann (1970), 60-61. His reading was followed by Chailley (1979), 157 and Käppel (1992), 388.
\textsuperscript{385} Bélis (1992), 73.
\textsuperscript{386} Bélis (1992), 71-3.
supplemented ἀρχὴν ἀγλαϊνζει. West reprinted this suggestion in his *Greek Music*, albeit with an apparent misprint in the preceding word: ἀρχὴν ἀγλαϊνζει. E.

Pöhlmann and M.L. West adopted this reading in their joint edition; however, in their transcription, they printed Ζ, and in their edition on the facing page they printed Z. W. Furley and J. Bremer re-printed the traditional consensus of ἀρχὴν τὸν κιθαρίσει.

The reading of these lines is not a trivial matter, as the various proposals not only replace words, but modify the entire grammatical structure, and hence meaning, of these lines. Unfortunately, the lacuna is substantial enough, that regardless of any confidence regarding Σ or Ι (zeta), it is impossible to be certain what the stone originally bore. The *BCH* Plate is too blurry to be useful here. It is impossible to distinguish between damage to the stone and intentional marks in Pöhlmann’s photograph. The oldest photo in Bélis reveals two parallel horizontal strokes at top and bottom, but no other marks.

It is unlikely to be an E, as Moens preferred, since the stone lacks any indication of the middle bar, which ought to remain visible. The bottom horizontal stroke is also somewhat more angled that that of the following E, and its right apex is not quite in line—if this character were another E, it would be positioned just slightly higher on the stone than the following E (the lines are not perfectly level, however). Not all E’s offer identically angled bars and widths, rendering an argument by comparison somewhat

388 West (1992b), 291. He was followed by Hagel (2000), 125.
389 Pöhlmann and West (2001), 66-7. They typically printed sub-linear dots in both editions.
390 The stone-carver routinely produced horizontal middle bars for E’s that reach past the mid-point of the character. This does not entirely eliminate the possibility of an E here, but renders the case unlikely. The immediately following E may serve as a comparison, and it is clear that the mid-height stroke should be visible if the letter were an E.
tenuous, but it does not aid in making the argument for it being an Ε. As for the matter of Ι (zeta) versus Σ, the complete absence of any connecting marks between the horizontal bars makes it impossible to be certain as to what the damaged character once was. The more recent photograph and squeeze reproduced by Bélis offer no more clarity. The most recent photo reveals that the stone has become even more worn here. Based on what the photographs and stone present, it is best to read an Ι (zeta) here, with a sub-linear dot. While the supplements proposed by Bélis and West are both fitting, the fact that two equally persuasive possibilities may be offered suggests the wisest course will be to keep these options in the apparatus rather than the edition proper.

18  [ ΖΕΙΚΑΥΤΟΝΠΑΙΔΑΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ]

There has been some limited concern for the reading of the stone midline, but with no serious worry as to what is meant. H. Weil first noted that the stone appeared to read ΚΑΥΤΟΝ, which he immediately and easily corrected to read κλυτὸν. All subsequent editions have printed Weil’s correction in their texts. Only a few have deemed it worth comment. Th. Reinach and A. Fairbanks both made note of the correction from the reading on the stone. O. Crusius printed ΚΑΥΤΟΝ in his transcription, but κλυτὸν in his edition, offering a more substantial explanation for the correction: καυ- did not fit metrically, and Apollo as κλυτός had literary precedent. In later edition, however,

391 Weil (1893), 575.
392 Reinach (1893), 586; Fairbanks (1900), 20, 121.
393 Crusius (1894), 30, 33, 35. He noted that the vocabulary of address here was not without precedent re Apollo. Cf. Macedon, Paean to Apollo, 1-6: Δήλιον .... κλυτόν ; also Alkaios fr. 307: ὧναξ Ἀπόλλον, παί μεγάλῳ Δίος.
Reinach commented that while he himself still saw the squeeze as reading KAYTON, his colleague G. Colin disagreed, reading KAYTON on the stone itself.\textsuperscript{394} Weil was limited to working from a photograph. E. Pöhlmann examined the stone itself, and claimed to read KAYTON on the stone.\textsuperscript{395} In her own examination, Bélis read KAYTON on the stone as well, and reasoned that Reinach likely did read an A on the squeeze, as it seems that what appears to be the bar, is actually deeper than the rest of the carving, and is actually a defect in the stone, rather than an intentional stroke.\textsuperscript{396}

When examining the reproduction of the old photograph in A. Bélis’ edition and E. Pöhlmann’s photo, it is easy to understand the reading—the photograph appears to clearly display an A. Bélis’ photograph, by itself, appears to clearly present the A, but her squeeze reveals that there is some damage to the form of the character, and that the apparent cross-bar is slanted slightly upward to the right. In a more recent photograph, the damage to the character, and the slant to the bar, is visible. While the stone-carver made his share of mistakes, it is unlikely that this was one. The stone most likely originally read KAYTON.

\begin{verbatim}
18 [ ]ΖΕIKAYTONΠΑΙΔΑΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ[ ]
19 [ ]ΡΑΚΡΟΝΙΦΗΤΩΝΔΕΠΑΓΟΝΑΑ[ ]
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{394} Reinach (1909-13), 152, 157, 155.
\textsuperscript{395} Pöhlmann (1970), 60-1.
\textsuperscript{396} Bélis (1992), 71-2, 74. In Weil and Reinach’s defense, she added that the very first transcription of the stone, given in the Journal de la Grande Fouille, dated Monday 5 June 1893 read EIKAYTON. Assumptions can easily affect impressions when attempting to handle damaged sources indirectly. This letter-carver is consistent in including the horizontal cross-stroke allowing easy differentiation of A from Λ.
The stone is damaged at the end of line 18, as well as the beginning of line 19, requiring significant restoration. H. Weil proposed that the text read \([\Delta iο\varsigma \; \epsilon\rho\omega \; σ' \; ά \; τε \; πα]ρ'\) in the sense of an invocation.\(^{397}\) Th. Reinach, uncharacteristically for his 1893 musical edition, modified Weil’s supplement to \([\Delta iος \; α\epsilonιδετε \; πα]ρ'\).\(^{398}\) After correcting the order of the columns, Weil felt it necessary to modify his supplements, and proposed \([\Delta iος \; ς\nuνοςι\; σε, \; πα]ρ'\), which a number of early editions followed.\(^{399}\) O. Crusius found Weil’s supplement unsatisfactory on a literary level; the idea of having both oracles and oracle-giver as independent objects of praise in such close propinquity seemed impossible to him. Crusius preferred to make use of a relative clause, a stylistic technique found in both Athenaios’ and Limenios’ hymns, and printed \([\Delta iος, \; δς \; | \; α\ισιμα \; πά]ρ'\).\(^{400}\) C. Jan initially followed Crusius’ supplement, but changed his mind in his second edition, preferring a modified form of Weil’s corrected version: \([\Delta iος \; ς\nuνειει. \; σ\; γε \; πα]ρ'\).\(^{401}\) Th. Reinach, in his \textit{FD} edition revised Weil’s supplement to take better account of the spacing of the lacunae on the stone; he moved the line break considerably forward, and printed \([\Delta iος \; ς\nuνοςι\; σε \; | \; πα]ρ'\).\(^{402}\) His text has become the consensus reading.

\(^{397}\) Weil (1893), 574-5. “je te dirai (dicam te), je te chanterai, toi et tes oracles.”

\(^{398}\) Reinach (1893), 586. He was followed by Monro (1894), 134.

\(^{399}\) Weil (1894), 351. He was followed by Reinach (1894), Plate XXVI; Gevaert (1895), 402; and Fairbanks (1900), 20.

\(^{400}\) Crusius (1894), 30, 33, 35. He commented that the relative clause is worth considering, particularly as Aristonoos did not use it as these latter authors did. Cf. Athenaios 1: αι λά[χες, 4: δς άνυ δικόρυνβα, Limenios 5: δν έτικετε, 11: δς πέριζ, 22: δς έξεις.

\(^{401}\) Jan (1895), 434-5; Jan (1899), 16-17.

\(^{402}\) Reinach (1909-13), 152, 157. His text was followed by Powell (1925), 141, 143, 148; Doutzaris (1934), 339 (although Doutzaris did not employ line-delineation); Pöhlmann (1970), 60-61; Chailley (1979), 157; and Käppel (1992), 388.
A few alternatives have been suggested, but none have managed to become firmly established. P.W. Moens pointed to Alcaeus as a comparandum: ὦ ναξ Ἄπολλον, παὶ μεγάλῳ Διός.\(^{403}\) Διός, she felt, made good sense. The standard supplement, Moens reminded, included the pronoun σε, which reinforced the 2\(^{nd}\) person character of line 6, but she noted that σε does not really work after κλυτὸν παιδα—instead of the traditional supplement, Moens felt that one would expect a vocative to follow these words. She argued that in the section of the poem where one dwells on heroic deeds, it is likely that Apollo is directly addressed, and she offered that the text might be restored as [Διός· δὲ ὑρ’ ἱθι | παρ’].\(^{404}\) Apollo is invited to attend the sacrifice at the Pythaïdes.

M.L. West, in his *Greek Meter*, relied on J. Powell’s edition, but the uncertainty of this line prompted him to remove the more controversial supplements, and merely print [Διὸς · ὑμνοσι].\(^{405}\) In his “Analecta Musica” edition, however, he printed his own new supplement. Commenting that, “[T]he pronoun σε should precede an articled adjectival phrase, not trail after it,” he found an additional issue with the scansion of the consensus ὑμνοσι, as the first syllable would have to scan short, which would be “extremely unusual.” Moreover, West noted that ὑμνοσι scans normally in line 16 of Athenaios’ hymn, and in line 2 of Limenios’ ὑμνωσι does as well. He felt that a 2\(^{nd}\) person pronoun was needed, not in association with the preceding phrase, but for the new second person verbs in lines 20/1 and 23. West printed [Διός· σοι γὰρ ἔξ|πορ’] as a

---

\(^{403}\) Alcaeus fr. 307.

\(^{404}\) Moens (1930), 40, 44, 119. She added Iliad 3.130 as a comparandum: δὲ ὑρ’ ἱτι, νόμφα φίλη.

\(^{405}\) West (1982), 361.
replacement supplement,\(^{406}\) and this supplement was adopted by E. Pöhlmann as well in their joint 2001 edition.\(^{407}\) A. Bélis, in her re-examination of the stone, claimed to see part of the Λ. Due to her revision in the preceding line ([κιθαρίζει]), she noted that it had become impossible to retain H. Weil’s supplements here. Failing to find a compelling replacement, Bélis chose to cautiously print Διός παίδα.\(^{408}\) W. Furley and J. Bremer proposed [Διός ἀείδομεν παίδα]. They found ὑμνοῦσι σέ “awkward” in light of the immediately preceding τὸν κλυτὸν παῖδα. To support their use of the first person plural (with ὁ πρόπας ἔσμός as subject) Furley and Bremer pointed to Limenios 18: κικλήσκομεν. They argued that self-reflexivity (we sing) is normative in hymns, and the collective is bolstered by the call for the muses to aid in singing found in line 3.

Unfortunately, even the most grammatically and metrically acceptable supplements can be no more than conjectures in this instance. I can find no trace of the Λ in the reproductions. The spacing of the letters in μεγάλου is troubling, since they get further apart as the word progresses. More bothersome is the fact that the photographs suggests a certain amount of ‘blank’ stone surface following the Υ, suggesting that the wide spacing continues. This would call for extreme caution in supplementing too many letters at the end of the line. At most there is space for two letters at the beginning of line 19 before the Ρ (which is quite clear). It seems likely that another genitive would be included here, seeing as there is no definite article associated with παίδα μεγάλου. Διός makes as good of sense as any, but there are many possible options for refereeing to Zeus.

---


\(^{407}\) Pöhlmann and West (2001), 66-7.

\(^{408}\) Bélis (1992), 71-2, 74.
It makes sense to place Διός with brackets as a sort of ‘placeholder’, but the verb must remain exceedingly uncertain.

| 19 | [ ΡΑΚΡΟΝΙΦΟΤΟΝΔΕΠΑΓΟΝΑΜ ] |
| 20 | [ ΠΙΑΣΙΘΝΑΤΟΙΟΙΣΠΡΟΦΑΙΝΕΙ ] |

There is extensive damage to the end of line 19, and the first characters of line 20 are also missing. A variety of attempts have been made to provide a satisfactory reconstruction. H. Weil supplemented αἰμ||βροτα πρό|πασι. Every editor since has accepted αἰμ||βροτα, with varying modifications made to the morphology of –τα. The attempts to fill the remainder of the lacuna have failed to achieve consensus. Th. Reinach initially suggested αἰ|μ|βροθ' ὄς α|πασι, but in his second edition preferred Weil’s new supplement, made once the correct column order had been re-established. Weil corrected his reading to αἰμ|βρότων ὄς πασι. D. Monro preferred the more conservative αἰμ|βροθ' ὄς πασι. O. Crusius, for the advantage of a precisely localized reference, preferred to look to the μαντικοὶ μυχοὶ of Pindar’s Pythian 5.68 and Aeschylus’ Eumenides 180. He supplemented αἰμ|βρότον| ἐκ μύχουν| πασι. Crusius’

---

409 Fritz Graf suggested πατρός as an alternative to Διός. I find this somewhat lacking as this reference would not do anything poetically. No association with former text or story suggests itself here, nor does the phrase either satisfy poetic expectation or produce surprise. But then, Διός would suffer from the same lack of flavor in this context.

410 Weil (1893), 574-5. He cited Sophokles, Antigone 1134: ἀμβρότον ἐπόων, and Euripides, Andromeda 1162: ὁ τὸν δικαίων πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις κριτῆς. These were in support of ἀμβροτα . . . λόγια and Ἀπασι θνατοῖς, respectively.

411 Reinach (1893), 586.

412 Weil (1894), 361; Reinach (1894), Plate XXVI; and Gevaert (1895), 402 both followed this reading.

413 Monro (1894), 134-5.

414 Crusius (1894), 30, 33, 35; Jan (1895), 435-5 followed his text, and Jan (1899), 16-17 also followed, with a minor modification: αἰμ|βρότον ἐκ μυχοῦν| πασι.
suggestion had little success, as only C. Jan followed his text. The consensus among early editions was basically Weil’s (1894) supplement, albeit with debate over the correct placement of the line-break. A. Fairbanks printed Weil’s corrected supplement, but kept his older line-break: \( \alpha\mu[|\beta\rho\omicron\varsigma \\upsilon\nu\nu\delta\epsilon \cdot \omicron\varsigma] \pi\alpha\sigmai. \)

In his critical \( FD \) edition, Th. Reinach moved it again, offering a placement that took more seriously the actual layout of the stone—at most, only 2 or 3 characters are missing from the beginning of line 20, and there is no clear reason to cram more when the end of line 19 could potentially extend to hold the needed letters. He moved the break to \( \alpha\mu[|\beta\rho\omicron\varsigma \\upsilon\nu\nu\delta\epsilon \cdot |\omicron\varsigma]. \)

This has become the consensus for its placement, even if disagreement has continued over the contents of the lacuna.

P.W. Moens found Weil’s supplement satisfactory in sense, and argued that it would allow one to read \( \alpha\mu\beta\rho\omicron\varsigma \) as a vocative addressed to Apollo. However, she commented that \( \acute{\alpha}\mu\beta\rho\omicron\varsigma \) and \( \acute{\upsilon}\nu\nu\delta\epsilon \varsigma \) are good epithets for oracles—or anything from or associated with the gods. Moens would connect \( \acute{\alpha}\mu\beta\rho\omicron\varsigma \) with \( \pi\alpha\gamma\zeta: \pi\alpha\rho' \acute{\kappa}\rho\omicron\nu\varphi\varsigma \cdot \tau\omicron\nu\delta \pi\alpha\gamma\omicron \alpha\mu\beta\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron. \) Hence, she supplemented \( \alpha\mu[|\beta\rho\omicron\varsigma, \theta\epsilon\varsigma\varphi\theta' | \delta]\zeta \pi\alpha\sigmai. \)

She made no comment regarding the \( \Sigma; \) her epigraphical transcription printed \( \Sigma, \) but her commentary printed \( \Sigma]. \)

E. Pöhlmann, in his examination of the stone, was the first to claim that he could actually see a \( \Sigma \) at the beginning of line 20, thus affirming Weil’s supplement. He printed

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Fairbanks (1900), 20.} \\
\text{Reinach (1909-13), 152-3, 157.} \\
\text{His text was followed by Powell (1925), 141, 143, 148 and West (1982), 361. Doutzar}\text{is (1934), 339 lacked line delineation, yet he re-printed the supplement of Weil and Reinach.} \\
\text{Moens (1930), 41, 44, 120. The edition on page 120 did not use sub-linear dots.}
\end{align*} \]
M.L. West, in “Analecta Musica,” changed the line to read \(\alpha \mu | \beta \rho \omega \tau ' \ \lambda \psi \varepsilon \nu \delta ' \ | \ \delta | \pi \alpha \sigma i\). In his Greek Music, of the same year, West printed the more conservative reading of \(\delta \alpha \mu | \beta \rho \omega \theta ' \ \circ \upsilon \) \(\pi \alpha \sigma i\). He and Pöhlmann adopted this reading in their joint 2001 edition. In their apparatus, they claim that the \(\circ \upsilon \) came by way of A. Bélis (1992). However, when I search her sketch and commentary, I fail to find any suggestion of such a reading in Bélis’ text. In fact, she very conservatively removed the controversial supplements, and instead printed \(\alpha \mu | \beta \rho \omega \tau ' \ | \ ] \pi \alpha \sigma i\). Bélis believed that the previous supplement of \(\delta \upsilon \) at the beginning of line 20 was too short. For comparison, she pointed to line 18, where the supplement \([RI]\), even if it occupied only 17mm of space (using the \(RI\) in \(\sigma \nu \rho \iota \mu \alpha \theta '\) in line 24, an example where the \(I\) takes up an unusually small amount of space), it would still leave a rather larger space to fill at the beginning of line 20. Bélis conceded that the stone does present cases of \(O\)’s and \(\Sigma\)’s which are somewhat separated (the title line of column 2 at 25 mm and line 28 at 26mm). However, for this to work, the \(RI\) in 18 need to take up considerably less space than two letters typically do, and the \(OS\) in line 20 would need to take up nearly three characters’ worth of space. Moreover, Bélis claimed that careful examination of the squeeze and photos allowed her to distinguish the remains of a letter, but not one that corresponds to a traditionally formed \(\Sigma\). She found the orientation of the apices difficult to interpret, and suggested there may be defects in the stone.

---

419 Pöhlmann (19730), 60-1. His text was followed by Chailley (1979), 157 and Käppel (1992), 389.


light of this, it is somewhat surprising that W. Furley and J. Bremer would print ἄμβροτον ἀψευδές ὅς πᾶσι in their edition.\(^{423}\)

In all reproductions, the right leg of the M at the end of line 19 is no longer visible, but identification is secure. In the more contemporary photographs the surface of the stone at beginning of line 20 is damaged. It is possible that intentional marks remain, but they could easily be damage to the stone. The older reproductions such as the oldest photo in Bélis and Pöhlmann’s photo (the BCH plate is too blurry) are highly suggestive of a vertical stroke, the right half of an upper horizontal stroke, and the right-ward projecting flair of a shorter, lower stroke, or perhaps the apex of the vertical stroke. The traces suggest a T, a Π, or perhaps an Y. The damage to the stone and quality of the reproductions makes certainty difficult. Αἄμβροτον seems a sure restoration, but the rest remains pure conjecture.

20 [ ΠΑΣΙΩΝΑΤΟΙΩΣΠΡΟΦΑΙΝΕΙ ]  
21 [ ΠΟΙΟΔΑΜΑΝΤΕΙΟΝΩΣΕΙΕΙ ]

There is extensive damage to the end of line 20, and two or three characters are missing from the beginning of line 21. While there can be no certainty over the restoration to the bulk of the lacuna on line 20, it has not been difficult to find persuasive and satisfying options, which suit the demands of meter and context. H. Weil first supplemented προφαίνεις λόγια τριποδα.\(^{424}\) His text was followed by Th.

\(^{423}\) Furley and Bremer (2001), 85-6. Note, they lacked proper line delineation, and do not double vowels. No comment was made regarding the Σ.

\(^{424}\) Weil (1893), 574.
Reinach. D. Monro and F. Gevaert both followed Weil’s supplement, but dropped the doubled diphthong: προφαίνεις [λόγια, τρ]ίποδα. Weil issued corrections in 1894 after reversing the order of the columns, and he offered a new supplement. Weil wanted to replace λόγια with ἐπη in order to close out the rhythmic period on this word, but felt that it did not adequately fill the space. Therefore, he supplemented προφαίνει[εις ἐπεα, τρ]ίποδα.

O. Crusius offered a different solution. Reasoning that προφαίνεις has to do with the future, and fate as expectation, he felt it appropriate to make use of a future tense verb. Crusius argued that it would be appropriate to make use of a first-person plural, as this was stylistically common to cult song. He proposed προφαίνει[ς, σε κελαδήσομεν, τρ]ίποδα. Crusius’ supplement failed to replace the more simplistic approach by Weil. His original supplement became the consensus reading, having incorporated the more appropriate placement of the line break. A. Fairbanks printed προφαίνει[εις | λόγια

425 It would seem that Reinach’s 1893 edition included a typo, as he printed προφαίνει [λόγια, τρ]ίποδα, but his 1894 edition correctly printed Weil’s supplement. Reinach (1893), 586; Reinach (1894), 153, 157; Plate XXVI.

426 Monro (1894), 135; Gevaert (1895), 402. Monro did not print doubled vowels, and so it is possible that he in fact followed Weil, yet he still placed the Σ outside of the lacuna: προφαίνεις [λόγια, τρ]ίποδα.

427 Weil (1894), 361. To break the line where he did (and it is clearly not a typo) hints at some confusion regarding the text on the stone. I find it difficult to understand how he thought that so many letters could fit at the beginning of line 21. Jan (1899), 16-17 followed his text. Doutzaris (1934), 340 oddly printed προφαίνει[εις ἔπεα τρ]ίποδα, but was clearly following Weil. He commented that he too preferred ἐπη, which is occasionally printed in the contract form of ἔπεα for both epigraphic and rhythmic reasons that he felt it would be useless to mention.

428 Crusius (1894), 30, 33, 35. Jan (1895), 434-5 followed his text, more or less: προφαίνεις [σε κελαδήσομεν, τρ]ίποδα. There is no justification for printing the Σ as visible on the stone, as no editor has ever claimed to see it. It is worth noting as well, that Jan did print doubled-vowels when they are appropriate.
but it was Th. Reinach’s placement in his FD edition that was most convincing: προφαίνει[εις λόγια, | τρ]ίποδα.430

P.W. Moens offered a variation, in part due to her supplement in the preceding line. In her opinion, λόγια was far too prosaic, and she argued that ἄναξ was a perfectly suited epithet for Apollo, as in Limenios’ hymn, 25—a comparandum she felt was strengthened by the presence of αἀμβρόται in the same line. To best understand Moens’ supplement, it is best to print somewhat more text: παρ’ ἀκρονιφῆ τόνδε πάγον αἀμ[βροτον, θέσφαθ’ | δ]ς πᾶσι θνατοῖς προφαίνει[εις, ἄναξ]| τρ]ίποδα.431

Typically cautious, A. Bélis preferred simply to print προφαίνει| |τρ]ίποδα.432 M.L. West argued that, by comparison to the supplements at the beginnings of the immediately preceding lines, line 21 would need three characters to fill the lacuna, and he recommended transferring the final syllable from line 20 on down: προφαίνει[εις λόγια, τρ]ίποδα.433 A compromise of ambiguity can be observed in his joint 2001 edition with E. Pöhlmann. In their transcription on page 66, Pöhlmann and West printed | . . . |ίποδα, but the musical edition with supplements on page 67 (which lacks proper line-delineation) visually breaks the line between λόγια and τρίποδα by necessity of layout—a formatting decision that could easily be misconstrued.434 W. Furley and J. Bremer, who

429 Fairbanks (1900), 20.
430 Reinach (1909-13), 153, 157. His text was followed by Powell (1925), 141, 143, 148; Pöhlmann (1970), 60-61; Chailley (1979), 157; and Käppel (1992), 389.
431 Moens (1930), 41, 44, 120. There is some question regarding the R, as she printed ΤΡ on page 41 in here epigraphical text, but in her commentary on 45 and edition on 120 she printed [TP]. No other editions have claimed to see the R.
433 West (1992a), 7; Hagel (200), 125 followed this reading.
did not make use of line delineation, maintained the ambiguity. They simply printed

\[\text{προφαίνει ἐν λόγῳ, τρὶπόδα}.\]

The surface of the stone at the end of line 20 is worn, but the EI is quite visible in all but the most recent photograph, where the I is no longer visible due to damage. All of the photographs had shown some damage to the bottom of this letter, but now the entirety is gone. Nothing is visible before the I at the beginning of line 21 in any reproduction. While the traditional supplements make sense, there is no certainty to anything more than the TP in τρὶπόδα.

21 [ ]ΠΙΟΛΑΜΑΝΤΕΙΕΙΟΝΩΣΕΙΕΙ[ ]
22 [ ]ΟΥΟΥΡΕΙΕΙΔΡΑΚΩΝΟΤΕΤΕ [ ]

The end of line 21 is damaged, with likely 8 to 11 letters missing. Two or three letters are missing from the beginning of line 22. The remainder of the column tends to have fewer and fewer letters preserved with each line, and so lacunae become more and more problematic. Here, the extant letters in each case form enough of a word to allow for reasonably certain restorations, however the middle of the lacuna presents more of a challenge, and several possibilities have been proposed. H. Weil first proposed that we read εἰε[λες, ἔχθρος ὅν ἐφρ]οουὸρειει, and the early editions largely followed his supplement. O. Crusius followed Weil’s supplements, but introduced some uncertainty

---

435 Furley and Bremer (2001), 85.
436 Line 2 has 35 letters (max), and lines 8 and 9 have 28 and 29 respectively. The assumption is made that column 2 has roughly the same length of lines as column 1.
437 Weil (1893), 574. He was followed by Monro (1893), 135 (note he did not print vowel doublings or line delineations); Reinach (1894), Plate XXVI; Jan (1895), 434-5; Gevaert (1895); Jan (1899), 16-19; and Fairbanks (1900), 20. Of these, only Fairbanks made use of line delineations, but it is clear that the
regarding what was still legible on the stone. Crusius printed EIEI\[ in his epigraphical transcription, but ειει\[ in his edition.\textsuperscript{438} The uncertainty regarding the I appeared in later editions. Th. Reinach repositioned the line break, to reflect more adequately the actual placement of the text on the stone: ειει\[ ιες, ἔχθρος ὃν ἔ[φρ]ουοῦρειει.\textsuperscript{439} This placement and supplement became the consensus reading.

P.W. Moens suggested that one could write ἀγριος rather than ἔχθρος. She noted that the Homeric Hymn to Apollo refers to the drakōn as ἀγριον τέρας.\textsuperscript{440} Moens supplemented ειει\[ ιες ἀγριος ὃν ἔ[φρ]ουοῦρειει, with some inconsistencies on the various pages in her edition.\textsuperscript{441} No comment was made regarding the P, and no other editor has claimed to see it. In his re-examination of the stone, Pöhlmann claimed to be able to see the I, and he modified his edition to read ειει\[ ιες, ἔχθρος ὃν ἔ[φρ]ουοῦρειει.\textsuperscript{442} A. Bélis, making her own examination of the stone, agreed with Pöhlmann, explaining that the I was flush with the break, but still clear. However, she cautiously preferred to print ειει\[ ιες, ἀγριος ὃν ἔ[φρ]ουοῦρειει; Bélis’ edition reminds the reader that extremely compelling supplements remain uncertain, and the automatic acceptance of supplements derived from Weil. Reinach (1893), 153, 157 conservatively printed ειει\[ ιεν... οὐοῦρειει, but he followed Weil in his 1894 edition.

\textsuperscript{438} Crusius (1894), 30, 33. His edition also dropped the comma, but this may have been unintentional as no mention is made. However, the finally I in his epigraphical edition was hatched, indicating that only a partial I remained visible.

\textsuperscript{439} Reinach (1909-13), 153, 157. He was followed by Powell (1925), 141, 143, 148; and Doutzaris (1934), 340 (although, as Doutzaris did not make use of line delineation, it is also possible that he followed Crusius).

\textsuperscript{440} Homeric Hymn to Apollo, 124.

\textsuperscript{441} Moens (1930). She printed EIEI\[ in the epigraphical text on page 41, but ειει\[ in her edition on page 45. She printed JP\[ in the epigraphical text on page 42 and the edition on page 45. Her edition on page 120 lacked vowel-doubling, line delineation, and sub-linear dots, where she printed ειει\[ ιες, ἀγριος ὃν ἔ[φρ]ουοῦρειει.

\textsuperscript{442} Pöhlmann (197), 60-1. He was followed by Chailley (1979), 157; Käppel (1992), 389; West (1992b), 291 (which is odd, as West’s other editions printed a modified supplement); Hagel (2000), 125; and Furley and Bremer (2001), 85.
of Weil’s first restorations perhaps needs to be questioned, particularly in the case of such extensive lacunae.\footnote{Bélis (1992), 71-2, 74.} Martin West also felt some uncertainty over the original supplement; in \textit{Greek Meter}, he preferred simply to print the expected meter: \textit{ειε\textendash ί\textendash λε\textendash ς \textendash δ\textendash ν} \footnote{West (1982), 146. Note: In this edition, West did not employ sub-linear dots.} J. Diggle, in his review of West’s book, suggested \textit{μέγα\textendash ς} as a suitable supplement.\footnote{Diggle (1984), 71.} West, having modified the placement of the previous line break to \textit{λ.\dot{γ}ι\textendash α \ τρ\textendash π\textendash ο\textendash δ\textendash α} in his “Analecta Musica” edition, found that he needed to reduce the length of line 21, as the addition of the \textit{A} (if the standard \textit{έ\textendash χ\textendash θ\textendash ρ\textendash ς \textendash δ\textendash ν} supplement was accepted) would produce an exceptional 36 characters for the line. Therefore, he adopted Diggle’s proposal and printed: \textit{ειε\textendash ί\textendash λε\textendash ς, \textendash μέγα\textendash ς \textendash \dot{φ}ρ\textendash ς \textendash ο\textendash ν\textendash ύ\textendash ρ\textendash ε\textendash ρε\textendash ι\textendash ε\textendash ι\textendash ε\textendash ι.}\footnote{West (1992a), 7. Note he also adopted Pöhlmann’s reading of \textit{I}.} West convinced Pöhlmann to adopt this reading in their 2001 joint edition, and relying on Bélis’ confident reading of the \textit{I}, upgraded the restoration to \textit{ειε\textendash ί\textendash λε\textendash ς, \textendash μέγα\textendash ς \textendash \dot{φ}ρ\textendash ς \textendash ο\textendash ν\textendash ύ\textendash ρ\textendash ε\textendash ρε\textendash ι\textendash ε\textendash ι\textendash ε\textendash ι.}\footnote{Pöhlmann and West (2001), 66-7. While it is true that Bélis confidently read an \textit{I} on the stone, they erred in printing her edition (pg. 74) as \textit{ειε\textendash λε\textendash ς}, when this supplement is only present as a matter of discussion of the readings of Reinach and Pöhlmann.}

When examining a recent photograph, the barest trace of the \textit{I} remains on the edge of the stone at the end of line 21, yet it is clearly a vertical stroke and there is no good reason to doubt a secure reading of \textit{I}. The older reproductions present the same trace. There is wear to the surface of the stone at the beginning of line 22, partially obscuring the \textit{O}, but the bottom and right-hand portions of the character is clear. \textit{ειε\textendash ί\textendash λε\textendash ς} seems to be a reasonable supplement, given the surety of the \textit{I}, as does \textit{\dot{φ}ρ\textendash ς \textendash ο\textendash ν\textendash ύ\textendash ρ\textendash ε\textendash ρε\textendash ι\textendash ε\textendash ι\textendash ε\textendash ι}.
due to context and the lack of other options for –ουρεῖ. Anything more is pure conjecture.

22  [ |ΟΥΟΥΡΕΙΕΙΔΡΑΚΩΝΟΤΕΤΕ[ ]
23  [ |ΗΗΣΑΣΑΙΩΛΟΛΕΚΤΑΝ[ ]

There is considerable loss at the end of line 22, and what appear to be two characters have been destroyed at the beginning of line 23. H. Weil initially supplemented ὅτε τε[οῖσι | βέλεσιν ἔτ]ρ η[π]σας, and many editions have found it compelling enough to retain, with some debate over the position of the line break and the actual characters still visible on the stone.449 Th. Reinach conservatively printed ὅτ' ἐτε[ ἐτρ]η[π]σας at first, and it is worth noting the possible variant in word-division. Although no edition has yet to offer a supplement following this division, it remains a possibility.450 Some early editions printed ὅτε τε[οῖσι βέλεσιν ἐτρ]η[π]σας, and it is important to remember that many did not employ sub-linear dots, or proper line-delineation.451 This is a simple matter more often than not, but it can produce occasional confusion, as in the case of D. Monro not printing the vowel-doublings in this instance.452 O. Crusius added more confidence to the reading of the characters on the stone, and decided to lengthen the supplement with a vowel doubling: ὅτε τε[οιοῖσι | βέλεσιν ἐτρ]η[π]σας. He argued that it

448 Cf. Scholiast on Apollonios if Rhodes, Argonautica (scholia vetera), page 181.14: ὅτι <Δελφύνης> ἐκαλεῖτο ὁ φυλάσσων τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς χρηστήριον.
449 Weil (1894), 574.
450 Reinach (1893), 586.
451 ὅτε τε[οῖσι βέλεσιν ἐτρ]η[π]σας, so printed Jan (1895), 434-5; and Gevaert (1895).
452 He printed ὅτε τε[οῖσι βέλεσιν ἐτρ]η[π]σας, and the lack of doubled vowels become apparent here, particularly, in that some editions printed τε[οιοῖσι while others did not, with the intent of rejecting the doubling rather than merely ‘tidying’ the text. He more than likely follows Weil and Reinach rather than Crusius. Monro (1894), 135.
was obvious ("offenbar") that the *drakōn* fell by repeated arrow-shots, and compared this event to Simonides’s *paean*: βέλεσιν ἐκατόν, as well as Eustathios: δέον ὃν μιᾷ βολῇ νεκρῶσαι τὸ θηρίον, and Kallimachos’ *Hymn to Apollo*: ὄλλον ἐπ’ ὄλλῳ | βάλλω ὃκὼν ὦιστών. Crusius was followed by several other early editions.

In his *FD* edition, Th. Reinach repositioned the line-break to better fit with the actual placement of the text on the stone. He questioned the supplement of ἔτρ, as the traces of the character before the Η appear to end with a vertical right stroke, allowing for an I, N, or M. Reinach reproduced the earlier supplements in his edition anyways, but called them “très douteux.” He printed ὅτε τε[σθι] βέλεσιν ἔτρησαί. The issue was further complicated by J. Powell, who followed Reinach and Crusius, but printed both ἔτρ and ἔτρ̣. P. Doutzaris printed ὅτε τε[σθι] βέλεσιν ἔτρησαί. Nevertheless, Weil’s supplement has had remarkable staying power. In his fresh examination of the stone, Pöhlmann updated the matter of visible traces, raising once more the problematic reading of the Π. Pöhlmann commented that while Weil claimed to see traces, he found the stone unclear and, further, he claimed that he saw the apex of either the letter I or N. In spite of this, Pöhlmann re-printed the older supplement: ὅτε τε[σθι] βέλεσιν ἔτρησαί. He also noted that he could make out traces of the E at the

---


454 Reinach (1894), Plate XXVII; Jan (1899), 18-19 (he printed both ἔτρ̣ and ἔτρ]); and Fairbanks (1900), 20. Only Fairbanks had proper line-delineation.


456 Powell (1925), 141, 143 printed ἔτρ̣ and page 148 printed ἔτρ.

457 Doutzaris (1934), 340.
end of line 22.\footnote{Pöhlmann (1970), 60-1. His text was followed by Chailley (1979), 157 and Käppel (1992), 389. Furley and Bremer (2001), 85-6 printed τέ[οίσι βέλεσιν ἐτρή]ςας, but they lacked vowel-doublings and proper line delineation.}

A. Bélis also claimed to see the E, saying that is was worn, but clear. She also found Weil’s restoration contestable, and the extant traces on line 23 suggested an I or N to her as well. Bélis removed the offending supplement, and printed τὲ[ ] ἑσας.\footnote{Bélis (1992), 71-2, 74; Hagel (2000), 125 followed this reading.}

P.W. Moens once more offered a potential variation. In response to Th. Reinach’s concern for the traces of the P, she commented that what he saw might not have been a letter at all, but simply a bump on the stone. Moens offered ὅτε τέ[ρας γαᾶς ἐνίκηςας] as a possible supplement.\footnote{Moens (1930), 42-46. She printed ὅτε τέ[ρας as well, on page 42.}

She noted that unlike Limenios’ hymn, 26, where the poet wrote παῖδα γαᾶς, or in Euripides Iphigeneia at Tauris, 1247: γᾶς πελώριον τέρας, the hymn of Athenaios lacks any extant reference to the drakōn as the child of Gē. The context seemed to her to be an appropriate fit.\footnote{Cf. also Statius Thebais, 1.562: terrigenam Pythona; Homeric Hymn to Apollo, 124: ἄγριον τέρας.}

While Moens’ supplement, as usual, failed to gain wide acceptance, the argument she deployed surfaced again in M.L. West’s edition. He presented it as his own idea. West found ἔ[τρ]ήςας “a most implausible verb.” He cited Limenios 27: παῖδα Γα[ᾶς] τ’ ἐπεφνες ιοῖς as a comparandum for his suggestion of ὅτε τέ[κος Γαᾶς ἀπέ]στήςας.\footnote{West (1992a), 7. No indication is made in this article that he was aware of Moens (1930), however her work did appear in the Bibliography of Pöhlmann and West (2001), and yet on page 67 they only cited West (1992a), Reinach (1909-13), and Bélis (1992) for this line.}

West followed his new supplement in his 1992 Greek Music, and he and Pöhlmann printed it in their joint 2001 edition.\footnote{West (1992b), 292. Pöhlmann and West (2001), 66-7. Hagel (2000), 131 preferred this reading as well. He personal claimed to be unable to see the traces, but argued the claim of a vertical stroke, while it eliminated the possibility of a P, did not eliminate West’s proposed T.}
West’s suggestion runs afoul of the same problem as Weil’s, in that the traces which Reinach, Pöhlmann, and Bélis all claimed to see on the stone do not permit a reading of T. In a recent photograph, I can make out what may be traces of the upper left portion of an E at the end of line 22, but the wear on the stone makes it difficult to be certain that damage to the stone is tricking the eye. The traces are not visible in the BCH Plate, Pöhlmann’s photo, or the oldest photograph in Bélis. Bélis’ more recent photo and squeeze offer suggest evidence for what may be traces, but they could just as easily be due to damage to the stone. At the beginning of line 23 what appear to be the upper and lower apices of a vertical line are visible, but the connecting stroke cannot be made out. The lower apex seems less certain. None of the reproductions in Bélis (or the other older photos) are helpful in revealing anything more. Therefore, any supplement remains highly conjectural.

23  [ ] ἩΣΑΣΑΙΟΛΟΕΙΚΤΑΝ
24  [ ] ΣΥΥΡΙΓΜΑΘΙΕΙΣΑΘΩΠΕ

There is increasing damage as the text proceeds, with each line retaining fewer letters, requiring more extensive (and creative) supplementation. The end of line 23 and the beginning of line 24 are damaged. The gap between is large enough that many authors have been reluctant to even attempt to restore the text fully. H. Weil proposed that the text read [φυάν], offering no justification for the word, nearly all later editions have accepted it.464 D. Monro conservatively attempted no restoration, and merely indicated

464 Weil (1893), 574. Among the early editions, he was followed by Reinach (1893), 586; Reinach (1894), Plate XVII; Gevaert (1895), 403; Fairbanks (1900), 20; and Doutzaris (1934), 20. Doutzaris ended his text at this point.
the lacuna. ⁴⁶⁵ O. Crusius was the first to creatively attempt to fill the full gap. He, with no real explanation, simply supplemented [φυάν, ἔσθ’ ὁ | θῆρ συχνα]. ⁴⁶⁶ C. Jan followed Crusius’ reading in both editions. ⁴⁶⁷ In his FD edition, Th. Reinach reprinted Crusius’ supplement, but repositioned the line break. Reinach noted that he found the supplements very doubtful. ⁴⁶⁸

P. W. Moens offered a significantly different possibility. She noted that after the TAN in line 23, there were traces of a character, perhaps a Γ. However, Moens’ proposed supplement does not begin with Γ. She preferred to begin a new sentence with ἑλικτάν. Moens noted Nonnus’ Dionysiaka 4.379: δέμας ὀρθώσας wherein the drakōn Cadmus fought is described. She also noted a graphic portrayal of this sort of event. ⁴⁶⁹ She supplemented ἑλικτάν [δ’ ἀείρων δέρην ἑ|δά]. ⁴⁷⁰

In his fresh examination of the stone, E. Pöhlmann claimed to be able to traces of an A at the beginning of line 24. He reprinted Crusius’ supplements, and the fresh reading appeared to grant some validity to the older supplements: [φυάν, ἔσθ’ ὁ θηρ

---

⁴⁶⁵ Monro (1894), 135.
⁴⁶⁶ Crusius (1894), 30, 33.
⁴⁶⁷ Jan (1895), 436-7, Jan (1899), 18-19.
⁴⁶⁹ A wall painting in the House of the Vettii in Pompeii shows Leto carrying both her children in her arms (as small children), confronted by a snake erect upon several coils, depicted within a cave entrance. Academia dei Lincei, Monumenti Antichi VIII (1898) pl. 11, p. 366 = fig. 3 in Fontenrose (1959). In addition, a Black-figure lekythos shows a similar scene, this time Artemis appears grown, but the baby Apollo shoots his bow at the coiled serpent, held in his mother’s arms. Bibliothèque Nationale, Cabinet des Médailles, Paris. CVA, France 10, pl. 86. 6-8 – fig. 1 in Fontenrose (1959). A silver coin c. 420-30 BCE from Croton, Sicily depicts Apollo shooting and erect but coiled serpent standing directly underneath the tripod-perhaps Apollo is portrayed as a youth (Cf. Apollonios of Rhodes, Argonautica 207-11). HN p. 96, fig. 54 in Historia Numorum, B.V. Head, 2nd ed., Oxford. = fig. 2 in Fontenrose (1959).
⁴⁷⁰ Moens (1930), 43, 45, 120.
συκ[ν]ι.] 471 Martin West proposed another alternative, saying that is “unknown to elevated poetry.” He exchanged it for πυκ[ν]ι.] 472 West convinced Pöhlmann to adopt this reading in their joint 2001 edition. 473 A. Bélis excised all supplements, and claimed that the traces on the stone were too indistinct to hazard a hypothesis, much less to affirm the A. 474

None of the reproductions show anything after the Ν at the end of line 23. At the beginning of line 24, it is possible that there is a single apex extant, which would have been located at the lower right corner of the character. This can be seen in Bélis’ recent photo and squeeze, as well as the most recent photograph. Nothing more can be seen. There is no reason to retain any of the supplements, including φυαν. Any supplementation by comparison with other, similar, texts is fraught with difficulty as Athenaios shows repeatedly that he is interested in modifying, avoiding, or transforming what one might have expected.

24 [ |ΣΥΡΙΓΜΑΘΙΕΙΣΑΘΩΠΕ [ ]

The end of line 24 is not only broken away—the last several characters are heavily worn and damaged, making it difficult to read them. However, sufficient traces remain for reasonably certain identification. The size of the lacuna, once more, has invited varying degrees of creativity or caution from the different editors. H. Weil

471 Pöhlmann (1970), 60-1. His reading was followed by Chailley (1970), 157; Käppel (1992), 389 (who reaffirmed the presence of the Α on the stone; and Furley and Bremer (2001), 85-6.
474 Bélis (1992), 71-2, 74. Hagel (2000), 125 followed her here, but retained the Α.
supplemented ἀθώπ[ευτος], and all subsequent editions have accepted this restoration, with varying modifications made to the morphology.\textsuperscript{475} Th. Reinach, in his first edition, printed ἀθώπε[υτος] but reverted to Weil’s reading, with an even more conservative approach to the supplement, in his second edition: ἀθώπ[ευτ . . . ].\textsuperscript{476} D. Monro offered a possible extension with ἀθώπε[υτ εβα\textsuperscript{477} ].

O. Crusius offered a new supplement, which was adopted by most subsequent editions. The ambiguity over the legibility of the E continued, as he printed it as visible in his epigraphic transcription, but as a supplement in his edition. Crusius himself cautioned that, while the supplements made sense, they were not certain. He printed ἀθώπε[υτ ἀπέπνευσ| ὁμῷος.\textsuperscript{478}]

Th. Reinach, in his FD edition, expressed doubt regarding Crusius’ supplements but printed them. He did move the line-break to represent the actual layout of text on the stone more accurately: ἀθώπε[υτ’, ἀπέπνευσ| ὁμῷος’].\textsuperscript{479} Reinach’s placement was adopted by all subsequent editions.\textsuperscript{480} P.W. Moens, again, offered her own supplement, a

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{475}{Weil (1893), 574. He noted Strabo, Geography 9.3.10, where the dying dragon produces whistling noises; Αθώπευτος = ἀμείλικτος. Gevaert (1895), 403 followed his reading.}
\footnotetext{476}{Reinach (1893), 586; Reinach (1894), Plate XXVII. Fairbanks (1900), 20 more or less printed the same thing, with ἀθώπε[υτα.}
\footnotetext{477}{Monro (1894), 135.}
\footnotetext{478}{Crusius (1894), 30, 33-5. His text was followed by Jan (1895), 436; and Jan (1899), 18-19. It must be commented on that that Jan (1895) printed the supplement in full in his textual transcription, but on the facing page, in the musical edition, he only printed ἀθώπ[ευτα . . . He overcame his caution in his 1899 edition, printing the supplement in full in the musical edition, accompanied by made-up melody notes. There is also a printing mistake in Jan (1894), as he printed σουρ[γμαθ on page 436, but the correct bracket placement on the facing page, 437. It is somewhat understandable, as his edition did not actually make use of ‘[’ s but instead relied on font size and weight.}
\footnotetext{479}{Reinach (1909-13), 153, 158.}
\footnotetext{480}{His text was followed by Powell (1925), 141, 143, 148; Pöhlmann (1970), 60-61; Chailley (1979), 157; Käppel (1992), 389; West (1992a), 7; West (1992b), 292; Pöhlmann and West (2001), 66-7; and Furley and Bremer (2001), 85-6, 91. Furley and Bremer noted that the supplement [ἀπέπνευστ'] derives from the}
\end{footnotes}
slight modification: ἀθώπε[υτος ἀπέπνευσ' ὁ θήρ]. She argued that ὁμος was redundant and unnecessary due to context, and that the placement at the end of the phrase/line was odd.\textsuperscript{481} A. Bélis removed the supplements and simply printed: ἀθώπε[υτ'].\textsuperscript{482}

An examination of the photographs reveals that the E at the end of line 24 is quite visible, albeit with damage to the lower right portion. The preceding letters are worn, but not in question. They are particularly clear in Bélis’ squeeze. The E is quite visible and legible in her reproduction of the old photograph, and reasonably clear in the BCH plate and Pöhlmann’s photo as well. The E never should have been in question. The restoration of ἀθωπ[ευτ'] seems reasonably secure, but anything more is pure conjecture.

25 [ΔΕΓΑΛΑΤΑΑΝΑΡΗΣ]

The beginning of line 25 has lost roughly two characters, and their restoration is made difficult, as the extant letters appear to begin a new word. Any restoration must be conjecture, due to the large lacuna at the end of line 24. Nevertheless, several possible supplements have been proposed.

Most of the initial editions simply left the lacuna empty.\textsuperscript{483} D. Monro suggested [νῦν].\textsuperscript{484} O. Crusius offered [πρῶν], and was followed by C. Jan.\textsuperscript{485} Th. Reinach, taking

\textit{Homeric Hymn to Apollo, 360 ἀποπωείουσ’,} and that Limenios’ 27 also functioned as a \textit{comparandum}: ὁ[μῶς].

\textsuperscript{481} Moens (1930), 44-45, 120. On page 44 the left ‘[’ is missing. It was correctly placed on paged 45 and 120.
\textsuperscript{482} Bélis (1992), 71-2. Hagel (2000), 125 followed this reading.
\textsuperscript{483} Thus Weil (1893), 573; Reinach (1893), 586; Reinach (1894), Plate XXVII; Gevaert (1895), 403; and Fairbanks (1901), 20.
\textsuperscript{484} Monro (1894), 135.
\textsuperscript{485} Crusius (1894), 30, 34, 36; Jan (1895), 436-7; Jan (1899), 18-19.
more seriously the limited space available on the stone at the beginning of the line, suggested [ὦς]. His reading has been the one adopted by later editors. ⁴⁸⁶ P.W. Moens printed her own guess, [ὅτε ἄ]δε, due to Crusius’ proposal being too long, and raised the question of whether the Δ was actually visible on the stone. ⁴⁸⁷ In his fresh examination of the stone, Pöhlmann failed to see the Δ. He noted that Reinach had claimed to read it, but it was no longer visible. However, due to the previous consensus, Pöhlmann printed [ὦς] ἄδε, and he noted line 21 as a parallel in support of his supplement: as with the drakōn, so too with the Gauls. ⁴⁸⁸ A. Bélis, too, failed to read the Δ on the stone, but she claimed that is was visible on older reproductions, revealing the right sloping stroke, and part of the left, starting from the top apex (only possible as Δ, Α, or Λ). She cautiously printed [ἴδε]. ⁴⁸⁹ M.L. West, in his “Analecta Musica,” printed [ὁδ]δε, another possibility, and a needed one, he claimed, due to the repositioning of the supplements he had engaged in. ⁴⁹⁰ However, in Greek Music, West printed [ὦς] ἄδε, and in his joint edition with Pöhlmann, they printed the more standard [ὦς] ἄδε. ⁴⁹¹ W. Furley and J. Bremer modified the standard supplement slightly, with [ὦς] δὲ. They pointed to Limenios’ paean, 27: ὁ[μοίως] as comparandum for their supplement. ⁴⁹²

---

⁴⁸⁶ Reinach (1909-13), 153, 155, 157. He was followed by Powell (1925), 141, 143, 146, 148; Chailley (1979), 157; and Pöhlmann and West (2001), 66-7.

⁴⁸⁷ Moens (1930), 46-48, 120.


⁴⁸⁹ Bélis (1992), 71-2, 74.

⁴⁹⁰ West (1992a), 7.

⁴⁹¹ Pöhlmann and West (2001), 66-7; West (1992b), 292.

⁴⁹² Furley and Bremer (2001), 85, 86, 91.
An examination of the most recent photograph reveals no discernable traces of the Δ. However, the old photograph reproduced in Bélis (1992) does reveal, as she claimed, the right sloping stroke and top apex, and what may possibly be the beginning of the left sloping stroke. Bélis’ own squeeze and photograph reveal nothing. Neither Pöhlmann’s photo nor the BCH Plate show visible traces. The identification of the Δ seems reasonably sure.

25 [ ]ΔΕΓΑΛΑΣΑΓΙΕΑΝΑΡΗΣ[
26 [ ]ΝΕΠΕΡΑΣΑΣΕΠΙΤ[

Line 25 breaks off at the end of a word, giving no hints as to what originally was written on the stone. Characters are missing at the beginning of line 26 as well, leaving a large lacuna that cannot be confidently restored. Most of the original editions made no attempt, and simply left the lacuna empty. 493 O. Crusius, inspired by other accounts of the Gallic invasion, as well as by Limenios’ account, attempted to fill the gap. He cited precedent: Cf. Kallimachos, Hymn to Delos 172ff: Ἑλλήνεσσι μάχαιραν | βαρβαρικήν καὶ Κελτὸν ἀναστήσαντες Ἀρη. For reading Ἀρης as equivalent to a mortal army, he noted Nonnus, Dionysiaka 25.50: Ἀρης . . . ναύτης. 494 More useful as a comparandum is Nonnus, Dionysiaka 13.343, wherein the Maurusian people take up arms, to be described

---

493 Cf. Weil (1893), 573 (He also did not print the N standing at the beginning of the extant text of line 26.); Reinach (1893), 586; Monro (1894), 135; Gevaert (1895), 403; Fairbanks (1900), 20; Reinach (1894), Plate XXVII; Jan (1899), 18-19 (note that he has removed Crusius’ supplements, which he had printed in his 1895 edition); Reinach (1909-13), 153, 158; Powell (1925), 141, 143, 146, 148. Powell did print Crusius’ supplements in his apparatus, even though he left them out of his edition.

494 He also cited Xenophon, Cyropaedeia 3.3.26 as an example a βάρβαρον στρατεύμα, but this is little help.
as βάρβαρος Ἀρης. Crusius supplemented [βάρβαρος, τάνδ' δ' ἐπὶ γαῖα|ν].\(^{495}\) His supplement was adopted and printed by most later editions.\(^{496}\) West found his supplements here “satisfactory,” and pointed to Limenios’ paean, 32: ὁ βάρ|βαρος Ἀρης as a comparandum.\(^{497}\)

Moens offered her own option. She criticized the supplements of Crusius as being “vague.” Thinking of plunder and the need for defense, Moens proposed [θόκον ἱερὸν μαντεῖον]. In support, she noted Pindar, Pythian 11.6: Ἰσμήνειον δ’ ὀνύμαξεν, ἀλαθέα μαντεῖον θόκον as well as Aeschylus, Prometheus Bound, 831-2: τὴν αἰπύρωτὸν τ’ ἀμφὶ Δωδώνην ἵνα | μαντεῖα θάκος τ’ ἐστὶ Θεσπρωτοῦ Δίος.\(^{498}\)

Bélis, perhaps best of all, reverted to the original practice of leaving the lacuna blank. She printed [   ]\(^{499}\) In all reproductions the Σ at the end of line 25 is perfectly visible, with the stone being broken just at the edge of this character. Again, at the beginning of line 26, the break is just at the edge of the N, which is clearly visible in all reproductions save the BCH Plate. The more recent images reveal nothing more. There is no compelling reason to print the supplements as part of the edition.

\[\begin{align*}
26 & \text{ [ ]ΝΕΠΕΡΑΣΑΣΕΠΙΤ}\text{[ ]} \\
27 & \text{ [ ]ΣΑΛΛΙΩΓΕΕΕΝΝΑΝ}\text{[ ]}
\end{align*}\]

\(^{495}\) Crusius (1894), 30, 34, 36.

\(^{496}\) Jan (1895), 436 printed Crusius’ supplement in his critical edition, but on page 437 in his musical score, he ended the line with Γαλατᾶν Ἀρης. Pöhlmann (1970), 60-61; Chailley (1979), 158; Käppel (1992), 389; West (1992b), 292; Pöhlmann and West (2001), 66-7; and Furley and Bremer (2001), 85, 86 followed Crusius’ text.

\(^{497}\) West (1992a), 8.

\(^{498}\) Moens (1930), 46-48, 120.

\(^{499}\) Bélis (1992), 71-2.
Lines 26 and 27 are heavily damaged on both ends. The visible Σ on line 27 is taken by most editions to be the final character in the third strophe. Therefore, the remainder of line 27 will be treated below in the next section. Again, the size of the lacuna makes confident (or even tentative, really) restoration impossible, yet the presence of a partial word at the end of 26 makes it likely that a few characters, at least, may be supplemented with caution. H. Weil restored the text to read ἄσεπτος | Σ.\(^{500}\) Th. Reinach originally followed Weil, but in his 1894 edition, he removed all supplementation.\(^{501}\) O. Crusius offered a more extensive supplement. He commented in his text that the proposal was only to be taken as an example, rather than anything that could be confidently relied on.\(^{502}\) Crusius commented that κράτιστος is a typical god-epithet, which suits Apollo in this context: cf. applied to Zeus in Pindar Paean fr. 52h.50: τάς ὁ κράτιστος ἑράσσατο μιχθείς τοχοφόρον τελέσαι γόνιν, and Athena in Aristophanes, Lysistrata 1320. Crusius felt that no evidence was required to justify the association with θεός. He supplemented ἄσεπτος, κράτιστον θεόν ἐόντα σ'esteqala, but

\(^{500}\) Weil (1893), 574; Reinach (1893), 586; Monro (1894), 135; and Gevaert (1895), 403 followed his text.

\(^{501}\) Reinach (1894), Plate XXVII; Fairbanks (1900), 20 preferred this as well.

\(^{502}\) Crusius (1894), 36-7. “…sollte mit den Ergänzungen lediglich der Gedankengang beispielsweise angedeutet warden.”

\(^{503}\) Crusius (1894), 30, 33, 36-7. His epigraphical edition hatched the O, indicating that it was only partially visible. Page 153, in his musical edition he printed a variation: ἄσεπτος θεόν ἐόντα σ'esteqala.
in his second edition he reverted to Weil’s simplistic restoration. In his *FD* edition, Reinach adopted Weil’s initial, conservative supplement.

P.W. Moens offered radically different supplements. She argued that Crusius’ suggestion was too long, as well as too vague. She preferred to invoke explicitly the snowstorm mentioned in the hymn by Limenios. As such, Moens proposed 

\[
\textit{ἀσέπτως \chiόνος \textepsilon\textmu\textomicron\nu\thetai\tau\omicrono \lambdaευκής \textit{βολαίς}.}
\]

She pointed to Euripides, *Bacchai* 661-2: ἦκω Κτθαιρὸν’ ἐκλπὼν ἵν’ οὖποτε | λευκὴς ἀνείσαν χίόνος εὖα<ν>γεῖς βολαὶ as a *comparandum*. Her direction was persuasive, and it was Moens’ supplement that was adopted and modified by later editors, rather than Crusius’. Pöhlmann, pointing to Limenios 21, and considering Moens’ supplement, offered 

\[
\textit{ἀσέπτως \chiόνος \textepsilon\textmu\textomicron\nu\thetai\tau\omicrono' \upsilon\gammaραίς \textit{βολαίς}.}
\]

In his notes Pöhlmann cites Moens as having dotted the \(\text{E} \) in \(\textit{ἀσέπτως} \), but this is incorrect.

Several later editions followed Pöhlmann’s text.

Martin West wished to modify this supplement slightly, changing it to 

\[
\textit{ἀσέπτως \chiόνος \textepsilon\textmu\textomicron\nu\thetai\tau\omicrono' \upsilon\gammaραίς \chi\omega|\alphaίς},
\]

as he felt that the line division of \(\textit{βολαίς} \) was impossible. West argued that making it \(\textit{βολαίς} \) would produce a line of 37 characters, which was too long. Additionally, he noted that the final note of a sentence is “always an undivided diseme in these *Paeans.*” As there was insufficient room for a consonant + long vowel at the beginning of line 27, preferred \(\chi\omega|\alphaίς\). West remained hesitant as to any confidence,

---

504 Jan (1894), 437 and Jan (1899), 18-19. In his 1894 edition, he only added the supplement to his textual transcription, not the musical edition on the facing page.

505 Reinach (1909-13), 153; Powell (1925), 141, 143 followed this text, but on page 146 he noted Crusius’ supplement in his notes, and left the entire line off of his text on page 148.

506 Moens (193), 47-48, 120.


508 Chailley (1979), 158; Käppel (1992), 389; and Furley and Bremer (2001). 85-6. Furley and Bremer noted that the supplement could be derived from Limenios 33.
and suggested that any supplement ending on line 27 might also satisfy the requirement by ending in –ω]. In his *Greek Music*, West simply ended with ἀσέπτος ... 510 He and Pöhlmann adopted this new supplement in their 2001 joint edition. Bélis printed ἀσέπτως | ..]|Σ. 511

The Τ at the end of line 26 is quite visible in all reproductions. None show any further traces. The *BCH* Plate is too blurry to read the beginning of line 27, but the remaining reproductions clearly present a Σ, but nothing before this letter. The various supplements proposed are interesting, and make a certain sense, but are utterly conjectural.

---

509 West (1992a), 8.
510 West (1992b), 292.
As in the critical edition, the complexity of this portion of the text requires a slight modification here in approach. The initial discussion of these partial lines will emphasize purely epigraphical concerns. A section will follow which will treat the fragments separately. Following that, a separate discussion will cover the more extensive efforts to restore the text—those by O. Crusius (1894) and P.W. Moens (1930)—where it will be best to deal with the entire strophe as a whole to better appreciate the supplements and arguments.

27 [ΣΑΛΛΙΩΓΕΕΝΝΑΝ]

The stone is quite damaged and broken throughout this strophe, with a great deal of the text is recoverable only by conjecture, if at all. The initial characters in each line are missing, and each line has fewer letters remaining than the one above, due to a diagonal break. The first extant character, the Σ, has uniformly been assigned to the preceding strophe. When H. Weil first published his transcription of line 26, he did not attempt to identify what the first words might be. Weil found it difficult to be certain whether the stone read ΣΑΛΛΙΩ, ΣΑΛΛΙΩ, or even ΣΔΑΛΙΩ. He noted the lack of other examples in the text where Doric genitives might end in Ω, or datives lack the I. In his words, this rendered the text “énigmatique.”

Th. Reinach initially followed Weil in choosing not to attempt to identify words here. O. Crusius was the first to divide the

512 Weil (1893), 574-6.
513 Reinach (1893), 586. Also, Cf. Monro (1894), 135: σαλλιω (?) γένναν.
syllables into words. He attached the Σ to the end of the preceding strophe, and began a new, glyconic, section with ἄλλῳ Ὸιῷ, γεένναν, followed by an attempt to fully supplement the rest of the strophe.\footnote{Crusius (1894), 30, 33. The full supplement will be printed at the end of this section.} All subsequent editions have adopted Crusius’ suggestion.\footnote{Weil (1894), 361; Reinach (1894), Plate XXVII; Jan (1895), 436-7; a change in print occurred at this point, of little consequence, but worth noting—a comma was inserted, requiring a change in accent: ἄλλῳ Ὸιῷ γεένναν. Later editions followed this new format: Gevaert (1895), 403; Jan (1899), 18-19 (ἄλλῳ is printed in the lighter, smaller type-font employed to indicated reconstructed text. This is clearly a typo. He did it on both 18 and 19.); Fairbanks (1900); Reinach (1909-13), 153; Powell (1925), 141, 143; Moens (1930), 51, 55, 120; Pöhlmann (1970), 60, 63; Chailley (1979), 158; Käppel (1992), 389; Bélis (1992), 79; Pöhlmann and West (2001), 68-9; Furley and Bremer (2001).} Weil commented on Crusius’ reading that, “sans doute,” the ἄλλῳ Ὸιῷ marked the commencement of the prayer.\footnote{Weil (1894), 361. Reinach (1909-13), 155 wrote the same thing. Later editions have accepted this conclusion. Although, I should note that Fritz Graf has informed me that, “Louis Robert used to skin non-French speakers who thought ‘sans doute’ meant ‘doubtless’: it means ‘presumably’ or ‘perhaps’, in Gallic overstatement; ‘doubtless’ is ‘sans aucun doute’.”} This understanding of the text was supported by a comparison with the hymn of Limenios, which also ended with a prayer in a new meter.\footnote{As an example of the dangers of cross-supplementing, Limenios, 21 has been restored to begin a new strophe with ἄλλῳ and the prayer beginning in 33 was supplemented with ἄλλῳ, Ὸιῷ Φοῖβῳ σοῦ. There is a clear case of precedent, however, in line 26, with a new section beginning ἄλλῳ Ἀντωνῖς.} While A. Bélis printed the traditional reading, she raised certain issues regarding its confidence. Bélis commented that, while there does seem to be a mark in the middle of the second Λ, it is only partial, and the reading of Λ seems secure. However Bélis conceded that ΛΛΛΙΩ as a word, if missing the iota adscript, would be possibly derived from ἄλλαις, which is metrically possible. H. Weil had thought ΣΛΛΙΩ possibility, but Bélis stated that the third character is securely identified as a Λ.\footnote{Fritz Graf has raised serious doubts regarding any ability to read Λ as a lambda and not and alpha with any certainty, as stonemasons may often forget to carve the horizontal stroke which distinguishes the Λ. Corrections may have been made with paint rather than a chisel when the time came to paint the lettering—corrections forever lost to the modern epigrapher. However, this stone-carver has been consistent in carving} C. Jan had wondered...
in his apparatus if the initial Σ might, in fact, be a Κ.⁵¹⁹ but Bélis was certain that the odd horizontal marking was a mark on the stone, not an intentional stroke by the carver. Her biggest concern was that the first syllable of the apparently new strophe carried no musical sign; Bélis noted that in Limenios’ hymn, in the transition from Strophe 1 to 2, the same note is re-inscribed. Bélis found herself wondering if this was actually the moment of transition between strophes, but was unable to provide a satisfactory alternative. She expressed a desire to refrain from separating from the traditional reading here.⁵²⁰ In examination of Bélis’ squeeze and photograph as well as the old photo, it is clear that the first letter is a Σ, and cannot possibly be perceived as Κ. Moreover, the horizontal bar of the following character firmly identifies it as an Α. The second Λ, due to a stray mark on the stone, offers an understandable excuse for misreading it as an Α. The troublesome mark is less visible in the recent photograph. The old BCH Plate does appear to read ΛΛΛΙΩ, and one can understand the difficulty of earlier editors.

There has been no controversy regarding the reading and identification of γεένναν, and no editor has claimed to be able to read any further characters at the end of the line., P.W. Moens, however, claimed that one could read the final partial character as a Μ rather than a Ν, allowing for a slight variation on the reading: ἰό̂ ὑλλ’ ἵδο γεέννα μ [εγάλου].⁵²¹ The old photo of the stone shows the final Ν (or Μ) to be partially damaged, but clearly reveals the left vertical stroke, and most of the downward-to-the-

---

⁵¹⁹ Jan (1895), 436-7.
⁵²¹ Moens (1930), 51, 55, 120.
right stroke. Neither Bélis’ photo nor her squeeze reveals anything more. The recent photograph suggests that wear has rendered the N somewhat less visible today, but the BCH plate appears to show the diagonal stroke nearly reaching the base line of the character before being broken away. This would suggest N rather than M.

28  | ΝΘΑΛΟΣΦΙΛΟ|Μ

It is difficult to know exactly how many characters have been lost on the left side of these lines. This is due in part to the wildly irregular spacing and width of the characters themselves (the first characters visible in line 28 have considerable blank space between them) and the fact that the edge of the stone has received significant wear over the years. The N that many editors claimed to read is more-or-less completely absent today. A reasonable guess would be to assume a loss of one to three characters from each line. It makes little difference, as so much has been lost to the right of the preceding line, that any attempted restoration or supplement has such a great lacuna available that placement of the line-break is of no concern.

H. Weil claimed to be able read a Ν at the beginning of the line, and printed υ

\[ θάλος \ φίλον \]. Subsequent editors have followed his reading with some variance over attempted supplementation, and a few editors have expressed doubt regarding the N, in

522 The M’s and N’s in this inscription are similar enough to render it difficult to distinguish when the damage prevents one either knowing the length of the diagonal stroke, the shape of the bottom right apex, or the width of the character. In this case only the upper left corner remains, rendering it impossible to distinguish which letter it might have been.

523 Weil (1893), 574-5; Weil (1894), 361. He was followed by Monro (1894), 135; Reinach(1894), Plate XXVII; Jan (1899), 18-19; Fairbanks (1900), 120. Reinach (1893), 586 supplemented o|v, as did Gevaert (1895), 404. Crusius (1894), 30 indicated that the N was only partially visible in his epigraphical edition, and supplemented o|o|v.
part due to its disappearance from the stone due to handling. Th. Reinach indicated the partial remains of the letter by depicting the right vertical stroke as an I, and J. Powell followed him, but (confusingly) reprinted the stroke as a lower-case, i.524 P.W. Moens felt the traces insufficient to identify, and chose to print | . θάλος, but in her restoration, continued to assume that it had once been a N.525 In his examination of the stone, Pöhlmann was unable to see the letter himself, and printed ] Ν, stating that he followed Reinach’s testimony.526 In her own examination, A. Bélis made it clear that she was confident in her identification of the traces as a N, but conceded that one must rely on older reproductions to make the case.527 Bélis still printed the sub-linear dot however. Following her description, rather than her edition, E. Pöhlmann and M.L. West in their joint edition, as well as W. Furley and J. Bremer in their own, removed the sub-linear dot.528 There are no meaningful traces on the recent photo. Bélis’ squeeze and photo suggest a vertical stroke, but it is the old photograph which clears the matter up. A vertical stroke is quite visible, with the lower half of the downward diagonal stroke as well. There is no doubt that the character should be read as N. The BCH Plate is too blurry to be helpful.

The identification of θάλος has received no challenge, as the characters following make it easy to identify the word-break, and provide several easy options for restoration. These options are affected by the debate over the final visible character, and seem at

524 Reinach (1909-13), 153, 155; Powell (1925), 141, 143.
525 Moens (1930), 51-2.
527 Bélis (1992), 79.
528 Pöhlmann and West (2001), 68-9; Furley and Bremer (2001), 85.
times to be the determinate. In other words, the desire to supplement tends to help the editor make decisions regarding the traces. Weil printed φιλον and Reinach originally followed his reading. Crusius more closely described the situation; only the left half of the character remained on the stone, and he identified it as a M, but conceded that the traces could also support an identification of X or K. Crusius’ choice of M over the others (he admitted) was determined by his favored supplement of φιλόμαχον. Weil too, upon reexamination, found that X was a possibility. Reinach preferred the X, supplementing φιλόχορον. C. Jan and A. Fairbanks followed Reinach here, as did F.A. Gevaert, except he placed the X within the bracketed text, perhaps indicating that it was the supplement, rather than the traces, which made the argument. Reinach clarified the matter in his FD edition. He stated that he personally found the traces suggestive of a X, and preferred φιλόχορον as a restoration, but that his colleague G. Colin, only saw N or M as possibilities. Noting that φίλον was excluded by rules of accent and melody, Reinach chose to print the supplement preferred by Crusius (and Colin). It is odd that he failed to print a sub-linear dot under the letter as he made use of them elsewhere, and he obviously felt the identification of this letter was tentative. P.W. Moens found this supplement objectionable, as she claimed that φιλόμαχον was not properly an epithet of Apollo. (It should be noted here that many of the epithets/adjectives in this hymn are

529 Weil (1893), 574-5; Reinach (1893), 586. Monro (1894), 135 also printed this reading.
530 Crusius (1894), 32, 33, 37, 38.
531 Weil (1894), 361.
532 Reinach (1894), Plate XXVII.
533 Jan (1899), 18, 19; Fairbanks (1900), 120; Gevaert (1895), 404—or perhaps it was due to a misprint.
534 Reinach (1909-13), 153, 155. He was followed by Powell (1925), 141, 143.
surprising and unexpected, and lack of precedent ought not to serve as anything persuasive regarding the text.) Keeping the Μ, which she seems to find a persuasive reading of the traces, Moens suggested instead that Apollo be referred to here as φιλόμολπος. She did acknowledge that this word also lacked precedent as an Apolline epithet, but she argued that it was at least more appropriate. Moens also restored the missing sub-linear dot: φιλόμ [ολπον].

In his fresh examination of the stone, Pöhlmann affirmed the reading of the traces as Μ, but preferred Crusius’ restoration. L. Käppel, consistently skeptical of the supplements, removed the restored reading, and merely printed φιλόμ [. . .]. A. Bélis agreed with Moens that either φιλόχορος or φιλόμοπος would better suit Apollo, but found no real objection to φιλόμαχος, and argued that the context (the drakōn fight and the repulsion of the barbarian horde) actually favored the more militant description. Still, Bélis felt hesitant regarding the supplement. She was confident that the traces did not reflect a Χ. Bélis argued that the stone carried a left vertical line, with half of the downward sloping stroke, but that the old photograph revealed upper right point of the Μ. Bélis also noted that one can measure the space between the two points; she claimed that the roughly 7.2 mm space up to the break ruled out the possibility of a Χ, as comparable Χ’s in column I (there is no suitable comparandum in column II) show a gap of 3 to 3.5mm. As a result, Bélis printed φιλόμ [αχον], but with no great confidence. Pöhlmann and West removed the sub-linear dot, basing their reading on her expressed

535 Moens (1930), 51, 55, 120-1.
536 Pöhlmann (1970), 62-3. He was followed by Chailley (1979), 158.
537 Käppel (1992), 389.
confidence and argument, in spite the fact that she still chose to include it in her own edition. An examination of the most recent photograph reveals the upper-left apex of a vertical or diagonal stroke, but nothing more. The argument which Bélis made regarding the width between upper apices would seem to still apply, and sufficient stone remains at the top to make the X unlikely, but it must be conceded that the stone may be sufficiently worn and damaged here as to render her concern unverifiable. Bélis’ squeeze and photo reveal nothing more, certainly not as much as she claimed to see—although it may be due to the quality of the reproductions. The old photograph, as reproduced in her book, is of too low quality to see any traces. The BCH Plate is also too blurry. Pöhlmann’s photo suggests an upper left apex, strongly suggesting that it belongs to a diagonal stroke.

29 ΣΔΑΑΜΟΙΟΛΟ

H. Weil first printed this line as reading |ε δαάμοιο λο|. There has been limited controversy over the first letter, although Th. Reinach initially read it as a Σ. Reinach, in his later editions, as well as most subsequent editors, would follow Weil’s reading. A. Bélis is the lone exception. She argued that all the editors reading the E were wrong, and that the letter was quite clearly a Σ based upon her examination of the stone and reproduction. Bélis noted that the middle point of the letter is visible on her

540 Weil (1893), 575. He neglected to print the accent.
541 Reinach (1893), 586. He also forgot the accent, but his edition generally left them out.
542 Monro (1894), 135 simply left out the letter, but Cf. Crusius (1894), 30, 33 (Crusius ‘hatched’ this letter in his epigraphical edition, indicating that it was only partially visible); Reinach (1894), Plate XXVII; Gevaert (1895), 404; Jan (1899), 18-19; Fairbanks (1900), 120-1; Reinach (1909-13), 153; Powell (1925), 141, 143 (He did not print the vowel doublings); Moens (1930), 52; Pöhlmann (1970), 62-3; Chailley (1979), 158; Käppel (1992), 389; Pöhlmann and West (2001), 68-9; and Furley and Bremer (2001), 85.
squeeze, and that it quite clearly lacks the apex that would be expected in the case of an 
E. Therefore, she argued, it must be a Σ, and the previous syllable would then become 
long, rather than short, interfering with previous supplements.⁵⁴³ E. Pöhlmann and M.L. 
West rejected her reading of Σ, not on epigraphical grounds, but rather rhythmic criteria. 
They insisted that the Σ was metrically “impossible.”⁵⁴⁴

An examination of a recent photo reveals the two parallel horizontal strokes, with 
a blank space between. There is some wear on the stone here, and so certainty is difficult. 
Bélis’ squeeze and photograph present a mark on the stone in the expected location, and 
the apex is quite visible. It becomes a matter of whether it has the required flaring of 
width expected of an E. The old photograph appears to present a clear sigma, but it is not 
impossible that damage to the stone has disfigured an E. Neither Pöhlmann’s photo nor 
the BCH Plate clarifies the matter. There remains Pöhlmann and West’s difficulty with 
the resulting meter.

None have questioned the final visible O, but some editors have claimed to be 
able to read traces of an I following it. O. Crusius was the first to print ΛΟΙ[ , but it is 
somewhat unclear how confident he was, as his epigraphical edition read ΛΟ[ and it is 
only in his supplemented transcript that he indicates the presence of the I. It is possible 
that the bracket is misplaced, as later when considering a supplement he ultimately 
rejects, he printed ΛΟ[.⁵⁴⁵ No one seems to have taken Crusius’ reading of the I 
seriously until Pöhlmann made it part of his edition. Pöhlmann indicated that he could

⁵⁴³ Bélis (1992), 78, 80.
⁵⁴⁵ Crusius (1894), 30, 33, 38.
only see traces of some letter, but that Crusius had read an Ι. It is quite possible that Pöhlmann’s choice to print λοι | γόν is entirely due to a misprint in Crusius’ edition.\(^{546}\) Bélis, in her examination of the stone, noted that insufficient traces remained at the edge of the break to read the letter, or even to verify the possibility of the Ι as a reasonable guess.\(^{547}\) An examination of all the reproductions (including Pöhlmann’s photo) reveals nothing. There are no grounds for reading an Ι, as it would seem it is the result of a misprint based on a proposed supplement by Crusius.

30   \[ |ΡΩΝΕΦΟΡ]\[

With line 30, it is no longer possible to identify full words, but the surviving letters do allow for some limited attempts at word division. H. Weil first printed the line as reading |ρῶν ἐφορ| and his identification of the characters has largely been accepted by later editors.\(^{548}\) Not a single editor has claimed to be able to read anything preceding the initial Π. Only A. Bélis, in her fresh examination of the stone, appears to suggest that the identification is less than certain. The matter, however, is far from clear as her transcript printed Π but her musical edition on the same page printed Π. Bélis made no

\(^{546}\) Pöhlmann (1970), 62-3. His printing was followed by Chailley (1979), 158; Käppel (1992), 389 (he eliminated the supplement); Pöhlmann and West (2001), 68-9; and Furley and Bremer (2001), 85 (they also eliminated the supplement).

\(^{547}\) Bélis (1992), 80.

\(^{548}\) Weil (1893), 575; Reinach (1893), 586-7; Reinach (1894), Plate XXVII; Monro (1894), 135; Crusius (1894), 32, 33, 38-9; Gevaert (1895), 404; Jan (1899), 18-19; Fairbanks (1900), 121; Reinach (1909-13), 153 (He misprinted the left bracket backwards); Powell (1925), 141, 144; Moens (1930), 53, 55-6, 121 (She misprinted the left bracket backwards, on 55, but correctly on page 121); Pöhlmann (1970), 62-3; Chailley (1979), 158; Käppel (1992), 389; Pöhlmann and West (2001), 68-9; Furley and Bremer (2001), 85. Editions not listed do not print this line.
comment regarding this letter. The old photograph reveals the \( P \) quite clearly. Bélis’ photo and squeeze also permit easy identification, making the \( P \) quite likely a misprint. The recent photograph reveals wear at the edge of the break, but sufficient traces exist to make identification certain. While it is true that the left vertical stroke is missing in most reproductions, the shape and placement of the circular stroke only allow for the letter to be read as a \( P \). Most editions made no attempt at supplementation here. O. Crusius suggested \( εχθρων \) while P.W. Moens preferred \( κεὔφρων \). In both cases the larger supplementation of the entire passage played a role in specific word choice.

The reading at the end of the line presents more variety. No edition has challenged Weil’s reading of the final \( P \), but some editors have claimed to be able to identify a subsequent character. Crusius suggested a supplement of \( εφορ\mu\acute{a}ν \) and Pöhlmann later printed \( εφορ\mu\acute{a} \) as well as \( εφορ\mu\acute{a}ν \), claiming in his notes that the apex of the \( M \) was still visible on the stone. J. Chailley found the supplement convincing, but reinstated the bracket: \( εφορ\mu\acute{a}n \). L. Käppel seemed to acknowledge the presence of some traces on the stone when he printed \( εφορ\mu\acute{a} \) but he made no comment beyond noting Crusius’ supplement. In her fresh examination of the stone, Bélis claimed that the squeeze revealed traces of a letter (also visible on the old photograph) which she felt

549 Bélis (1992), 78, 80.
550 Crusius (1894), 32, 33, 38. His suggestion was reprinted by Pöhlmann (1970), 62 with a comment on Crusius as the source. His edition was the main source for Chailley (1979), 158, who printed the supplement as well. Moens (1930), 53, 55-6, 121. She misprinted the left bracket on page 55, but corrected it on page 121.
551 Crusius (1894), 32, 33, 38. Moens (1930) has a variant of her own; she supplemented \( εφόρ\mu\acute{a} \), 53, 55-6, 121.
553 Chailley (1979), 158.
554 Käppel (1992), 389.
was oddly shaped. She identified it as either an O or Ω. Bélis argued that the reading of Ω was more likely due to matters of spacing. By making a comparison to the ΠΩ at the beginning of the line, and noting the presence of the left apex still visible right at the edge, Bélis felt it was reasonable to print Ω. In their joint edition, Pöhlmann and West preferred to print Ψ[ as they claimed that reading Ω was metrically impossible. The old photograph is unclear, and does seem to reveal the upper curved shape of either an O or Ω, but it would seem actually to argue against Bélis’ claims regarding spacing. Neither Bélis’ squeeze nor photo reveal any traces, and the recent photo exhibits too much wear at the edge of the break to be helpful. I see no evidence of a left apex in these reproductions. The BCH Plate is too blurry. Pöhlmann’s photo, on the other hand, is not suggestive of either O or Ω, but appears to offer the two top points of either a N or M. It may simply be damage to the stone.

31 [ΓΕΩΝΚ]

Little can be done with line 31 beyond establishing which characters remain visible. There has been very little disagreement among editions. H. Weil first printed [ΤΕΟΝΚ]. O. Crusius, more confident, printed [ΤΕΟΝΚ]. Th. Reinach (and all other editors) could not read the Ν on the stone, and printed [ΤΕΟΝΚ]. No edition has offered

555 Bélis (1992), 78,80.
557 Weil (1893), 575.
558 Crusius (1894), 32, 33, 39.
559 Reinach (1893), 587; Reinach (1894), Plate XXVII; Monro (1894); Gevaert (1895), 404; Jan (1899), 18-19; Fairbanks (1900), 121, 144 (he left out the left bracket on page 121, but printed it on page 144); Reinach (1909-13), 153; Powell (1925), 141, 144, 146 (Although Powell commented that he could read
any discussion regarding the division of words, but it has been traditional to print a space as is found in Weil’s edition. The division makes sense as no other immediately obvious solution presents itself. Additionally, in Limenios’ hymn, line 16 the word μειγνύμενος suggests the unlikelihood of seeing κν rather than γν in the interior of a word—however, it must be noted that the form of δικόρυνβα in line 4/5 gives evidence that expectations are not always fulfilled. The extended reconstructions of O. Crusius and P.W. Moens must bear some responsibility for encouraging other editors to retain the division, if not their restorations. However, not all editors thought it wise, and simply printed the letters as they were on the stone.  

A. Bélis commented that the lines on the stone had received enough damage over the years that it was necessary to rely on older reproductions to verify the readings of earlier editors. As such, some editions do not print these lines, or they indicate the presence of some further text by means of ellipsis. An examination of Bélis’ photo and squeeze indicate that this line is actually quite clear, and a comparison with the old photograph reveals nothing in addition beyond what might possibly be a trace of a letter following the K, but could equally be damage to the stone. The break like seems to occur immediately following the K. The recent photograph reveals significant wear to the edges. The characters are still visible, but the edges have clearly receded, precluding any future possibility of improving the reading; the diagonal stroke of the N is nearly gone.

neither the final N nor K on the stone himself, but merely reprint Weil’s reading); Moens (1930), 54-5, 121 (like Powell, she could not make out the K); Pöhlmann (1970), 62; Chailley (1979), 158; Käppel (1992), 389; Bélis (1992), 78, 80; Pöhlmann and West (2001), 68-9. No other editions print this line.


561 Furley and Bremer (2001), 85 merely printed ‘ . . . ’ to indicate that the text continues, but their edition ended here.
Line 32 offers no easily identifiable words, and any attempt to find possible word-divisions is somewhat more complex than line 31. There is practically no editorial conflict regarding which letters appear on the stone; disagreement is limited to whether, or how, to break the letters into words. H. Weil initially printed the letters as-is, making no attempt to identify words. Most modern editions have returned to his practice. Th. Reinach suggested that the line be printed as $\text{εναι κ}$ and his reading was popular among the earlier editors. O. Crusius suggested $\text{εν αικ}$ as an alternative. P.W. Moens, with her own creative approach, offered $\text{παρθένους αἰκλυτοτόξῳ}$. A. Bélis printed $\text{ε̣ναικ}$, commenting, “vacat lapis,” and noting that she followed E. Pöhlmann and Reinach here. This is odd and confusing; as 1) Bélis breaks the words differently from those editions, and 2) her squeeze and photo (as well as the old photograph) offer very clear readings of these letters and present ordinary spacing. The recent photo reveals considerable wear from handling: The upper left portion of the E is now worn away, as is the lower-right apex of the K. The interior characters remain quite clear.

562 Weil (1893), 575.
564 Reinach (1893), 587. Cf. Reinach (1894), Plate XXVII; Monro (1894), 135 (he also printed “about 12 bars wanting”); Gevaert (1895), 404; Jan (1899), 18-19 (He did not print εναι on page 19, the musical edition, as there were no notes visible over these characters); Fairbanks (1900), 121; Reinach (1909-13), 153; Powell (1925), 141-2, 144.
565 Crusius (1894), 32, 33. He only offered the division, no supplement.
566 Moens (1930), 54-56, 121.
567 Bélis (1992), 78, 80.
Very little remains of line 33. H. Weil printed $\text{[N ΘH]}$.\textsuperscript{568} No other editors were comfortable assuming that a word division could be discovered. Reinach upgraded the reading of the $\text{N}$, printing $\text{[NΘH]}$ in his edition.\textsuperscript{569} O. Crusius suggested that the text might be restored as $\text{kē[νθΗ]}$.\textsuperscript{570} P.W. Moens claimed to see nothing on the stone before the $\text{Θ}$, and only traces following it, which she said could possibly be an $\text{H}$, but also a $\text{M}$ or $\text{N}$. Moens judged only the $\text{Θ}$ as certain, but conceded the likelihood of the following letter being a $\text{H}$. This was likely due in part to her desire to supplement $\text{ε[ωνθΗ]}$.\textsuperscript{571} Other editors also found the $\text{N}$ difficult to detect. In his critical $FD$ edition, Reinach revised his reading of the stone to read $\text{[ΘΗ]}$.\textsuperscript{572} Bélis printed $\text{[NΘH]}$ but commented that she had to rely on older reproductions, and she could no longer read the characters on the stone itself.\textsuperscript{573} The joint edition of Pöhlmann and West followed her text.\textsuperscript{574} The old photograph reveals what appears to be the right, up-right stroke of the $\text{N}$, along with the bottom half of the diagonal stroke. The $\text{Θ}$ is quite legible. The traces following appear to be an up-right stroke, and possibly another apex at the upper-right. If there were a diagonal connecting stroke, it would have remained visible on the stone.

\textsuperscript{568} Weil (1893), 575.

\textsuperscript{569} Reinach (1893), 587. His edition was followed by Reinach (1894), Plate XXVII; Gevaert (1895), 404; and Fairbanks (1900), 121.

\textsuperscript{570} Crusius (1894), 32-33. He did, however, ‘hatch’ the $\text{H}$ in his epigraphical edition, suggesting that it was only partially visible.

\textsuperscript{571} Moens (1930), 54-5, 121.

\textsuperscript{572} Reinach (1909-13), 153. He was followed by Powell (1925), 141, 144, 146 (He claimed he could not personally see any letters on the stone for this line); Pöhlmann (1970), 62-3; Chailley (1979), 158, and Käppel (1992), 389.

\textsuperscript{573} Bélis (1992), 78, 80. She made an odd comment that the $\text{N}$ was only partially glimpsed by Crusius.

\textsuperscript{574} Pöhlmann and West (2001), 68-9.
There is enough damage, however, that a horizontal connecting stroke would have been lost. It seems quite possible that the character was an H. Bélis’ squeeze and photo offer no evidence of the N, but the final traces are strongly suggestive of an H. The recent photo shows damage to the stone—part of the Θ is now beginning to wear away, and nothing at all remains of any traces to the left. The traces to the right are still suggestive of the upper portion of an H, but the wear and damage makes identification less certain. Pöhlmann’s photo shows enough of two vertical strokes, and the space between, to be reasonably confident that the letter is an H.

Some editions assumed that the text would have continued to at least this line, but none offer any discussion. Only Bélis claimed to see anything—she said that there were indistinct traces of what would have been a musical sign, but that it was impossible to make out. I see nothing on either her photograph or squeeze. The old photograph also reveals nothing. The recent photograph also offers no indication of anything below.

Two fragments are treated here: inv. 494 and inv. 499 belonging to Athenaios’ hymn. The earliest editors incorrectly included other fragments. These two remain reasonably certain as belonging to the text due to 1) the presence of musical notation, and 2) the correct kind for this hymn. Some editors attempted to place the fragments, making use of them in their supplements. Accurate placement is problematic and uncertain. Most editions simply left the fragments out. The more serious critical editions print them, but make little effort to place them. H. Weil (1893) discussed several other fragments that actually belong to Limenios’ hymn, and did not discuss those fragments that quite likely do belong.\textsuperscript{576} As such, rather than beginning with Weil (1893) as in the commentary above, the critical history of the fragments begin with Th. Reinach (1893) instead.

**Inv. 494, fr. 2 in BCH**

| 1 | ΑΠΕ [ |
| 2 | ΡΑΤ [ |
| 3 | ΟΣΥ [ vel Ť |

Reinach first published this fragment, associating it with the text of Athenaios’ hymn by its notation. He printed a sketch of the fragment with the following text:\textsuperscript{577}

\[ | ΠΕ [ |
| ΡΑΤ |
| ΟΣ ] |

\textsuperscript{576} Weil (1893), 579-583.

\textsuperscript{577} Reinach (1893), 604-5.
In Reinach’s 1894 edition, where the two fragments are labeled “fragments de place incertane,” he upgraded the indistinct traces in the third line, printing a T.⁵⁷⁸ O. Crusius followed Reinach’s readings, but indicated in his epigraphical edition that the T was only partially visible on the stone.⁵⁷⁹ In his FD edition, Reinach once more improved his reading of the fragment, claiming to see traces of an A at the beginning of the first line, and proposing a significant supplement for the third line.⁵⁸⁰ Reinach claimed to see traces at the beginning of the line compatible with a P, and supplemented ΠΡΟΣ[T]. This supplement was printed by E. Pöhlmann, but failed to gain acceptance in other editions.⁵⁸¹ Several variations have been printed. J. Powell and P.W. Moens conservatively printed ]ΟΣ[⁵⁸² while L. Käppel allowed that traces remained on either side, but felt them too indistinct to hazard a guess.⁵⁸³ A. Bélis, freshly examining the fragment, claimed to see traces of an Y at the end of line three, but nothing identifiable at the beginning. Bélis printed ]ΟΣΥ[.⁵⁸⁴ She claimed to see traces below of what would be a fourth line, but acknowledged them as far too indistinct to say more. Moens had

---

⁵⁷⁸ Reinach (1894), Plate XXVII. His reading of T was followed by Jan (1899), 18-19, who referred to this scrap of text with “loca incerta.” Jan printed this line of the fragment alone.

⁵⁷⁹ Crusius (1894), 30. Fairbanks (1900), 121 followed his reading, but moved the T beyond the bracket, indicating a stronger degree of uncertainty over the reading.

⁵⁸⁰ Reinach (1909-13), 155. He printed it as reading only the right diagonal stroke of the A. ]ΠΕ[. His reading of the first line was widely adopted and followed by Powell (1925), 142-3; Pöhlmann (1970), 62; Bélis (1992), 81; and Pöhlmann and West (2001), 68-9. While possibly a Λ or Δ, the A remains a far more likely candidate considering the following Π.

⁵⁸¹ Pöhlmann (1970), 62. He oddly left out the second line.

⁵⁸² Powell (1925), 142-3; Moens (1930), 49.

⁵⁸³ Käppel (1992), 389. He printed ]. ΟΣ. [.

⁵⁸⁴ Bélis (1992), 81. Her reading was followed by Pöhlmann and West (2001), 68-9.
suggested that the Π in line 1 was actually a Γ, but a cursory glance at the reproductions removes this possibility.\textsuperscript{585}

The oldest photograph of the fragments in Bélis shows a very distinct ΠΕ in the first line, but no traces to the left, however Pöhlmann’s photograph suggest the presence of a bottom right apex, but the stroke is broken away. The more recent images in Bélis also show this apex, the angle of which suggest that the stroke may have been diagonal, but so little remains of the stone that it is difficult to tell. All of the reproductions clearly present the ΡΑΤ in line two, with no additional traces. The bottom line should never have had any characters added to the left. The stone is broken sharply to the left of the Ο. The Σ is clear in all of the reproductions, and what would be an upper-left apex of the following character can be observed to the right. An Υ is possible, but it could also be a Τ.

**Inv. 499, fr. 3 in BCH**

```
1  | Ά | . | . |
2  | ΠΙΝΑΟ | vel Τ |
3  | Τ | ΕΟ |
```

Th. Reinach first published this fragment, associating it with the text of Athenaios’ hymn by its notation. He printed a sketch of the fragment with the following text:\textsuperscript{586}

\textsuperscript{585} Moens (1930), 49.

\textsuperscript{586} Reinach (1893), 604-5. He retained lines 2 and 3, but excised line 1 in his 1894 edition, Plate XXVII. Jan (1899), 18-19 followed him here, also leaving out the first line.
O. Crusius indicated that the A was only partially visible, and preferred to read a T rather than an I in line 1.\(^{587}\) No other editors have accepted his addition. Reinach significantly modified his reading in his FD edition, printing \(\text{\. \(\text{\[. \text{AI}\]}\)}\).\(^{588}\) The center I’s represented vertical strokes, not letters, as the top portion was missing and it was possible that they might actually combine to form a Π. Other options were also possible. J. Powell copied this reading in his own edition, but turned the vertical strokes into lower-case ι’s, potentially causing some confusion.\(^{589}\) P.W. Moens largely followed this new reading, but preferred an H to the A.\(^{590}\) E. Pöhlmann, relying heavily on Reinach’s reading, printed \(\text{\. \(\text{\[A\]}\)}\), finding the traces too ambiguous to be ascertained.\(^{591}\) L. Käppel very conservatively printed \(\text{\. \(\text{\[A\]}\)}\).\(^{592}\) In her fresh examination of the stone, Bélis adopted a modified version of Reinach’s text, printing \(\text{\. \(\text{\[AQ\]}\)}\).\(^{593}\) Nothing of this line can be seen in Pöhlmann’s photo. The oldest photograph in Bélis reveals a series of bottom-line apices, with a break just above the points. Her more recent photograph shows more wear to the stone, but still shows a series of 4 or 5 points. The A seems a reasonable guess due to the angles of two, but they could also conceivably belong to a Δ or Λ.

\(^{587}\) Crusius (1894), 30. Fairbanks (1900), 121 followed his reading, but moved the new E out into the brackets.

\(^{588}\) Reinach (1909-13), 156.

\(^{589}\) Powell (1925), 142-3.

\(^{590}\) Moens (1930), 49.

\(^{591}\) Pöhlmann (1970), 62.

\(^{592}\) Käppel (1992), 389.

\(^{593}\) Bélis (1992), 82.
O. Crusius tentatively identified the traces at the beginning of line 2 as an E.\textsuperscript{594} No other editors have accepted his addition. C. Jan and L. Käppel preferred Reinach’s original text.\textsuperscript{595} In his \textit{FC} edition, Reinach extended his reading, adding a T to the beginning of this line; Moens followed his reading.\textsuperscript{596} Most other editors accepted the T, but were less certain, preferring to print it with a sub-linear dot.\textsuperscript{597} Pöhlmann initially felt the traces were too ambiguous, but was willing to print T in his joint edition with West.\textsuperscript{598} The photographs in Bélis show \textbf{INAO} very clearly, with no hint of traces beyond to the right. To the left, however, what appears to be a bottom point, possibly a vertical stroke, and the right portion of a horizontal stroke at the top. While T is indeed a possibility, II seems like a much stronger candidate, based on the spacing between the bottom point and the upper right point.

Most editions have been content to read with Reinach’s initial reading of [\textit{EN}] for row 3.\textsuperscript{599} In his \textit{FD} edition, however, Reinach claimed to read a partial II at the beginning of the line.\textsuperscript{600} Pöhlmann agreed that there were traces, but not enough to identify.\textsuperscript{601} In her fresh examination of the stone, Bélis preferred to interpret the traces as

\textsuperscript{594} Crusius (1894), 30. Fairbanks (1900), 121 followed his reading, but moved the new E out into the brackets.

\textsuperscript{595} Jan (1899), 18-19 and Käppel (1992), 389.

\textsuperscript{596} Reinach (1909-13), 156 and Moens (1930), 49.

\textsuperscript{597} Powell (1925), 142-3, Bélis (1992), 82.

\textsuperscript{598} Pöhlmann (1970), 62; and Pöhlmann and West (2001), 68-9.

\textsuperscript{599} Reinach (1894), Plate XXVII; Crusius (1894), 30; Jan (1899), 18-19; Fairbanks (1900), 121; Powell (1925), 142-3; and Moens (1930), 49.

\textsuperscript{600} Reinach (1909-13), 156 made a confusing claim when he said that the first letter of line 2 was probably Π. It is possible that he meant \textit{this} line, not counting the traces on top as a proper line. Pöhlmann (1970), 62 clearly understood it this way, but Pöhlmann and West (2001), 69 prefer it to refer to the middle line, as if the T could be read Π.

\textsuperscript{601} Pöhlmann (1970), 62; Käppel (1992), 389 followed his reading.
belonging to a T. The E and N are visible in all of the reproductions. The N has lost its bottom-right corner, but the rest is quite clear. To the left of the E, it is possible (especially in Bélis’ modern photo) to make out an apex at top, oriented in such a way as to suggest that it belongs at the end of a horizontal stroke. There is no good reason to read a Π, and it is far more likely that the reading in Reinach (1909-13) is meant to refer to the 2nd line, rather than what some other editors thought. It is quite possible that a T should be read here, but not enough traces remain to prevent it from having been another letter, such as a Γ, or even an E or Σ.

---

Extended Supplements: Crusius and Moens

Most editors were more comfortable leaving the last extremely fragmentary lines without supplements. O. Crusius attempted to place the fragments (inv. 494, 499, and 489) in such a way as to provide a framework for his proposed restorations. Unfortunately, he included a fragment (inv. No. 489) which has since been determined not to belong to Athenaios’ text. As such, Crusius’ supplements cannot be relied on in any ‘critical’ capacity. However, many editions have continued at least to include his supplements for reference. This is, I believe, appropriate, not only to retain a record of an important historical moment for the text, a reading relied upon by scholars for a period of time, and therefore of potential influence, but also for the very reason Crusius created it—that is, to give the ‘sense’ of the lines, if not the actual reading.

Crusius was quite humble in his claims regarding the fragments. He acknowledged that his placement was a conjecture and that his restoration is one of the ‘sense’ rather than anything textually certain. Crusius noted that the damage to the lines is so significant that one cannot even know exactly how much supplement is even required. He claimed that the additions were intentionally paradigmatic.\(^{603}\) By doing so, he raised an important methodological issue, in wondering if it would really be better to

\(^{603}\) Crusius (1894), 32. “Ob mir das durch Einstellung der kleinen Fragmente 2. 3. 1 gelungen ist, mögen Andere entscheiden, vor Allem die französischen Fachgenossen, die mit den Steinen selbst arbeiten können. Die ergänzungen, die ich zum großen Teil unabhängig von Weil gefunden hatte, beanspruchen nur, den Sinn annähernd wiederherzustellen.”
simply leave gaps empty rather than fill them, as some might object to his additions.\textsuperscript{604} 

Either case has the potential to be misleading. As such, Crusius’ supplements are printed below, albeit with a caveat: let no one imagine this is how the hymn actually goes. There has been a problem with musical editions adopting these supplements ‘as if’ they were legitimate.\textsuperscript{605}

\begin{verbatim}
27]ς. ἀλλ’ ἵ, γένναν [αὐτὰν τ’ ἐ]π[υχαῖς σε, Λ]α[τ[ο[ι[κεῖξομεν οἰ-
28]ν θάλος φιλόμ[α[χον ἐπή]ρ[το[ν ἐγ]είνα’, ὃ[ς φοίνιον τοῦ-
30]ἐχθρῶν ἐφορ[μάν
31]τεόν κν
32]ν αἰκ γαῖαδ’ ἐγεγά-
33]θεὶ τε κηνθη[σε]ν ἀνθων[
\end{verbatim}

His attempt relied on the use of a fragment, inv. 489 (\textit{BCH} fr. 1), which is no longer regarded as belonging to the text. He read it thusly:

\begin{verbatim}
ΔΕΓΕΓΑ
ΝΑΝΩΜΩΝ
\end{verbatim}

This fragment was initially discussed in Reinach (1893) along with fragments 2 and 3. Crusius made use of it in his supplements. However, it is clear that it does not belong to Athenaios’ hymn, due to the use of the alternate system of musical notation

\textsuperscript{604} Crusius (1894), 32, note 41. “Es ist mir schwer verständlich, weshalb man in meinem Herondas die Aufnahme derartiger Ergänzungen zwischen Klammern beanstandet hat. Ich kann nicht einsehen, daß es gerathener gewesen wäre, oben den leeren Raum zu lassen und unten die adnotatio noch schwerer zu belasten, als sie leider schon belastet ist.

\textsuperscript{605} I myself favor a compromise: collect and preserve the proposed supplements of prior editions, but for scholarly purposes, moving forward, to scrub conjecture from the critical edition. Sometimes, knowing how a text is likely to proceed sets up expectations that favor or hinder certain readings by an editor. As this project will later argue, the nature of poetic tradition involves such a degree of innovation that it is most rational to practice caution when restoring and supplementing heavily damaged texts.
employed by Limenios in *his* hymn. I print the fragment as Crusius (1894) read it, to make clear upon what he relied when imagining his supplements.

Moens reprinted Crusius supplements, and noted that they were satisfying, but found herself wanting to try her own hand.606 Her edition here followed no clear system for line-breaks:

\[ \text{Ἀλλ’ ἰὼ γεέννα μ [εγάλου] } \\
[Διός Λατόδες θ’ ἀγνόν] \text{ θάλος} \\
Φιλόμ [ολοποι, Παλλάδος ἀσ-} \\
[τυ σοίς’ ἡδ]ὲ \text{ διάμοιο λο[ι-} \\
γὸν ἁμύνων ὅπαζ’ ὅλβον,} \\
ἀναξ, κευφ[ρον ἑφόρ[α Δελ-} \\
fὸν πόλιν ἡδὲ τέμενος] \\
teὸν κ[λυτόν’ δία τε Λα-} \\
tὼ κυναγὲ τε παρθ]έν’, αἰ \\
k[λυτότωξῳ ὑπαδεῖτε] \\
[Φοίβῃ, θεαὶ, εὐαν]θῆ [ἄλ-} \\
βον δότε, δεύρῳ μολοῦσαι].

In her own discussion of supplements and fragments, Bélis noted that there is yet another fragment belonging to lines 33 and 34 of the text, one that lacks inventory number.607 It had been displaced to Limenios’ hymn by a misreading of the musical signs. Bélis felt it nearly impossible to assign locations to the fragments, but considers that it seems possible that inv. 499 belonged to lines 32-34 based on the height placement of the musical signs, as they are positioned slightly higher than other lines. The slight slippage of the rule line of the signs on inv. 494 may not be enough to allow for the same sort of placement divination. Apparently, it is not possible to restore it to lines 18-20 of

606 Cf. Moens (1930), 50-51 for technical disagreements with Crusius’ assumptions.
607 Cf. BCH 1893, 606, figure 6,11.
column 2 where the spacing of the lines is more reduced. Ergo, the first line of the fragment cannot with good logic be placed higher than line 21. There is some chance that it belongs between lines 21-28, but it cannot be positively determined. The spacing is not sufficiently strong to make an argument to position this piece.
Chapter 4: Poetic Resonances

Very little commentary or consideration at the literary or philological level has occurred in previous editions of the text. Some editors offered limited comments in an attempt to clarify what might be confusing to the reader in various places, as the vocabulary can frequently be unusual. At times, various other Greek sources have been cited as aids for clarification or comparison. The level of detail provided has been inconsistent, and limited to the minimal level required for ‘comprehension’ of the text or, alternatively, what was felt useful for justifying a particular reconstruction or supplement. O. Crusius, P. Moens, as well as W. Furley and J. Bremer may be credited with offering the most consideration of the text as literature. Rather than attempt to label each and every note with a catalogue of which former editions have made mention, I have instead preferred to simply note at the beginning of each discussion in which editions and on which pages any comment may be found.

This commentary aims to be something other than a simple ‘aid’ in the reading of the hymn. The practice of ‘explaining’ texts is freighted with problematic assumptions regarding our own ability to read and understand ancient texts, cultures, and contexts. The mere fact that most of Greek literature is lost handicaps tremendously any attempt to
explore the intertextual discourse of the poem. Questions of intertexts quickly deconstruct themselves. However, one cannot fully embrace a “Death of the Author” style position—it is undeniably true that both author and audience were real, with experiences and perspectives. To read the text in ignorance of this is to read a different text. On the other hand, one can never adequately know author, audience, or intertexts, meaning that one is never going to read the same text. Somewhere along this spectrum, one may situate various readings by modern scholars. In this commentary, I hope to lean toward context, tradition, and intertexts, but to do so in a creative manner, raising possible readings rather than discovering necessary ones.

Moreover, as a scholar reading and re-reading a text with such close attention, one with the leisure to pursue and peruse possible associations, and biased by an inherent incapability for simply taking words as presented, I cannot hear this text as its Greek audience would have, or read this inscription as Greek visitors to Delphi would have. 608

In an attempt not only to avoid these problems, but also to offer a useful commentary for the reader, I have adopted a less common approach. I offer linguistic background, some philological study of semantic range throughout history of use, and brief comments and considerations regarding other texts (most often extant and famous) that are likely to have ‘resonated’ in the mind of the audience member through association (what we are in the

608 Several factors are in play here: 1) there was never a single, monolithic, audience. Those who heard the performance were diverse in taste, knowledge, and experience. Those who later read the text over the centuries were diverse linguistically, ethnically, culturally, and professionally. One of the participating technotai differs significantly from a Delphic bystander, who in-turn differs broadly from Roman (et al.) tourists of the next several centuries. 2) Translation occurs not only between different linguistic systems such as Greek, Latin, and English, but between different communities using the same language. To give an example of the distortion potentially introduced by translation, one need only recall the names of the gods, notably in Hesiod (as there are so very many ‘personifications’ in the Theogony). Should Gaia be read as a name, a proper noun, or a personification of a common noun? – Gaia, Earth, or the earth?
habit of calling intertextuality). The scope of this dissertation does not permit a fully comprehensive consideration of word histories, or comparison with a more limited set of texts such as cult songs, or even with the Apolline tradition alone. As such, I have aimed to explore and suggest less obvious intertexts, attempted to show common words as well-chosen and full of meaning, and also point to potential significations which lie beyond traditional assumptions.

I want to be explicit regarding my approach to genealogies and intertexts. I take as fundamental the observations of J. Derrida regarding matters of roots and rootedness. I include both French and English, as the clarity of word play is relevant to this distinction:

“…l’appartenance historique d’un texte n’est jamais droite ligne. Ni causalité de contagion. Ni simple accumulation de couches. Ni pure juxtaposition de pieces empruntées. Et si un texte se donne toujours une certaine representation de ses propres raciness, celles-ci ne vivent que de cette representation, c’est-à-dire de ne jamais toucher le sol. Ce qui détruit sans doute leur essence radicale, mais non la nécessité de leur function enracinante. Dire qu’on ne fait jamais qu’entrelacer les racines à repasser par les memes points, à redouble d’anciennes adherences, à circuler entre leurs differences, à s’enrouler sur elles-mêmes ou à s’envelopper réciproquement, dire qu’un texte n’est jamais qu’un système de racines, c’est sans doute contredire à la fois le concept du système et le scheme de la racine.”

“…the historical appurtenance of a text is never a straight line. It is neither causality by contagion, nor the simple accumulation of layers. Nor even the pure juxtaposition of borrowed pieces. And if a text always gives itself a certain representation of its own roots, those roots live only by that representation, by never touching the soil, so to speak. Which undoubtedly destroys their radical essence, but not the necessity of their racinating function. To say that one always interweaves roots endlessly, bending them to send down roots among the roots, to pass through same points again, to redouble, old adherences, to circulate among their differences, to coil around themselves or to be enveloped one in the other, to say that a text is never anything but a system of roots, is undoubtedly to contradict at once the concept of system and the pattern of the root.”

609 Derrida, J. (1967), 149-150.
By this, I understand him to say that rootedness need not imply derivation, that association may be free of genetic priority, that connectivity is in part pretense, and that rootedness is a subjective and contingent experience. That is to say, intertextuality is a mirage. It is unreal, unverifiable, and subjective, but may remain ‘true’ and indeed relevant to the observer and author, incidentally or purposely.611

An intertextual connection or association cannot be ‘real,’ as in an historical event. It must be perceived or intended if it is to approach such a state, and these are two ancient actions that remain beyond the reach of a modern scholar. Moreover, it is quite apparent that an audience member may perceive an intertextual association which the author did not intend, and that not all audience members may perceive the same associations. Arguing over the reality of intertexts is a waste of time. On the other hand, exploring the possibilities of what may have been ‘true’ to one reader or another, and the possible layers which those perceived ‘roots’ might connect, in all their contingent and subjective non-reality, this is worthwhile. It moves us away from the ‘THE’ interpretation of the text and into the realm of what I am inclined to call the ‘aesthetics of reading’.

As such, I worry over too strong a reliance on the earlier Apolline tradition as either norm or interpreter, but still feel compelled to remember it as the tradition within which (and perhaps beyond which) the author works. In the epigraphical edition, I was keen to avoid relying on other, similar, texts as resources for filling the gaps. However, the author is clearly working within a poetic and narrative tradition in a self-conscious

manner. He exploits, manipulates, appropriates, rejects, transforms, and innovates. To read this text requires more than a mere understanding of semantic intent, but an appreciation of the rich tangle of contingent potential embedded in, and lurking through, this poem.

To describe my approach better (or at least more simply), I find it useful to employ the term “affordances.” By this term, I mean something quite specific, as it has been described and deployed by S.I. Johnston in her 2009 article, “A New Web for Arachne.” Johnston argues that the mythical resonance and force of a word is dependent upon the audience for activation – it permits, but does not compel, the audience to read or hear it in certain ways. There are limits, but within those boundaries lies a spectrum of possible semantic expression. As an example, in Athenaios’ hymn, βαθύδενδρον (deep-forested) may merely describe the slopes of mount Helikon, but this adjective may also possess the potential to activate associations in the minds of the audience, which other, more traditional, descriptors of Helikon would lack. As we will see, the deep forest can be associated with crowds of maenads. To connect frenzied worshippers of Dionysos with the Muses may seem to stretch the bounds of intention or appropriateness. Yet, when the poet strings several words together that are capable of ‘resonating’ in such a way, perhaps we should take notice. Whether or not this possible

---

‘intertext’ exists for a particular audience member will depend in part on their own personal, subjective awareness of and familiarity with works such as Euripides’ *Bacchai*.

The meaning and implications of word choice are entirely dependent upon the audience. As modern readers, we are now (somewhat) comfortable with our illiteracy (pun intended) in the matter of authorial intent, which derives in part from our existential separation from the author’s own subjective experience and knowledge. We are forever *etic* readers. This status may be extended to ancient readers—they may be culturally and chronologically *emic*, sharing much in common with the author, but their readings remain external, as ours do. Debate over degree of difficulty and separation may have merit, but they did not know the intent of the author with certainty and exactitude, and we cannot know how they understood the author’s text with any confidence. (It is not ridiculous to suggest that authors themselves are not always fully aware of their own intention or engagement with context and intertext.) We cannot know how the words of this hymn resonated in their ears, or what associations, intertexts, or images they activated. It is likely that the ‘rootedness’ which might be obvious to one listener completely passed by the audience member standing at his or her elbow.

Considering the latent potential of words is important to reading deep and reading well. Rather than explain what the vocabulary of Athenaios’ hymn meant, or

---

613 I count authors as a kind of audience as well.

614 While scholia may at times exist that get us ‘closer’ in chronological proximity to ancient texts, we are still confronted by the fact that the scholiast is *still* separated from originary contexts (where performance is concerned), and while he may offer some help as to how he himself and his peers may read a text, they represent but a small portion of readers. That is not to say that scholia are not useful, but rather to argue that they merely add possible readings, not necessary ones.

615 It is not unreasonable to suggest that the same audience member might even experience the text differently as a reader of the text as an inscription.
must have meant to author or audience, I intend to aid the reader in exploring a spectrum of what it could have meant. Approaching a literary commentary in this fashion offers an advantage. Much of the vocabulary in this text is unusual, and frequently we must rely on later usages to build our knowledge of their semantic range. Reverse causality or ‘rootedness’ is, of course, absurd. However, to discover that a word could be used in a certain way, even if posterior, is to suggest that this use may be catalogued among the latent possibilities, or affordances, of the word throughout its entire history. We have no sure way of knowing at what point certain affordances become ‘unlocked,’ but it is surely foolish to assume that a neologism could not have been first heard in a manner similar to later usage. This commentary embraces the potentiality of words, and unabashedly suggests possibilities without feeling the need to play umpire.

What possible meanings, roots, and affordances lie latent in the text at the level of vocabulary? This is more than a simple genealogy of the text, but rather an exploration of the history and usage of words. What significations or narratives lie dormant within the text, ready to be activated by a reader or audience, to be recognized, linked, or associated? Or, in what way can these words also be simply ‘understood,’ while ignoring everything beyond this specific, isolated, text? Every text and word can exist as a new creation, a freestanding construct, self-contextualizing—the words gaining meaning from

\[616\] E.g. A word such as λόγος will resonate with more potential after the Gospel According to John was written than before. The possible association with incarnation may have indeed been latent before, but Christian audience will be far more likely to activate that meaning. Latency is tricky, however, as the use of speech acts to create in the Genesis account likely lies behind John’s use of the word, and the fact that he did deploy the word in such a manner suggests that others could have as well, earlier. The difference is that after John, λόγος is more likely to that before, for some readers, to resonate in such a manner. It always had the potential—that is why it could be used this way in the first place.
use. Nevertheless, one may imagine, or actually see, roots and connectedness—situating the text within older tradition(s).
Strophe 1:

1 [Προμόλεθ'] Ἐλικ]ω̣δα γαθοκόμουν αἰ λά-
2 [χετε, Δι]ο[ν ώιν δρομόπες νιθρήσων] εὐωλ[εοι,
3 μόλετε συνόμαιμον ἵνα Φοιοῖβον ὦδας[ί]-
4 σι κέλημες φρυσσοκόμμαν, ὃς ἀνὰ δικόρυν-
5 βα Παρνασίδος ταίσδε πετρέας ἐδραν' ἐμί' [ἀ]-
6 γακλυταῖες Δελφοφίσιν Κασταλίδος
7 ἐσυδρότου νάμιν ἐπινίσται, Δελφὸν ἀνά
8 [πρωδον] μαστεσιον ἕρθων πάγον.

Come forth! ] You who have Deep-Wooded Helikon as your allotted portion,
Fair-Armed daughters of Loud-Roaring Zeus!
Come! So that you may celebrate your Blood-Brother with songs,
Bright-One, Golden-Hair;
Who, above these rocks, split-cragged seats of Parnassus,
Along with the Famous Delphian women,
Visits the streams of Kastalia, abounding-in-water,
Arriving at Delphi, above the headland, prophetic hill.617

Strophe 1 begins with an invocation to the Muses, pivots to Apollo for whom they
are to sing, and then firmly locates the song in the very real and geographical heights of
Delphi. The poet relies heavily on periphrastic references to the deities, and consistently
utilizes descriptive (rather than cultic) adjectives as epithets.618 Nouns are often paired
here with unexpected or unusual adjectives. The use of the relative pronouns sets up a
strong parallel between those goddesses who dwell on mount Helikon and the god who
visits (as possessor) mount Parnassus.619 A band of Delphian women, encircling the god,

617 Translation is my own. I am grateful to J. Lipp and L. Marshall for the suggestion of the kenning
“blood-brother.”
618 By “cultic” here I mean those epithets that associate deities with specific, real, cults.
619 A quick survey of comparable texts in Powell (1925), reveals that use of the relative pronoun in lyric
and paean is common. It is Aristonoeas’ avoidance that is exceptional. As such, it is unremarkable that it
should be used in Athenaios’ text.
serves to balance the chorus of muses. In addition, mountain forests give way to
mountain streams. The strophe begins with a summoned departure, and closes with
arrival at the location of the performance itself. Numerous allusions are made to previous
literary and cultic works, but in an elusive manner—the intertextuality is evasive and
playful, challenging any certainty on the part of the audience or reader. Surprising use of
unexpected forms and epithets is poetically creative, and suggestive of a rich and lively
interaction with previous texts.620

Invoking the Muses

Invocation of the Muses at the beginning of mythological narrative and hymn is
well attested in Greek texts, albeit with a diversity of language and form; however, it is
neither required nor formulaic.621 Many texts do not mention the Muses, and many that
do fall well outside a formulaic use of invocation or concern for authority. The
invocations at the beginning of the Homeric epics are familiar and establish what has
often been considered as precedent: Iliad 1.1 ἀειδε, θεά; Odyssey 1.1 ἐννεπε, Μοῦσα.

620 E.g. βαθύδενδρον and ἐ[ρι]βρόμουου.
621 The role of the Muses is discussed by many authors who comment on ancient Greek literature. Some of
the scholarly literature is quite complex, delving into the worlds of semiotic and narrative. Cf. Calame
(1995) [1986]. A quote from his introduction (pg.18) is telling: “…when inspiration represented by the
Muses becomes merely a literary convention, it is the I of the narrator that inherits the power-knowledge
previously bestowed by the Muses.” In response to this, I simply note—there is little basis to assume that
the Muses were ever a source of authority. Cf. Hesiod, Theogony where the poet not only makes the Muses
his theme (line 1), invokes them (line 104ff), but claims that they gave him his poetic skill to begin with
(line 30); however, he also makes it clear that there is no trustworthiness to these Muses (lines 27-28). I
take the Muses as a literary technique largely devoid of any discourse of authority, and I find it entirely
unsurprising that there is, in fact, no consistent invoking their aid in Greek poetry throughout the centuries.
Our sample of epic is not sufficient even to determine if Homer’s varied formula were normative for epic.
Hesiod certainly varies.
Hesiod begins his *Works and Days* with Μοῦσαι, invoking them with his first word; the same word also begins the *Theogony*, but with an interesting variation, as here the Muses are the genitive object of the verb ἀρχόμεθα, making them the *theme* of his poem in the epic manner. This approach results in a delayed invocation; Hesiod does eventually directly address the Muses, just before he begins his genealogy of the gods, devoting all of lines 104-115 to an extended invocation. He invokes them again in 1021-2, just before he begins the so-called *Catalogue of Women*. This tactic of delayed invocation, or rather re-invocation, appears in Homer as well: cf. *Iliad* 2.484, just as the catalogue of ships begins. This is a technique that is employed commonly among other, later, poets, and is especially frequent in the work of Pindar.

Looking beyond these early precedents, however, there is a surprising lack of consistency regarding the role of the Muses as poetic inspiration, and one can even argue for a general decline in their use as a poetic device. Of the 33 collected *Homer* Hymns, only 10 invoke the Muses: the longer hymns to Hermes and Aphrodite as well as 5 of the shorter hymns call upon the Μοῦσαι, who are occasionally referred to as ‘clear-voiced’ (λίγεια); the *Hymn to Helios* specifically invokes Μοῦσα Καλλιόπη; the hymns to Selene and the Dioskouroi each invoke Μοῦσαι in the plural. There is a significant degree of

---

622 Μοῦσαι Πιερίθεν ἀοιδήσι κλείουσαι | δεῦτε Δί' ἐννέπετε, σφέτερον πατέρ' ὑμνείουσαι.

623 Μουσάων Ἐλικονιάδων ἀρχώμεθ' ἀείδειν.

624 ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι. NB that the initial invocation was to a single θεά.

625 Cf. Pindar, *Olympian Odes* 5.17 (Zeus); *Olympian Odes* 9.81 (Muses); *Pythian Odes* 1.29 (Zeus); *Pythian Odes* 4.67 (Muses); elsewhere, in Apollonios, *Argonautica* there are clear parallels with the Hesiodic precedent. 1.1 begins ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβ... and the Muses are invoked slightly later at line 22: Μοῦσαι δ' ὑποφήτορες εἶνεν ἀοιδής; again in 3.1: Εἰ δ' ἔγεν νῦν, Ἐρατώ, παρά θ' ἱστασο καὶ μοι ἐνισπε. The conscious imitation of Hesiod is made clear in 4.984: ἥκε τε Μοῦσαι, οὐκ ἐδέλων ἐνέπω προτέρων ἐπος— the author professes squeamishness regarding Kronos’ castration.
flexibility to the tradition. Additionally, it is possible for there to be wide variation in practice and occurrence within the corpus of a single author.

Pindar, for example, quite inconsistently invokes the Muses—in his *Olympian Odes* he relies heavily on Zeus as an arbiter of truth (which makes sense in the context of Zeus as the ultimate umpire for the games), and employs a diversity of divine reference: he invokes the songs themselves,\(^626\) he describes the Muse standing beside him as he discovered his new song,\(^627\) he calls upon Zeus,\(^628\) describes songs as the gift of the Muses,\(^629\) requests their ‘arrows,’\(^630\) credits them reminding him that he owed a friend a song,\(^631\) describes their role in fostering through music,\(^632\) and invokes the Charities.\(^633\)

He does occasionally allow the Muses a more recognizable role, such as the first *Pythian* ode, which reads (1-4):

Χρυσέα φόρμιγξ, Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ ἱπποκάμων
σύνδικον Μοισᾶν κτέανον τὰς ἀκούει
μὲν βάσις ἀγλαίας ἀρχά,  
πείθονται δ’ ἀιοδοί σάμασιν  
ἀγησιχόρων ὑπόταν προοιμίων  
ἀμβλολάς τεῦχης ἐλελξομένα.

Golden Lyre, shared possession of Apollo and violet-braided Muses;  
The Foot-step leading in the glorious show, it listens to you  
And singers follow your cues when you swell with sound,

\(^{626}\) Pindar, *Olympian Odes* 2.1-2: Ἀναξιφόρμιγγες ὑμνοὶ, τίνα τεῦχ, τίν’ ἣρω, τίνα δ’ ἀνδρα κελαδήσωμεν;

\(^{627}\) Pindar, *Olympian Odes* 3.4: Μοῖσα δ’ οὕτω ποι παρέστα μοι νεοσίγαλον εὐρόντι.

\(^{628}\) Pindar, *Olympian Odes* 4.1: Ἐλατήρ υπέρτατε βροντᾶς ἀκαμαντόποδος Ζεῦς.

\(^{629}\) Pindar, *Olympian Odes* 7.7-9: νέκταρ χιτόν, Μοῖσᾶν δόσιν...γλυκίν καρπόν φρενός.

\(^{630}\) Pindar, *Olympian Odes* 9.5: ἄλλα νῦν ἐκαταβάλοιν Μοῖσᾶν ὑπὸ τόξον. There is an easy conflation between the strings of the lyre or kithara and the string of a bow.


Striking up chorus-leading prooimia

Yet, even here, we find description, or rather, association in the place of direct invocation. Frequently the Muses serve less as a source of poetic knowledge, more participants, as deities present for musical performances. Not all of the Pythian odes mention the muses or invoke deities, but those that do, do so in seemingly more traditional ways than in the Olympian odes. In sum, Pindar avoids the direct invocations of Hesiod and Homer, and often prefers a different deity, or simply suggests that he himself is the poetic source. Similarly, the text of Athenaios’ hymn is more suggestive of presence and participation, and does not appear to express a need for inspiration or knowledge. At first blush, the invocation the Muses feels traditional, but a closer consideration reveals their role as participants rather than providers.

Many other scholars have noticed the difference in the relationship between Muses and poet here. H. Mackie comments:

“Thanks to his communication with the Muses, the epic poet can claim to reproduce an accurate account of the past, based on the eyewitness testimony of the Muses. This conceit is nowhere to be found in epinician poetry. In epinician poetry, the past is introduced not for its own sake but for the sake of the present occasion. Ultimately, the past is subordinate to the present as a poetic them. This has various consequences. For one thing, the epinician poet does not boast that he is able to tell the ‘truth’ about the past. Instead, he boasts of being able to give an account of the past that ‘befits’ the present. The epinician poet openly acknowledges that the myths he introduces into the ode have been adapted where necessary to suit the needs of the occasion.”


635 Cf. Pindar, Pythian Odes 4.3-4: Μοῖςα, Λατοίδαισιν ὄρεθλόμενον Πυθῶνί τ’ αὐξῆς οὖρον ὑμνον. However, they are only ‘present’ again in Pythian Odes 10.37-40, where there are choruses of maidens and the sounds of lyres and pipes.

While I take issue with the strong distinction drawn between genres (epic and epinician), what Mackie has to say about Pindar’s prose would appear quite applicable to Athenaios’ text. To get into arguments over authority regarding past events as regaled in cultic, poetic, narratives is a red herring. These are neither theological texts nor historical annals. They are art. Mackie goes on to argue that Homeric invocations of the Muses are characterized by either attached interrogatives or the suggestion that the material is too distant, too much, too hard for mortals to know and remember. The Muses’ aid is required, so she argues (I am reluctant to take such human ‘ignorance’ at face value—the bard and the audience both know what is really going on, but willingly suspend this knowledge for the sake of mythmaking). When such problems arise in Pindaric material, Mackie argues that similar invocations (or we might say, formulae) occur. Yet, in other cases, they are either absent, or play a subordinate role.\textsuperscript{637} The presence of the Muses is not always (or perhaps ever) limited to doling out information.

Of significant relevance for this matter, the Apollonian tradition in particular appears to lack the custom of calling upon the Muses. For example, the author of the \textit{Homeric Hymn to Apollo} has ample opportunity to invoke the Muses,\textsuperscript{638} but instead defers to more indirect references. They appear twice: as chorus participating in a divine performative context that mirrors one of mortals (or vice versa), and as the source of the

\textsuperscript{637} For a detailed discussion, cf. Mackie (2003), 39-76.

\textsuperscript{638} I read the hymn as a literary reproduction or representation of festival performance—it is a single literary composition constructed of two separate performances (each with \textit{prooimia} and \textit{paean}) linked by a brief ‘frame’ of the performative context. As such, there are at least four good opportunities to call upon the muses. One could say that the \textit{Homeric Hymn to Apollo} exemplifies rhapsodic tradition, in that it is \textit{stitched} together. Cf. pgs. 116-130 on “Stichich Meters” in Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012). The value of the text as a mimetic representation of performance may surpass its potential value as a source for ritual; many of the interpretive problems posed by the hymn are resolved by means of this reading.
Cretan sailors’ ability to sing *paeans* to Apollo. It is possible that the Delian Maidens mentioned in the intermission function as their mortal reflections. The shorter *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (no. 21) makes no mention of them. The *Homeric Hymn to the Muses* and *Apollo* (no. 25) opens with a line reminiscent of Hesiod’s *Theogony*: Μουσάων ἄρχομαι Ἀπόλλωνός τε Διός τε. Yet, as with Hesiod, this situates them as the topic, and lacks any suggestion of invocation. Closer in context, Aristonos’ *paean* to Apollo, also lacks any invocation of the Muses.

Kallimachos’ *Hymn to Apollo* features no invocation of the divine but rather features a (real or imagined) direct address to the mortals present and participating. There is no reference to the Muses. His *Hymn to Delos* is somewhat more complicated. The poet begins by invoking his own θυμός, but immediately pivots to Delos’ claim to the first-fruits of the Muses: Δῆλος δ’ ἐθέλει τὰ πρῶτα φέρεσθαι ἐκ Μουσέων. He then refers to Apollo as the guardian/ruler of song: Φοῖβον ἄοιδάων μεδέοντα. He suggests that the Muses are the judges of poetic material and poets. If the songs were to come

639 *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, 189. The performative role for the goddesses, as present at festival is useful as precedent. *Ibid*, 516: τοί δὲ ρήσιοντες ἔποντο | Κρήτες πρὸς Πιθό καὶ ἱππαῖον ἤκειον, | οἴοι τε Κρήτην παήνες, οὐσὶ τέ Μοῦσα ἐν στήθεσιν ἔθηκε θεὰ μελόγηρν ἄοιδήν.

640 *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, 157: κοῖρας Δηλιάδες. They sing the praises of Apollo, Leto, Artemis, and the deeds of mortals long ago.


642 Kallimachos, *Hymn to Delos* 4-5.

643 Kallimachos, *Hymn to Delos* 5.

644 *Hymn to Delos* 5: the Muses grant Delos first place in worth, and dislike poets who fail to praise Pimpleia, a fountain sacred to the Muses in Pieria near Mt. Olympus and associated with Orpheus. Cf. Strabo, *Geography* 7fr.17.4, 7fr.18.2; 9.2.25; 10.3.17—he comments the Muses were worshipped in Pieria, Olympus, Pimpleia, Leibethrum, and Helikon. Perhaps it is unsurprising that it is also mention in Nonnus, *Dionysiaka* 13.428. Certain versions of myth claim that the Muses were the children of the nymph Pimpleia and Pieros. Lycophron, *Alexandra* 275 mentions this location, in close reference to nymphs and the krater
from the Muses alone, and not the poet, there might be a problem with them hating poets that overlook or forget Pimpleia. The poet does ask for knowledge from the Muses in lines 82-3, regarding the birth of trees and Nymphs—a fully traditional style of request. An oblique reference is made when the swans sing at Apollo’s birth in line 252—Kallimachos informs his readers that these birds are associated with the Muses.645

Finally, he makes mention of the mortal equivalent, the Delian Maidens in line 296.646 As in the latter half of the Homeric Hymn, the Muses are discussed, but are not invoked as aids at the beginning of the hymn. It has been argued that Kallimachos consciously remembers the Homeric Hymns as he writes his own.647 As such, the consistency of role for the Muses is both unsurprising (Kallimachos largely retains their absence) as well as surprising (significant works in praise of Apollo routinely avoid any invocations of divine aid).648

The invocation in the hymn of Athenaios appears at first blush to embrace tradition, but in fact breaks step with it. What may have been tradition for early epic is not a characteristic of hymnody or cultic poetry since. In particular, the Apolline

---

of Bacchus. In Pausanias, Description of Greece, 9.293-5 several variants of their origins are recorded: mortal daughters of Pieros, divine daughters of Ouranos, as well as of Zeus (these being two separate generations: elder/younger.).

645 Groups of singers bear a certain association with these goddesses, whether birds, maidens, or bards.

646 Cf. Stehle (1997), 110. A (possibly) professional chorus in residence at Delos responsible for singing for Apollo, Leto, and Artemis. Cf. also Allen, Halliday, and Sikes (eds.) (1980) [1936], 225, s.v. κοιραὶ Δηλιάδες. They were a chorus of young women who took part in several festivals at Delos and are mentioned various places in Greek literature, cf. Euripides Heracles Furiens 687, wherein they sing a paean. There was apparently a similar chorus at Ephesus, the Lydian Maidens.


648 If the Muses are seen as a necessary source of authority, then Apollo the god of Oracles may also inspire. If the Muses are seen as an aid in the production of song, then Apollo the god of the kithara may also accompany. Of course, nothing stops a poet from choosing both…and.
tradition, which constantly refers to Apollo’s combat with the *drakōn*, later texts also commonly mention of the invasion of the Gauls) makes the unexpected addition of an invocation to the Muses at the beginning of the poem stand out that much more. Even if common among the earliest texts, with frequent variations throughout the centuries, invocation of the Muses cannot be considered ‘normative’ practice by the late 2nd c. BCE, particularly for texts addressing Apollo. The addition is even more striking when the specific vocabulary employed is considered. The presence of the invocation hearkens back to ancient poetic traditions, but also violates them; one easily comprehends the word choice of the poet, but this recognition of meaning occurs inspite of edgy innovation and creativity.

Προμόλεθ—The poet uses a strong imperative here, commanding the Muses to come forth. M.L. West proposed the restoration in order to better fill the lacuna on the stone. The previously accepted restoration of κέκλυθ makes good sense as well.
but it is hard to see how it can adequately satisfy the demands of space on the stone or the poetic context; still, other recent editions have preferred κέκλυθ'. While West convincingly argued the possibility of compound verbs followed by simplex forms, it must be remembered that the two forms do not mean precisely the same thing. The compound form here possesses a more specific, narrow, sense than the simplex, and therefore requires more attention to fit and flavor. προμόλετε refers to more than simple motion forward or toward—it adds detail to the initial moment of that motion. To come forth, or more commonly, to come out of the house, city, or room, increases the importance of geography and starting location. Location is elevated.

The word choice is unexpected, as there is no extant precedent for mortals invoking deities with this word. Still, unusual vocabulary is common in Athenaios’ hymn and, as in other instances of the text’s vocabulary, the word is quite rare to the Greek corpus as a whole. Several scholiast and ancient lexicons felt it helpful to comment on the morphology and meaning of the word. It is a poetic word found most often in hexameter, offering a convenient anapest. It appears already (and most commonly) in Homer. In the

wherein the poet begs Aphrodite with ἔκλυθες. Hesiod utilizes the word in the Theogony, 644, as Zeus addresses the assembled gods. Pindar, Pythian 4.13 has Medea address the Argonauts before she prophecies. An easily understood term, and familiar to an audience exposed to Homer, but as a choice for the invocation of deities, particularly, the Muses, it cannot be seen as traditional or even 'generic'. The word is primarily used by mortals to address collections of mortals, or a god addressing gods in a parallel fashion. It can be used as a prayer, but is not common, and it is hard to see Athenaios’ hymn praying here. M.L. West’s suggestion of a summons (as unexpected as his word choice is) fits the context better. There is also the parallel in Limenios 1: Ἴτε. As a secondary comment, the form κλυθ is far more common outside of Homeric usage (cf. Theognis, Elegy 1.13; Euripides, Hippolytus 872; Sappho, fr. 86.5; Sophokles, Trachiniae; but also Homer, Iliad 1.37: κλύθη μοι ἄργυρότος'), but quite clearly is too short to fill the lacuna on the stone. It is possible that instead of a verb, yet another epithet might have been present, but there is no way of knowing.


657 LSJ, s.v. προβλώσκω.
three instances found in the *Iliad* is found one of only two other examples of an imperative form: Charis, wife of Hephaestus, summons her husband to come greet Thetis. In similar a context, Theocritus’ love-mad poet claims that he would refuse to ‘come out’ of the house if summoned by his beloved. (This usage perhaps parallels the sense of Athenaios’ text, but certainly differs insofar as the addressee is mortal, and refuses.) Kallimachos uses the word in his hymn to Artemis (the only other ‘cultic’ use), but merely to describe the goddess out for a walk on the hills. The scarcity of usage produced glosses on the older texts, typically but merely to describe Charis’ own motion from the interior to the exterior of the house to receive their guest: *Iliad*, 18.382: προμολοῦσα Χάρις. The other imperative comparandum can be found in a much later Christian epigram wherein Christ summons Lazarus to come forth from his grave. *Greek Anthology*, 1.49.1: Χριστὸς ἔφη· “Πρόμολ’ ὀδε.” Other epic use tends towards extremely mundane circumstances—Achilles captures Lycaon, who had gone out to the fields at night; cf. Homer, *Iliad* 21.37: ἔννύχοις προμολόν. There is a direct parallel in Apollonios, *Argonautica* 2.966 where Heracles is said to have ambushed Melanippe, who had come out for a walk (ransomed by her sister Hippolyte’s girdle): ἔνατα ποτέ προμολοῦσαν Ἀρητιδὰ Μελανίπην. Also, Apollonios uses the verb to disembark his heroes from their boat; cf. Apollonios, *Argonautica* 4.523: τότε προμολόντες ἐπὶ χόον. The three occurrences in the *Odyssey* are simple descriptions of ‘going out. Cf. Homer, *Odyssey* 4.22 Menelaus’ servant Eteoneus comes out and sees Telemachus and Nestor’s son: ὁ δὲ προμολόν ἵδε; *Odyssey* 15.468 The visitors had gone out from the hall to the council: οἱ μὲν ἄρ’ ἐς θὸκον προμολὸν δήμοι τῇ φήμῃ; *Odyssey* 24.388 A woman went out and called men in from the field: ἐπὶ προμολοῦσα κάλεσσα. It appears once in a comic chorus, to describe a nightmare sent up from Hades by Nyx; cf. Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1333: τίνα μοι δύστανον δνευρὸν πέμπεις ἐς ἄφαντος Λίδα προμολόν. The word is used poetically by an anonymous poet in the Greek *Anthology*; the act of unravelling the truth behind Cassandra’s prophecies is likened to escaping a labyrinth, and ‘coming forth’ into the light; Cf. Anonymous, *Greek Anthology* 9.191: Οὐκ ὃν ἐν ἡμιτέρουσι πολυγνάμπτους λαβυρίνθοις ῥηδίας προμολὸς ἐς φάος. It is suggested that knowledge of the Muses (e.g. poetry, particularly epic poetry in this context as Kalliope is mentioned by name) enables this journey to enlightenment. Less relevant (and less poetic), but illustrative of the word’s mundane nature, Oppian uses it to discuss fish; cf. Oppian, *Halieutica* 4.284: ὅστε νέον προμολοῦσαν ἐν τροφὸν ἅμα χαλάσα; *Halieutica* 5.646: αὐτὰρ ὃ γ’ ἐς βιοσὸν προμολὰς ἐξέστησεν ἀλοφίν. 

658 Homer, *Iliad* 18.392: Ἡφαίστε προμολ’ ὀδε. Just moments before the word was used to describe Charis’ own motion from the interior to the exterior of the house to receive their guest: *Iliad*, 18.382: προμολοῦσα Χάρις. The other imperative comparandum can be found in a much later Christian epigram wherein Christ summons Lazarus to come forth from his grave. *Greek Anthology*, 1.49.1: Χριστὸς ἔφη· “Πρόμολ’ ὀδε.” Other epic use tends towards extremely mundane circumstances—Achilles captures Lycaon, who had gone out to the fields at night; cf. Homer, *Iliad* 21.37: ἔννύχοις προμολόν. There is a direct parallel in Apollonios, *Argonautica* 2.966 where Heracles is said to have ambushed Melanippe, who had come out for a walk (ransomed by her sister Hippolyte’s girdle): ἔνατα ποτέ προμολοῦσαν Ἀρητιδὰ Μελανίπην. Also, Apollonios uses the verb to disembark his heroes from their boat; cf. Apollonios, *Argonautica* 4.523: τότε προμολόντες ἐπὶ χόον. The three occurrences in the *Odyssey* are simple descriptions of ‘going out. Cf. Homer, *Odyssey* 4.22 Menelaus’ servant Eteoneus comes out and sees Telemachus and Nestor’s son: ὁ δὲ προμολόν ἵδε; *Odyssey* 15.468 The visitors had gone out from the hall to the council: οἱ μὲν ἄρ’ ἐς θὸκον προμολὸν δήμοι τῇ φήμῃ; *Odyssey* 24.388 A woman went out and called men in from the field: ἐπὶ προμολοῦσα κάλεσσα. It appears once in a comic chorus, to describe a nightmare sent up from Hades by Nyx; cf. Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1333: τίνα μοι δύστανον δνευρὸν πέμπεις ἐς ἄφαντος Λίδα προμολόν. The word is used poetically by an anonymous poet in the Greek *Anthology*; the act of unravelling the truth behind Cassandra’s prophecies is likened to escaping a labyrinth, and ‘coming forth’ into the light; Cf. Anonymous, *Greek Anthology* 9.191: Οὐκ ὃν ἐν ἡμιτέρουσι πολυγνάμπτους λαβυρίνθοις ῥηδίας προμολὸς ἐς φάος. It is suggested that knowledge of the Muses (e.g. poetry, particularly epic poetry in this context as Kalliope is mentioned by name) enables this journey to enlightenment. Less relevant (and less poetic), but illustrative of the word’s mundane nature, Oppian uses it to discuss fish; cf. Oppian, *Halieutica* 4.284: ὅστε νέον προμολοῦσαν ἐν τροφὸν ἅμα χαλάσα; *Halieutica* 5.646: αὐτὰρ ὃ γ’ ἐς βιοσὸν προμολὰς ἐξέστησεν ἀλοφίν. 


660 Kallimachos, *Hymn to Diana* 99: ἔφρεε ἐπὶ προμολὴσῃ δρεος τοῦ Παρρασίου σκαφροῦσας ἐλάφους. 

Colin (Reinach 1909-13), but it too fails to adequately fill the lacuna.\textsuperscript{662} The proposed supplement makes good sense and suitably fills the demands of meter and lacuna, but if correct, has Athenaios opening his hymn with an unusual and unexpected word, albeit one that quite nicely prepares the audience for the following lines which concern geographic detail and travel.

\textbf{Ἑλικωνίδας} -- The Muses are often associated with Mount Helikon, but not exclusively. Throughout Greek literature there is a blurring of the lines, a conflation, regarding their geographical placement. Strabo attempts to untangle the confusion in his discussion of Thracian migration (he views their cult as Thracian in origin), and comments that they had several cult sites where they were worshipped: in Pieria, Olympus, Pimleia, Leibethrum, as well as Helikon.\textsuperscript{664} The confusing conflation can be seen in the opening to Limenios’ hymn, line 2: Πιερίδες, αἱ νιφοβόλους πέτρας ναίεθ’ Ἑλικωνίδας. They belong to both (well, many) regions and Helikon has acquired the physical traits of Olympus (according to Hesiod)\textsuperscript{665} as well as those of Parnassus (according to Athenaios)—line 5: Παρνασσίδος ταξίδε πετέρας upon which the snow-bolts of Apollo slaughter the Gauls. What Limenios does here is nothing new, however. In Hesiod’s \textit{Theogony}, they are associated with Helikon (line 1), Pieria (line 53), as well as Olympus (lines 25, 52, 62-3, 76, 114, 966, 1022). The tragedians associate them in

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{662} Cf. Corinna, fr. 41.11.6. Further examples are quite lacking, suggesting there is no precedent for such usage.
\item \textsuperscript{663} Moens (1930), 14; Bélis (1992), 58; Furley and Bremer (2001), vol. 2, page 86-7.
\item \textsuperscript{664} Cf. Strabo, \textit{Geography} 7fr.17.4, 7fr.18.2; 9.2.25; 10.3.17.
\item \textsuperscript{665} Cf. \textit{Theogony} 62: τυτθὸν ἄτ’ ἀκροτάτης κορυφῆς νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπων’
\end{itemize}
Helikon as well, but contribute to the geographical confusion. Euripides, *Hercules* 790-1 seems to conflate both Helikon and Delphi: ὦ Πυθίου δευτέρωτι πέτρα Μουσῶν θ᾽ Ἑλικωνιάδων δῶματα. Sophokles, *Oedipus Rex* 1105-9 refers to Helikonian nymphs, immediately after Bacchus who dwells on rocky crags.\(^{666}\) Lyric fragments also refer to them as Ἑλικωνιᾶς.\(^{667}\) In later antiquity they appear to be more popularly known by their Helikonian association.\(^{668}\)

Ἑλικωνίδες/Ἑλικωνιάδες is an interesting term, however. The LSJ defines it as “dwellers on Mt. Helikon.”\(^{669}\) However, the suffix employed is more precisely a gentilic, defining not dwelling but ethnicity.\(^{670}\) Of course, the two may overlap, but when we remember that the Muses received cult in numerous places, this epithet refers to a specific cult, not merely mythical houses. Moreover, what mythical resonance Helikon may have will root itself firmly in Hesiod.\(^{671}\) Athenaios does not use this particular formulation, as Limenios does, but rather finds a more elliptical way to refer to their cult. It is worth strongly articulating that the Muses do not actually *live* on Helikon, any more than Athena *lives* on the Acropolis in Athens. These are locations they have received as

\(^{666}\) Note, more recent editions (Hugh Lloyd-Jones) have adopted Wilamowitz’ suggestion and corrected Ἑλικωνιάδων (codd.) to read Ἑλικωπίδων.

\(^{667}\) Cf. Alexander, fr. 9.5; Ibycos, *Fragment* 1a.24. Also, Pindar *Isthmian Odes* 2.34.

\(^{668}\) Cf. *Greek Anthology* 7.709.5; 7.612.1; Eusebius, *Life of Constantine* 3.54.2.8; Himerios, *Oration* 64.51; Joannes Grammaticus, *Anacreontea* 1.12: Ὁ δ’ ἄναξ λόγων Ἀπόλλων Ἑλικωνίδες τε Μοῦσαι.

\(^{669}\) *LSJ* s.v. Ἑλικών.

\(^{670}\) Cf. Smyth §344. NB how closely linked gentilic and patronymic formations are. There is a sense of heritage, of time—not necessarily of location.

\(^{671}\) One possible way of reading Hesiod’s apparent conflation, is to see him as embedding a more local, Helikonian, cult within the larger kosmos of Olympos.
property—each is a temenos within which they receive cult.\(^{672}\) Greek literature is consistent in locating the actual dwelling place of the Muses on Olympos. While Hesiod describes the Muses as bathing and dancing on Helikon,\(^{673}\) he quite specifically locates their halls on Mt. Olympus’ snowy peak, in Pieria.\(^{674}\) Cf. also Homer, Iliad 2.484: "Εσπετε νόν μοι, Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπία δόματ' ἔχουσαι. Their homes are on mount Olympus.

Athenaios’ hymn avoids geographic conflation as is found in Limenios’ poem.\(^{675}\) He is also quite explicit in naming Helikon as their cult center (NB the use of λανχάνω). If indeed the first verb of the poem is a summons to change place, to transfer location from Helikon to Delphi, we find here a request for the Muses not to ‘get out of bed and come to work’ but to arrive at Delphi.\(^{676}\) It positions the Muses as visitors, arriving in Delphi after a journey away from their own temenos, much like those artists who perform the hymn, and in nice counter-balance to the mortal, but famous, Delphic women whom the author describes as accompanying Apollo.\(^{677}\) The result of all this is a large, mixed

\(^{672}\) For the cult of the Muses at Helikon, cf. Pausanias, Geography 9.29-31. The temenos was said to contain statues of famous poets and musicians, including Hesiod.

\(^{673}\) Theogony 1-8.

\(^{674}\) Cf. Theogony 62-63: τυφθον ἀπ’ ἀκροτάτης κορυφῆς νιφόντος ὘λύμπου ἐνθά σφιν ἄλαυτα τε χοροί καὶ δόματα καλά; also 75: Μοῦσαι άρειδον Ὀλύμπια δόματ’ ἔχουσαι.

\(^{675}\) Limenios manages to reference Parnassus, Pieria, and Helikon in the first three lines as he addresses the Muses.

\(^{676}\) There is some difficulty to the notion of ‘travelling’ deities, found so often in art and literature, as it suggests that they are only present, or manifest, in a single location at a time. This idea, of course, is necessary for anthropomorphic storytelling, but in cult the manifestation of deity in one place does not seem to exclude their manifestation elsewhere. Mortals want their attention, participation, and response—the gods need not necessarily be bothered by mortal limitations.

\(^{677}\) The counter-balance of goddesses from abroad with locals has a nice precedent in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo, 157. The women of Delphi need no more be actual members of the chorus than the Muses, whom the real crowd, of course, do not see. As will be mentioned later, this parallel of Muses with mortal women is charged with possible resonance due to the way in which the Muses are described. The Bacchic flavor of
group, of mortals and divinities, from Delphi and elsewhere, joining together to praise Apollo—a reflection of historical praxis.

Delphi is consistently a place of arrivals—both for mortal *theoria*, as well as for the gods. Apollo himself is frequently depicted as *arriving*. The location of this geographic noun before the relative pronoun marking the clause of which it is the object suggests an emphatic force to the word. Immediately following a verb of summons and motion, the emphatic geography strongly suggests that motion and geography are important attributes to this first strophe.

**βαθύδενδρος**—This is an unusual poetic adjective. There are an extremely limited number of occurrences of this word in extant Greek literature, all appearing in texts dated later than Athenaios’ hymn. In not one case does it refer to Helikon. Still, as a neologism to describe Helikon, it is quite appropriate on two levels: Pausanias writes that there was a sacred grove (* difficulté*) belonging to the Muses at Helikon, but also that, of Greek mountains, Helikon is one of the most fertile, being full of cultivated trees.

---

678 Cf. Alkaios, *Paean to Apollo*.
679 Weil (1893), 577; Crusius (1894), 40; Fairbanks (1900), 122; Moens (1930), 15; Bélis (1992), 58.
680 Pausanias, *Description of Greece*, 9.29.5; also more generally 9.29-31: the summit of Helikon was snowcapped, but with slopes of meadows and forests, a fountain arose there. There was also a temenos of the muses there with famous statues.
681 Pausanias, *Description of Greece*, 9.28.1. Weil (1893), 577 writes that “sans doute” the poet alludes to the sacred grove, but it is more likely to refer to the entire area, as a *temenos*. It was not unusual for deities to be landlords, owning significant tracts of land around their shrines, and renting both fields and produce to tenants for a tithe. Cf. τέμενος βαθύδενδρον in Nonnus, *Dionysiaka*, 13.184, 446: two places are described as such—Olive-Adorned Marathon and Mountain-Dwelling Panacros. In both cases the regions are places where mortals dwell, and possession by the inhabitants is indicated by the presence, respectively, of the verbs λάχον and ἔχον, although the use of *temenos* adds a certain sacral flavor to the description. This text offers a good parallel to Athenaios’ text. Also, on *territory* as sanctuary, beyond the popular focus
Kallimachos, in his *Hymn to Delos*, describes the oaks of Helikon shaking and quivering like a mane of hair. Is unremarkable for Helikon to be heavily forested, but the word-choice is odd, as βαθύδενδρος has an odd trajectory of use.

Most appearances of the term come from a single text, Nonnus’ *Dionysiaka*. The text dates to the 4th-5th c. CE, but the extreme paucity of usage demands that we explore even late usages. In addition to more generic uses, Nonnus deploys it to describe a place appropriate to the Muses—the area is at the wooded feet of a mountain, watered by rushing mountain streams, far from civilization (much like Helikon)—but it is encamped by an army of Bacchants. Again, elsewhere, he describes an idealistic pastoral scene, similarly an echo of Helikon, with musical shepherds. But, again, it is populated with Bacchants:

> δερκομένων δὲ
> ψευδομένους λειμώνας ἐβακχεύθησαν ὑποσαί,
> καὶ σφιν ὅρος βαθύδενδρον ἔφανετο καὶ νομὸς ὕλης
> καὶ χορός ἁγρονόμων καὶ πώεα μηλοβότηρων,
> καὶ κτύπον ὥσαντο λιγυφθόγγοι νομῆος
> ποιμενίῃ σύριγγι μελιζομένοι νοῆσαι,

Mistakenly thinking they saw meadows, their sight became frenzied, and a deep-wooded mountain and forest pasture appeared to them,

---

682 Kallimachos, *Hymn to Delos* 81-2: ὡς ίδε χαίτην σειομένην Ἑλικόνος.
683 A surprising amount of vocabulary from these hymns appears with remarkable frequency in Nonnus, while being largely absent elsewhere.
684 E.g. a geographic region in 41.18 (Lebanon): βαθύδενδρον ὑπὸ ῥάχιν.
685 Nonnus, *Dionysiaka*, 27.150: βαθύδενδρα παρὰ σφυρὰ κυκλάδος Ἀρκτοῦ.
686 Nonnus, *Dionysiaka*, 45.159-162.
687 Note the sound of the pipe in the final line, σύριγγι, which in Athenaios’ hymn may be found in line 24 in reference to the drakōn wheezing as it dies. The word also refers to (as will be discussed in the final chapter) a portion of nomos *Pythikos*, a musical competition at Delphi in which Apollo’s combat with the beast is depicted.
and a chorus of country-dwellers and shepherds' flocks, and they thought they could hear the sound of a clear-voiced shepherd making music with shepherd’s pipe.

Nonnus reveals that the word easily resonates with a Dionysian element, deploying it in contexts that conflate the pastoral with the Bacchic. While this is the future history of the word, and not all of his uses echo the presence of the god in such a manner, there would seem to be an affordance, a latent potential reading, of easy association of the deep forest with this god and his followers in this word.

It is particularly relevant that this book of Nonnus concerns the events related much earlier in Euripides’ *Bacchai*. The precise term θάδενδρος does not appear in Euripides, however various compounding of βαθυ- as a description of woods and forest was not unusual, and dates back to Homer. Euripides deploys a variant in his *Bacchai* (1138): the torn pieces of Pentheos are scattered, some in the “Deep-wooded ‘mane’ of the forest”— ὑλης ἐν βαθύξυλῳ φόβῃ. This less pastoral use parallels the use of βαθύδενδρος in a quotation by Plutarch to describe a place of burial, one devoid of music. Nonnus places Bacchus himself in close proximity to the term, as he describes the god’s use of trees as missiles: σκιερῆς βαθύδενδρος ἐγυμνώθη ῥάχις ὑλης (45.203).

Additionally, while considering possible resonance, the chorus in the *Bacchai* sings something quite strange, worth comment in this context. Lines 409-16 read:

---

688 Homer, *Iliad* 4.383 describes a place as ‘deep-grown with rushes’—Ἀσωπὸν δ’ ἱκόντο βαθύσχοινον. In addition, the scholiast on Pindar’s *Pythian* 1.27 pairs up μελάμφλλος (dark-with-leaves) with πολύδενδρος (many-treed) as illuminating “ἡ γὰρ τῶν δέντρων πυκνότης βαθύς ἐργάζεται τὴν ὑλην.”

689 Plutarch, *Moralia* P 1104E (*Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum*, 26)= Lyrica Adespota PMG η. 91.1.1: ἐπείτα κεῖσται βαθύδενδρο ἐν χθόνι σθμποσόων τε καὶ λυράν ἁμορος. This would be the most chronically proximate usage to Athenaios.

690 Dodds (1944), 119-120, notes that Diodoros 17.16.3 mentions that Euripides’ host Archelaos during his stint in Macedonia established dramatic competitions dedicated to Zeus and the Muses in Dion, in Pieria (birth-place of the Muses). If the *Bacchai* were written to be performed there, Dodds would read these lines.
Οὖ θ’ ἀ καλλιστευομένα
Πιερία, μούσειος ἑδρά,
σεμνά κλειτός Ὀλύμπον’
ἐκαὶς ἄγε μ’, <ὡ> Βρόμε Βρόμε,
πρόβασκ’ εὑε δαίμον.
ἐκεὶ Χάριτες, ἐκεὶ δὲ Πόθος, ἐκεὶ δὲ Βάκ-
χας θέμις ὀργάζειν.

“And there, most-beautiful
Pieria, sanctuary of the Muses,
Holy slope of Olympos;
Lead me there, O Bromius, ‘Loud-One’
Procession-Leading Loud-Crying spirit!
There the Graces, there Yearning, and there
The place where it is ordained for reveling with Bacchantes.”

The haunt of the Muses is presented as not only suitable for, but a customary
place for Bacchic revels by women, and is suggestive regarding the participation of the
Graces (Charites) who are often closely associated with the Muses.

In summary: to attribute βαθύδενδρος to Helikon is a 'literary hapax,' but as a
description, it makes sense. There are no extant occurrences prior to the hymn. Later uses
tend to be geographical in nature. The use of βαθύ- in compounds describing forests is
common. To suggest that Athenaios’ intends for the reader to misread Dionysos into his
poem would be untenable, but it is certainly not too much to suggest that the word easily
affords a Dionysiac element. In its generic sense, the word is applicable to Helikon;
however, in its mythological associations, it is an unexpected epithet for the haunt of the
Muses—nevertheless, other haunts of the Muses have already been coopted into a

as an intentional compliment to the region and audience. Pieria, Dodds, remarks “was in fact Dionysiac
country.” This supported by numerous events, such as the death of Orpheus.

691 It is dependent upon the reader to activate the resonance by an act of recognition, remembrance, or
association.
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Dionysiac geographical vocabulary. It will be of particular importance to remember this context as we move forward.

\[\text{αἱ λάχετε}^{692}\] — The idea suggested is that of ownership. The positioning of Helikon before the relative clause of which it is the object not only serves rhythmical ends, but also emphasizes place and location in this line, rather than the deities. The Muses are referred to here, but the importance of geography is clearly elevated. \[\lambda \chi e t e\] speaks to the Muses possessing Helikon, but the context and arrangement is focused on establishing a parallel between the Muses and their sanctuary at Helikon with Apollo and his sanctuary at Delphi. Athenaios begins with a verb of motion, immediately emphasizes location, and thus sets the stage for the chorus of Muses to travel to, and arrive at Delphi.

There was a long-standing tradition of division as \textit{kosmos} in the mythology of the Greeks. Each divinity (or group of divinities) had received their own special ‘\textit{temenos}’ of honors, cult, and geography. Hesiod’s \textit{Theogony} refers to the division of wealth and honors among the gods.\(^{693}\) The concept can be found in other texts as well. Plato refers to Athena’s patronage of Athens: \[\heta \tau i n \tau e \upsilon \mu e t e r a n \pi o l i n \epsilon l a x e n.\] The \textit{Homeric Hymn to

---

\(^{692}\) Fairbanks (1900), 122; Moens (1930), 14; Bélis (1992), 58; Furley and Bremer (2001), vol. 2, 86-7. The form is an epic aorist; Cf. Homer, \textit{Iliad} 4.49: τὸ γὰρ λάχομεν γέρας ἡμεῖς.

\(^{693}\) Hesiod, \textit{Theogony} 112: ὃς τ’ ἄφενος δάσσαντο καὶ ὀς τιμᾶς δύλοντο. Cf. also Hesiod on Hekate, \textit{Theogony}, 411-428. The verb \[\tau i m a o\] features heavily in Hesiod’s account, and present are also \[\delta o r a, \tau i m h.\] NB: the verb \[\lambda a n g ā n o\] is used to describe the \textit{original} division of honors (line 423), one which has not necessarily endured over the course of time, wars, and struggles. E.g. after the war of the Titans, (line 885) we find Zeus, now king, apportioning \[\tau i m h.\] In line 2, the Muses are said to ‘have/hold’ (\[\epsilon h o\]) Helikon.

\(^{694}\) Plato, \textit{Timaeus} 23d.
Pan claims that all snowy crests, mountain peaks, and rocky crags are the god’s domain in this manner.\footnote{Homeric Hymn 19.6-7: ὃς πάντα λόφον νυφόντα λέλογχε καὶ κορυφὰς ὀρέων καὶ πετρήεντα κάρηνα.} Deities may have more than one cult site, more than one region as their own.\footnote{An obvious example would be Apollo at both Delphi and Delos.} Strabo notes that they received cult in Pieria, Olympus, Pimpleia, Leibethrum, as well as Helikon due to Thracian migration and settlement.\footnote{Cf. Strabo, Geography 7fr.17.4, 7fr.18.2; 9.2.25; 10.3.17.} While there seems to have been a certain lack of consistency as to number, names, and origins there is a strong thread of tradition associating the Muses with Helikon, and a long-standing cult present.\footnote{Cf. Farnell (1909), Vol. 5, pg. 434-437; Pausanias, Description of Greece 9.29. Farnell notes (pg. 436) that there is no trace of Apollo worship at Helikon, but possible evidence of Muse cult at Delphi. Cf. Plutarch, Moralia 402C (The Oracles at Delphi) wherein are mentioned both a temple of Gaia as well as former shrine of the Muses which used to be located near the Kastillian spring.} To raise the matter of apportionment with respect to the Muses is to raise the matter of Apollo’s apportionment too—Apollo’s ‘ownership’ of Delphi and the tripod (oracle) possesses a complex history, but does not seem to be one of original allotment.\footnote{The LSJ defines λαγχάνω as generally meaning “to obtain as one’s portion.” No contest is implied between the Muses and Apollo, who is, after all, their leader as we see in both literature and graphic representation.} Delphi, unlike many other sites, has a tradition of contest associated with it. Rather than a temenos apportioned by Zeus, Apollo comes into ownership of the site at a later date, at his own initiative, through his own, often violent action. Later in the hymn we find narrated the episode of combat with the drakōn; this invokes a contested history of the site. It brings to mind questions regarding previous owners if any, and/or Apollo’s rightful ownership of the oracle either as gift or taken by force.\footnote{There is extreme variance in how Apollo came to possess the site, ranging from gift by elder gods to violent acquisition by slaying of the guardian, to being nearly a ‘founder’ of cult at the site. Cf. accounts in}
Διὸς ἑρίβρομου — The restoration of ἑρίβρομου in the text of Athenaios’ Delphic Hymn has never been contested, and likely represents a correct reading. Of most immediate concern is the unanimous restoration of the full phrase Διὸς ἑρίβρομου. The pairing of this descriptive adjective (epithet) with Zeus occurs nowhere else in extant Greek literature. Additionally, when associated with a divinity, it is routinely associated with Dionysos. In light of the potential connotations of βαθύδενδρον, this is worth careful attention.

There is a very close relationship, both semantic and linguistic, between ἑρίβρεμέτης and ἑρίβρομος, and the most convenient solution to Athenaios’ innovation has been to read them interchangeably, as ἑρίβρεμέτης does have a history as an epithet of Zeus. This seems reasonable at first glance, but upon a careful philological consideration of these words, it becomes difficult to allow for a simple substitution. Extant examples show the interchangeability flowing only in one direction—that is, one may apply either ἑρίβρομος or ἑρίβρεμέτης to Dionysos, but never ἑρίβρομος to Zeus.


701 Weil (1893), 577; Crusius (1894), 41; Fairbanks (1900), 122; Moens (1930), 15-16.

702 Descriptive adjectives (read, epithets) attached to Divinities serve two functions: 1) poetic devices for ease in construction of metrical lines’ 2) cultic specificity regarding description of location, task, or aspect of a deity (it places the deity. To innovate in this manner is not something to be taken lightly.

703 The one exception is a later reference to Hephaistos: Triphiodorus, Ἀλωσίς Πλίου, 232: Ἡφαιστος δ’ ἐκέλευεν ἑρίβρομος.

704 Weil (1893), 577; Moens (1930), 15. Both editors are confident in their readings and explain the difficulty away through swappable epithets. Chantraine is of the opinion that metrical considerations are responsible.
There is no mistaking the actual letter ‘O’ on the stone,\textsuperscript{705} and the clear reference to the Muses as daughters of the deity referred to here makes certain the restored reading of Zeus.

Both descriptive adjectives are compound in form. The prefix ἐρι- is superlative in force, equivalent to ἀρι-.\textsuperscript{706} In the same way that ἀριστος = “best” or “superlative,” so too do ‘sound’ words strengthened by ἐρι- go from loud, to very loud. Cf. ἐρίβομβος (loud-buzzing) bees in Orphic Fragment 154,189; ἐρίβρυχος (loud-bellowing) lions in Quintus of Smyrna, 3.171 and a trumpet in The Greek Anthology 6.159; particularly relevant—ἐρίγδουπος (loud-sounding, thundering) Zeus, in Homer, Iliad. 5.672 as well as ἐριβόας (loud-shouting) Bacchus in Pindar, Fragment 75.10. The base word of two constructions, Βρόμος, may refer generically to any loud noise. However, the epithet βρόμιος frequently stands for the god Dionysos.\textsuperscript{707} Chantraine notes that it is derived from the verb βρέμω, meaning to growl or rumble; clash of arms, sound of a crowd.\textsuperscript{708} This word combines freely with prefixes, including ἐπι-, περι-, συμ-, and ὑπο-. Βρόμος also happily compounds, with a dozen prefixes including ἀ- (Iliad 13.41) [cf. ἰάχω], βαρύ-, ἐγχει-, as well as ἐρί-. Combining with the suffix –τα we get βροντή, and it is in βροντήσιος that we find an epithet suitable for Zeus, yet one not utilized. Βρόμος also

\textsuperscript{705} The very rare form ἐριβρεμής as a substantive epithet for Zeus the Thundering One is cited by in the LSJ as appearing in Greek Anthology 6.344. However, the current reading of the TLG (and the Loeb) is the more standard ἐριβρεμέτης (Ἐρίβρεμέτη δαιδάλεν τρίποδα), and this exception to the rule for Zeus should be discarded.

\textsuperscript{706} Chantraine (1968), s.v. ἐρι-. The prefix is potentially found in Mycenaean texts. The LSJ notes that it is an inseparable particle, like ἀρι, used to strengthen the sense of the word.

\textsuperscript{707} Cf. Euripides, Cyclops 63 et al.; Ion 216 and elsewhere throughout the Euripidean corpus; Pindar, Dithyramb Fragment 75.10: τὸν Βρόμον, τὸν Ἐριβόαν; Aeschylus, Eumenides 24 notes that Bromios has dwelled in Delphi since the days of Pentheos.

\textsuperscript{708} Chantraine (1968), s.v. “βρέμω.”
forms -βρεμέτης cf. υψβρεμέτης as an epithet of Zeus in Homer; also βαρυβρεμέτης. Dionysos receives the epithet ἐρίβρομος frequently in Greek literature. The rational for the epithet is fairly straightforward—the mysteries of the god were thought to involve a great deal of noise (ἦχος). However, the god is not the only person or thing described as such—the adjective is applied to a variety of ‘loud-roaring’ things: lions, flame, a furnace, Mt. Etna (a volcano), the god Hephaistos (the only other deity to receive the epithet), the sea, a beach, a trumpet, clouds, and the ground.

710 Sophokles, Antigone 1116: Διὸς βαρυβρεμέτα. In 1120 Bacchos Is invoked. NB the proximity.
711 Cf. Διόνυσος ἐρίβρομος in the Homeric Hymn to Dionysos (7) 56; ibid. (26) 1; Orphic Hymn 30.1; ibid. 48.2; Panyasas fr. 13.2 (Kinkel) [cited in Athenaeos, Deipnosophistae 2.3.26; Anacreon fr. 20: πολλὰ δ’ ἐρίβρομον Διόνυσον.
712 The scholiast on In Dionysium Periegetam (scholia vetera) , 576, line of scholion 1 writes: Ἐρίβρομον διὰ τῶν ἐν τῶι μυστηρίωι αὐτῶι γινόμενον ἥχον.
713 Pindar, Olympian Odes 11.20: ἐρίβρομοι λέοντες.
714 Constantinus Manasses, Compendium chronicum 3639: φλόγας ἐρίβρομους.
715 Constantinus Manasses, Anat. 4.45: ἐρίβρομον καμίνων.
716 Greek Anthology 6.203.5: ἐρίβρομοι Αἰτνής.
717 Triphiodorus, Άλωσις Ἴλιου 232: Ἡφαιστὸς δ’ ἐκέλευεν ἐρίβρομος. There is a certain logic that the god of the forge and fire could be described this way. Cf. Homer, Iliad 18.368-616 he works with forge, anvil, hammer, and bellows to craft tripods and armor; Iliad 21.342-381 he scorches the plain with fire, boiling the river Xanthus.
718 Aelius Aristides, Eἰς τὸν Σάραπιν, Jebb page 47, line 24; Pindar, fr. 351.1: πόντον ἐρίβρομον.
719 Oppianus, Cynegetica 4.80: ἐρίβρομοι ἡδόμοις λέξ.
720 Gregory Nazianzenus, Carmina Dogmatica 400.5: σάλπιγγα ἐρίβρομον.
721 Pindar, Pythian Odes 6.11: ἐρίβρομοι νερφέλαις. One may assume that thunder is implied here.
722 Pindar, Pythian Odes 6.3: ὁμφαλὸν ἐρίβρομοι χθονὸς ἐς νάνον. Perhaps an earthquake is referred to?
The less common compound adjective ἐριβρεμέτης, occurs throughout Greek literature in association with Zeus, but also with Dionysos, as well as other ‘loud-roaring’ things: the playwright Aeschylos, lions, regions, and aulos signals in battle. Both forms would seem to be applicable to Zeus, even if Athenaios’ choice is unprecedented. It is fascinating how interchangeable the two adjectives are: Pindar uses both to refer to roaring lions, and apparently, places and things can be either—the idea being noise. Dionysos, a generically noisy god, is able to be described by both. On the other hand, Zeus, it seems, is only considered noisy in a specific sense, by his association with thunder and storms.

The semantic proximity of these terms was noticed and commented on by ancient authors. Eustathius explains that Bacchos is called both ἐριβρομός and ἐριβρεμέτης, either because of the loud shouts of those who are inebriated, or because of the βρόμος which too-sweet wine makes when bubbling and fermenting. In addition to being noisy himself, the god is associated noise made by other and other things. Hesychios’ *Lexicon* offers additional insight: ἐριβρεμέτης is defined as “μεγαλόψοφος, μεγαλόηχος,” and

---


724 Cf. *Dionysius Periegetem* 578: ἐριβρεμέτη Διονύσῳ; Orphic Hymn 29.8: ἐριβρεμέτηο πολυμόρφου Εὐβουλῆς; Orphic Hymn 49.3: ἐριβρεμέταο Τάκχου.

725 Aristophanes, *Frogs* 814: δεινὸν ἐριβρεμέτας χόλον ἔνδοθεν ἔξει. The chorus is describing Aeschylos.


728 *Greek Anthology* 6.195: αὐλὸν ἐριβρεμέταν.

729 Eustathius, *Commentarium in Dionysii periegetae orbis descriptionem* 566.6: Ἐρίβρομος δὲ καὶ ἐριβρεμέτης ἢ διὰ τὰς τῶν μεθυόντων κραυγὰς … ἢ διὰ τὸν βρόμον, ὥν ὁ γλευκάζων οἶνος ποιεῖ. πνευματούμενος καὶ ξέων. “But Loud-Roarer and Loud-Roarer, either on account of the shouts of the drunk … or on account of the noise which the fermenting wine makes.”
ἐρίβρομον is also defined as “μεγαλόηχον.” That is, they both refer to loud noise.

What this has to do with Zeus is made clear by the word coming between these two in the *Lexicon*: ἐριβρεμέτεω, which is defined by the lexicographer as “μεγάλα βροντόντος.” Zeus, when he is associated with thunder and lightning, is noisy.

To recap, while this epithet as a description of Zeus is understandable, that is, recognizable, it is certainly unexpected and non-traditional. Without precedent, if taken together with the description of Helikon as βαθύδενρος, it poetically resonates in an interesting way. Even as the poet speaks of the Muses and their father Zeus, the presence of the deep woods and a loud-roaring god tinges these lines with a hint of Dionysos. One additional resonance is possible, but would seem to be less easily activated by an audience. Strabo, describing the ancient Pythaïdes, explains that they were celebrated irregularly, dependent on the sighting of ritually observed lightning strikes in Attica. Zeus of lightning is Zeus of thunder, gatherer of clouds. Athenaios may be nodding to the ancient tradition here.

Διός... θύγατρες —Here the poet provides a seemingly straightforward description of the Muses. Hesiod sings that Mnemosyne bore Zeus nine daughters

---

732 Strabo, *Geography* 9.2.11. He notes that there was a proverb: ὁπόταν δ’ Ἀρματος ἀστράψῃ, when lightning flashes in Harma. They stood, so he says, near the altar of Zeus Astrapaeos (of lightning), between the temples of Pythian Apollo and Olympian Zeus, within the city walls. There is an interesting moment in Euripides, *Ion* 211-218 where the chorus sings of the art at Delphi— they describe Zeus holding his lightning-bolt (κεραυνόν ἀμφίπυρον ὄβριμον), and immediately after they describe Dionysos (Βρόμιος) holding his wand.
733 Moens (1930), 16.
However, with the exception of this one instance, every other description in Hesiod’s *Theogony* relating them to their father prefers the word κούραι. Cf. Μοῦσαι Ολυμπιάδες, κούραι Διός αἰγιόχοι; κούραι μεγάλου Διός ἄρτιέπειαι, Διὸς κούραι μεγάλοι, ἐννέα κούρας, τέκνα Διός. In Hesiod’s *Works and Days*, the poet names Zeus as their father, but avoids calling them either θύγατρες or κούραι. Poets use both terms commonly, but while the words may seem synonymous they are not. Throughout Greek literature there appears to be a preference for describing the Muses as κούραι, although θύγατρες is used with some frequency. As with Hesiod, the same author may make use of both. Cf. Theocritus, *Idyll* 16.1, Διὸς κούραις; 16.70, κουράων ἀπάνευθε Διὸς μέγα βουλεύοντος; but 16.101-2, Διὸς... θυγατέρες.

There appears to be a significant degree of diversity as to how they are described; elsewhere in the *Homeric Hymns*, a Muse is invoked as Διὸς θυγάτηρ μεγάλοι, Calliope is τέκος Διός, and collectively they are both τέκνα Διός as well as κούραι Κρονίδεω Διός. While θύγατρες is used to describe the Muses, it is the less common word choice. Proclus, in his Hymn to the Muses refers to them as the ἐννέα θυγατέρας

734 Hesiod, *Theogony* 76: ἐννέα θυγατέρες μεγάλου Διός.
735 Hesiod, *Theogony* 52, 966, 1022.
736 Hesiod, *Theogony* 29.
737 Hesiod, *Theogony* 81.
738 Hesiod, *Theogony* 60.
739 Hesiod, *Theogony* 104.
740 Hesiod, *Works and Days* 1-2. Here they are Πιερίηθεν.
742 *Homeric Hymn to Helios*, 31.1.
743 *Homeric Hymn to the Muses and Apollo*, 7.
744 *Homeric Hymn to Selene*, 32.1.
μεγάλου Διός ἀγλαοφώνους in direct imitation of Hesiod *Theogony* 76. Pausanias, in discussion of their origin, refers to them as θυγατέρας potentially of Pieros (according to some) or παῖδας of Zeus (according to others). Other uses are rarer and later. κοῦραι, on the other hand, is more common, and found widely throughout the corpus.

There is a semantic connotation which θυγατήρ possesses that is lacking in κοῦρα. They both may refer to young women, but the latter quite explicitly makes a statement about youth, and possibly beauty or eligibility. θυγατέρ, on the other hand, takes the focus from the woman and places it firmly upon the parent. For Athenaios to employ this choice is to lay the emphasis on Zeus in this line—to define the Muses in terms of their genealogy rather than geography or beauty. The epithets and descriptive adjectives here are not redundant, but rather additive, and the emphasis on Zeus as father makes it very easy for the poet to pivot to another offspring of this famous father—Apollo, who will be first referenced in this text as συνόμαιμον, brother by shared parent.

---

745 Proclus, *Hymn to the Muses* 3.2.

746 Pausanias, *Description of Greece*, 9.29.5.

747 Cf. *Contest of Homer and Hesiod* 152: ύψίστοι Διός μεγάλου θύγατρες; Antimachos, *Fragments* 1.1: ἔννέπετε, Κρονίδαο Διός μεγάλου θύγατρες (This would seem to be in imitation of Homeric introductions.); Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 5.8.3-4: Μοῦσαι, Μναμοσύνας θύγατρες, Διός ξενίου σέβας αὔξουσαι φιλίας τε γέρας βεβαίου; Claudius Aelianus, *De natura animalium* 12.6.26: τὰς Μοῦσας ταῖς Διός θυγατρίσι; Manetho Astrol., *Apothelesmatici* 6.753: Διός αἰγάχου τε θύγατρες; Scholast on Homer (vetera), *Iliad* 1.1d.5: ἐννέπετε Κρονίδαο Διός μεγάλου θύγατρες; etc.

748 Cf. Theognis, *Elegies* 1.15, Μοῦσαι και Χάριτες, κοῦραι Διός (he lumps them together with the Charites, much like the *Homerian Hymn to Apollo*, 189ff.); Homer, *Iliad* 2.598: Μοῦσαι αἰέδουν κοῦραι Διός αἰγάχου; *Iliad* 6.414: νῦμφαι ὑρεστιάδες κοῦραι Διός αἰγάχου (albeit, these are mountain nymphs, not properly the Muses); Hesiod, Fr. 1.2 (P. Oxy. 2354, ed. Lobel): Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπιάδες, κοῦραι Διός αἰγάχου (heavily restored); Anacreon, fragments 45.1: καλλίκομοι κοῦραι Διός θρήσκευτ' ἔλαφροις; Aelius Aristides, *Concerning Rhetoric* pg. 98.25: ὄντινα τιμήσουσι Διός κοῦρα μεγάλου; *Greek Anthology*, 9.572.7: Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπιάδες, κοῦραι Διός; etc.
**Εὐώλενος**—The descriptive adjective is a poetic word, rare enough to require glossing in the scholia, yet clear in meaning. The prefix εὖ- derives from ἑύς, a Homeric adjective. Over time the adverbial form εὖ was replaced by καλῶς as common usage. As a prefix in composites the form was, and remained, quite common. Cf. Homeric εὖζωνος, εὖξεστος. In meaning, it carries a sense of “abundance” (cf. εὐανδρία, εὐβοτος) and functions as the opposite of δυσ-(cf. εὐδαίμων rather than δυσδαίμων).750

ἐὐλένη refers to part of the arm, specifically from the elbow on down. The word is ancient, but rare in Ionic/Attic, where one finds πῆχυς instead, as well as ἄγκον.751 In poetry it is often compounded—λευκώλενος is incredibly common, and should be considered the ‘expected’ form of which εὐώλενος is an unexpected variation. Hera is λευκώλενος, as are other women and goddesses in Homer and other poets.752 As such it appears more as an epithet intended as praise rather than pure description. λευκώλενος is associated a few times with the Muses. Once it is applied to Kalliope, one of the Muses: Bacchylides, *Epinician Ode* 5.176-8 calls λευκώλενε Καλλιόπα, | στάσον εὐποίητον ἄρμα | αὐτοῦ. A fragment of Empedocles invokes the πολυμνήστη λευκώλενε παρθένε Μοῦσα to send the εὐήνιον ἄρμα.753 While it is unusual to focus on the beauty of the arms of the muses, it is not unheard of.

---

749 Fairbanks (1900), 122; Moens (1930), 16.
750 Chantraine (1968) s.v. ἑύς. He notes also that the prefix was common in Mycenaean naming.
751 Chantraine (1968) s.v. ἐὐλένη.
752 Cf. Homer, *Iliad* 1.55, et al. (Hera); *Iliad* 6.371, et al. (Andromache); Homer, *Odyssey* 6.101, et al. (Nausikaa), *Odyssey* 7.233, et al. (Arête), *Odyssey* 19.60 (Penelope’s maids), *Odyssey* 22.227 (Helen). Also, Cf. *Homeric Hymn to Dionysos* 7 (Hera) and *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 95, et al. (Hera). There are other instances in the Homeric Hymns, Hesiod, and Pindar as well, referring to goddesses. Hera features most predominantly.
753 Empedocles, fragment 3.8.
However, the pairing of the word εὐώλενοι with θύγατρες (as opposed to κούραι) is unprecedented, as is the association of this term with the Muses. The word itself is quite rare. To briefly catalogue its occurrences: Pindar grants the adjective to Kyrene, daughter of Kreusa and either King Hypseus or Peneios the river god—“τὰν εὐώλενον … παίδα Κυράναν,” with a later scholiast glossing εὐώλενον as λευκόπηχυν, A fragment of lyric poetry refers to, “Aisa and Klotho and Lechesis, the εὐώλενοι κούραι of Night;” Euripides refers to the lovely right arm of Hippolytus; Timotheus has a lyric fragment in which the Mountain Mother is supplicated by “εὐωλένους τε χείρας ἀμφιβάλλων;” a heavily restored fragment of Hesiod mentions the wedding of a κούρης εὐ[ω]λ[έν]υ̣; finally, Nonnus later describes Klymene as a “παρθένον ὀπλοτέρην εὐώλενον.”

It is quite comprehensible to describe young women or goddesses with the adjective, but its use in Athenaios’ hymn is singular. Descriptive adjectives paired with the Muses are not widely varied, and are more often geographic in sense, referring to Helikon or Olympus. Physical description is less common. Frequently their musical talent is quite comprehensible to describe young women or goddesses with the adjective, but its use in Athenaios’ hymn is singular. Descriptive adjectives paired with the Muses are not widely varied, and are more often geographic in sense, referring to Helikon or Olympus. Physical description is less common. Frequently their musical talent

---

754 Moens (1930), 16 discusses the word.
756 Scholia in Pindarum (scholia vetera) on Pythian 9, scholion 31.1: <ὁ δὲ τὰν εὐώλενον:> ὁ δὲ Ὑψεῦς τὴν λευκόπηχυν Κυρήνην ἀνέθρεψεν, and scholion 16b.2: ἡ λευκόπηχυς Αφροδίτη. This gloss is as rare as εὐώλενοι, occurring mostly in explanatory sources. Cf. Hesychios, Lexicon s.v. Λ.745.1: <λευκόλενος·> λευκόπηχυς and Apollonios, Lexicon Homericum Bekker page 170, line 30: <ὁλέναι·πήχεις· ἀφ’ οὗ καὶ “λευκόλενος “Ηρη” ἡ λευκόπηχυς. Both Hera and Aphrodite, renowned for their beauty, are described this way.
757 Lyrica Aedespota PMG, fr. 100b.1.1.
758 Euripides, Hippolytos 606: τῆς δέξας εὐώλενον.
759 Timotheus, fragment 15, col. 4.126.
761 Nonnus, Dionysiaka 38.113.
is emphasized—in Hesiod’s *Theogony* they are ἥδυεπεια (sweet-voiced),

in the Homeric Hymns they are at times λίγεια (clear-voiced),

ἡ δυεπεῖς (sweet-voiced),
or ἐλικώπιδες (bright-eyed).

The choice to emphasize physical appearance in this context is suggestive of participation in a chorus, an observable activity. Rather than invoking the Muses as a source of knowledge or skill, Athenaios’ hymn seems to request that they attend and participate in the song and dance. This is reinforced by the emphasis on geography, as the Muses are expected be physically present, leaving Helikon and coming to Delphi. One may compare this to the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* where many goddesses have joined with Apollo in dance and song. The Muses are said to sing with sweet-voice (ἴπι καλῆ ὑμνεῖσιν), and the dancing Charites are ἐυπλόκαμοι (rich-tressed) alongside the ἔφφρονες (cheerful) Horai. To be εὐόλενοι is to be beautiful, divinely beautiful.

However, it must be noted that εὐώλενοι θύγατρες does nothing to detract from the Dionysiac effect of the other epithets. The glossing of εὐώλενοι as λευκόπηχυν in later lexical works, along with an awareness that the former is nearly exclusively epic in usage, while the latter is the preferred Attic formula (at least insofar as –πηχυν goes) produces another interesting, potential resonance. In this case, it is worth quoting at length to see the piling up of associations:

---

762 Hesiod, *Theogony* 1021.
763 *Homeric Hymns* 14.1; 25.1; 22.1.
764 *Homeric Hymn* 32.2.
765 *Homeric Hymn* 33.1.
766 *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 189-194.
ὦ καλλίπυργον ἄστω Θηβαίας χθονός ναόντες, ἔλθει' ὃς ἵδητε τήν' ἄγραν
Κάδμου θυγατέρες θηρός ἣν ἠγεύσαμεν,
οὐκ ἀγκυλωτοίς Θεσσαλῶν στοχάσμασιν,
οὐ δικτύοισιν, ἀλλὰ λευκόπήξειν χείρον ἀκμαίσι.

O you dwellers in the well-fortified city, land of Thebes
Come! So you may see this wild-prey
Which we, the daughters of Kadmos hunted down,
Not with Thessalian throwing-javelins
Nor with nets, but white-armed,
With the fingers on our hands.768

It is too much to suggest that the poet sees the Muses as Bacchants, or wants to conflate their mythic narratives. It is also probably too much to read a subversive insertion of Dionysos into Apollo’s praise.769 However, the piling up of potential ‘roots’ is highly suggestive that some effect may have been intended, or at least possibly perceived. To be εὐώλενοι alone does not activate this resonance, but to be εὐώλενοι in close proximity to these other words, and potential ‘roots’ activates additional affordances—rather than seeing the Muses as sources of poetic authority, or ‘just’ chorus members, we have now the possibility of Bacchic revelry fused with the suggestive eroticism found in Euripides’ play, finding expression in the Muses performing in a highly visible manner (as was custom for young women in ancient Greece) wherein the audience was supposed to notice and appreciate their physical beauty. The cumulative effect, at least, is to perhaps strip away from the muses any sense of austerity that may have been associated with their status as a source of knowledge. What is being offered here, as a replacement, in pervue of their role as chorus in Athenaios’ hymn, is something

768 Euripides, Bacchae 1202-1207.
769 In spite of the fact that Limenios’ hymn (20-21) does explicitly describe the technitai who wrote and performed the hymn as belonging to Bacchus.
more. The poet is innovating, by writing a recognizable periphrasis which strains the expectations set by certain precedents but which relies on other precedent in order to be noticed.

μόλετε—The poet again employs an imperative. M.L. West (as noted earlier) has argued that complex/simplex pairs are a recognizable literary technique. If his proposed restoration for line 1 of προμόλετε is correct, there is no cause for concern over repetition. In fact, I would argue, the repetition is useful as it ‘reinitializes’ the lyrics, drawing the focus back to the matter at hand. Just in case the audience has gotten lost in the wilds of unexpected adjectives and unusual epithets, Athenaios refocuses on his theme—singing praise for Apollo. This line, in fact, forms a nice pivot between the geographical description of Helikon and the Muses and the geographical description of Delphi and its inhabitants. The center of focus here, of course, will be Apollo.

Furley and Bremer suggest that a command of this sort is standard for a kletic hymn, but a perusal of cultic texts suggests that kletic commands are less common. Moreover, that the use of μόλετε in reference to divinities is not common. Rather, this


771 It should be noted that there was a degree of conflation and slippage with regard to how these sort of descriptors were applied to divinities. As a comparanda to Athenaios’ text, cf. Plutarch, On the Obsolescence of Oracles, pg. 415D, claiming to quote from Hesiod regarding the life spans of various beings. He refers to nymphs: νόμφας ἐνπλόκαμοι, κοῦρας Δίος αἰγίδοιο.


773 West (1990), 96.

774 It is true that Limenios uses this term in his hymn, but it is all the way in line 45, in the final strophe/prayer. He does use ‘Io’, however, as the first word of line 1, but this is no difficulty. Other hymns do much the same. It is the use of μόλετε that is unusual.
kletic finds use as a summons for mortals, particularly in lyric passages. E.g. Euripides’ *Hecuba*, where the playwright has mortals summoned with this imperative, a *comparandum* made more interesting by the presence of the cry *ἰὼ*, which will appear in the final strophe of Athenaios’ hymn (line 27):

> ἰὼ Ἀχαιοί, ἰὼ Ατρείδαι·
> βοάν, ἄντω βοάν·
> ὥ ἵτε μόλετε πρός θεῶν.

Ah Achaeans! Ah sons of Atreos!
I’m shouting, shouting for help!
Oh, come come, by the gods!  

As seems to be often the case with this poem, Athenaios uses an unusual word in a less usual way. There is no difficulty understanding the meaning, but the novel way in which he employs words often unpacks new ways of thinking about a common, traditional, theme. In this case, he has borrowed a word that is heavily poetic, yet firmly situated in mortal contexts—this is not quite the same thing as adopting a word from prose, but the impact is potentially similar. The Muses are now approached in a manner previously common with mortals. These Muses who have been described in interesting ways that allows them to be easily paralleled with mortal groups: bacchantes, chorus of young women, and soon the famous women of Delphi. The reiteration of a kletic command of motion closes off the first portion of the strophe, and turns to Apollo. The motion away from Helikon will soon shift to become motion *towards* Delphi.

---

775 Euripides, *Hekuba* 1091-3. Also see *Orestes* 150-1: κάταγε κάταγε, πρόσθυ’ ἀτρέμας, ἀτρέμας ἵτω λόγον ἀποδος ἤφ’ ὅτι χρίσε χέριετε ποτε; Sophokles does much the same. cf. *Oedipus at Kolonos* 885: ἰὼ πάσ λεῶς, ἰὼ γὰς πρόμοι, μόλετε σὸν τάχει, μόλετ’. 

189
This is an unusual form, due most likely to the necessary placement of the accent. That is to say that the musical melody has taken priority here, forcing an awkward pronunciation upon the lyric. Editors have uniformly understood the word to be equivalent to συνομαίμον(α), but with the demands for agreement between accentuation and melodic motion, the accent has recessed. This explanation is more ‘exceptional’ than required. It is a compound form. The prefix συνό(μ)- is adjectival and is derived from the preposition ξυν-. Chantraine comments that there is a linguistic link with κοινός, and that it is preferred instead of κοινός by Homer, where it is used extensively in compounds. As such, the adjective carries the sense of “common” or “shared.” Here it has compounded with αἷμα, “blood.” The accentuation is less troubling if one assumes that the word is declined as a 2nd declension adjective rather than 3rd. While it is true that other extant occurrences are 3rd declension, this simple adjustment allows the accent to follow the rules—συνόμαιμος rather than συνομαίμων. One may see a comparable variation with εὖνις, -ίδος, ή (bedfellow) which combines with the same prefix to form συνόμευνος, ά, ή or ομευνίς -ίδος, ή in epigraphical inscriptions. Indeed, it would seem that similar 2nd declension variations of the word appear elsewhere in the Greek corpus: in the Orphic, Argonautica, the Greek Anthology,

---

776 Cruyssen (1894), 41; Fairbanks (1900), 122; Reinach (1909-13), 154; Powell (1925), 145; Moens (1930), 16.
777 Cf. Moens (1930), 16. The melody descends over μαι, in a syllable that would typically have an acute accent. The melody cannot descend against the rising voice pitch of the syllable. Therefore, the accent must be displaced.
778 Chantraine (1965), s.v. ξυν.
779 Cf. LSJ, s.v. εὖνις and συνόμευνος; IG 14.2117(Rome); 12(5).310(Paros); and Supp. Epigr. 6.796(Cappadocia, iii A.D).
780 Orphic, Argonautica 1191-3: Ὑν πέρι μύθον ἄπαντ' ἕκλυνε, Μουσαίες διάφορον, ὕς ποτε Φησεσφόνην τέρεν' ἄνθεα χερσὶ δρέπουσαν ἐξάπαρον συνόμαιμοι ἀν' εὐρύ τε καὶ μέγα ἁλσος.
The 3rd declension form, συνομαίμων, is far more common, but still somewhat rare. It occurs throughout the Greek corpus: Cf. Aeschylus, *Prometheus Bound* 410; Euripides, *Iphigeneia at Tauris* 848; Greek Anthology, 14.40.4; *Dedicatory Epigrams* 239.3; *Funeral Epigrams* 395.3; 637.28; 646.2, 9. In any case the term is quite clear in meaning, and provides a tight bond between the Muses and Apollo. It is an odd choice of word, in that it is not typical for celebratory occasions. The unusual nature of the choice is further emphasized by the (perhaps) awkward, but necessary, re-formation of the word in order to better fit the melody. One has to wonder why this particular epithet was so necessary as to encourage the poet to *force* it to fit. Just because one *can* find justification for a specific grammatical formation does not mean that one *should*. The employment of this word, in altered form (even if due to melody) must be considered ‘poetic,’ and therefore, potentially attention grabbing and loaded with latent resonance. In light of the emphasis on bloodlines and allotments so far seen, we may wish to read further into additional descriptors than we might else be in the habit of doing. For example, up to this point in the poem there has been no indication as for whom the poet sings. Of course, all in attendance know that this hymn is to honor Apollo, but from a purely textual basis, up to the point that this word is sung, it might as well be for the Muses *other* blood-kin—Dionysos.

Φοιοῖβον—It is with this title that the poet firmly sets his focus on Apollo. Apollo referred to as Phoebos is almost so common as to escape need for comment. Yet,
there are certain resonances to which a modern reader is largely deaf which are worth note, and the recent emphasis on ‘relatives’ raises some interesting possible resonances that may be activated. This epithet (or perhaps title?) is already widely used in Homer.\footnote{Cf. Homer, \textit{Iliad} 1.43. By this point in the poem the god has already been mentioned six times, as Λητοῦς καὶ Δίως υἱός (1.7), ἐκηβόλου Ἀπόλλωνος (1.14), ἐκηβόλον Ἀπόλλωνα (1.21), Ἀπόλλωνι ἄνακτι, τὸν ἥκοιμος τέκε Λητώ (1.36), ἀργυρότοξ’ (1.37), and Σμινθῆ (1.39). It is in the moment in which he hears the priest’s prayers and strides into action that he is described as Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων (1.43). It is somewhat unsettling that the coming of the ‘brilliant’ or ‘shining’ one is νυκτὶ ἕοικός (1.47). He is referred to as Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων again in 1.64, as well as 1.72.}

The first appearance in extant literature (Homer) finds itself in close proximity to the word λευκώλενος, as white-armed Hera intercedes with Phoebus on behalf of the Greeks, as plague rages through the camp.\footnote{Homer, \textit{Iliad} 1.55.} Φοῖβος or Ἀπόλλων appear to be used interchangeably, the epithet serving nearly as a second proper name for the god. In the \textit{Homeric Hymn to Apollo}, the god is first named as “Apollo” but at the end of the prooimia, the poet begins his direct address to the god, calling upon him as “Phoebus.”\footnote{Cf. \textit{Homeric Hymn to Apollo} 1, 20.}

\textit{Homeric Hymn} 21, entitled “To Apollo” begins with the direct address: Φοῖβε. “Apollo” appears nowhere in this short hymn. The two words often appear together, and it is interesting that they have a very strong tendency to occur in fixed sequence; the expected order is Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων.\footnote{Chantraine (1968) notes that φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων occurs 28 times in Homer, while Ἀπόλλων φοῖβος occurs only 4 times. φοῖβος appears alone 9 times.}

There is a clear association of his name with a goddess named Φοῖβη. Hesiod’s \textit{Theogony} names her as χρυσοστέφανη (golden-crowned), daughter of Gaia and Ouranos,
of the same brood as Rhea, Themis, and Mnemosyne (mother of the Muses).\footnote{Hesiod, \textit{Theogony} 136. Hesiod also says that she lay with her brother Koeos and gave birth to Leto (mother of Apollo and Artemis), Asteria (wife of Perseus), and Hekate, \textit{Theogony} 404-411. All associated in one way or another with ‘light’.
} Φοῖβος is named χρυσεοκόμα in Athenaios’ hymn, activating a potential resonance here. In his 1941 article, Robertson addresses her appearance in Aeschylus’ \textit{Eumenides}.\footnote{Robertson (1941), 70.} He reads the opening lines as having been carefully and intentionally crafted. He argues re the \textit{ἐν δὲ τῷ τρίτῳ} of line 4 that Aeschylus is striving to portray a paradigm in parallel with the succession myths of Hesiod’s \textit{Theogony} (cf. 885, 389ff); with each change in cosmic kingship the oracle changes hands: Ouranos-Gaia, Kronos-Themis (sister), Zeus-(Olympian?). However, since Apollo had not yet been born at the time of Zeus’ triumph, an intermediary is required. Phoebe was a Titan who did not fight, the sister of Themis and mother of Leto, with both an etymologically close and useful name (Phoebe-Phoebus) and no distractingly strong personal narrative. Immediately upon his birth, she gives the oracle over to Apollo as a ‘birthday’ present. While this demonstrates a careful attempt to harmonize myth by the author, the rest of the play calls into question the seriousness with which this narrative is presented—Apollo is repeatedly presented as a problematic character, the sort who might be involved in, and condone, violent aggression against relatives. It also begs the question: is there any evidence that a similar, non-violent succession myth existed prior to this modification, or is it entirely a \textit{nova res}, one unsettling to the audience? At the least, should not a reader take note that a modification has occurred nearly as soon as the play begins, almost as a hyper-visible warning that ‘change’ is to be expected? It is a stretch to assume that Aeschylus presents
us with anything that ought to be considered canonical. There is some variety available for this narrative. (E.g. The peaceful transition narrated later in Aristonoos’ *paean*, wherein Apollo possesses the oracle, Athena having *persuaded* (*πείσας*) flower-nourishing Gaia and well-braided Themis 21-24.)  

Phoebe is conspicuously absent from this telling. One *may* tell of peaceful transitions which do not involve a *drakōn*, but even these accounts fail to suggest any fixed, canonical, understanding.

In a 1985 article, M.L. West argued for the presence of an earlier cult at Delphi to a female goddess, before the arrival of Apollo. West, rather than viewing Aeschylus as making an arbitrary insertion, argues that he got the name Phoebe from some Delphic tradition, but a weak one. That is, a goddess before Apollo that had it as a similar *title*, rather than name, which allowed for an easy genetic link to be posited at a later date, as in Aeschylus. West is of the opinion that the older, original goddess of prophecy at Delphi was an earth goddess with the title of Phoebe, a title that Apollo would late acquire.

Conjecture aside, the title is quite interesting. Φοιβὸς, -η, -ον as an adjective is used to describe things that are “pure” or “luminous.” The adjective could be glossed as καθαρός and ἀμίαντος. An interesting argument is found in Apollonios Sophist, *Lexicon Homericum* 164.10-15 wherein the author notes that Aeschylus, in his *Eumenides*, claims that Apollo inherited his title from his aunt. He, however, rejects this

---

788 It is worth noting that divine identities could be fluid and there was no fixed canonical catalogue of names and individuals. Case in point: Aeschylus *Prometheus Bound*, 209-211 where Prometheus exclaims that his mother is known by many names, including ‘Gaia’ and ‘Themis’ and explicitly grants her the power of prophecy. ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴν οὐχ ἄπαξ μόνον Θέμις | καὶ Γαία, πολλὸν ὄνομάτων μορφὴ μία, | τὸ μέλλον ἢ κρανοῦτο προκεκληθεῖ.


790 Cf. of water in Hesiod, fragment 363.

791 Cf. of the sun Aeschylus, *Prometheus Bound* 22.
explanation, as Homer did not make use of maternal epithets. Instead, he considers that it might be derived from the verbs φοιβάσθαι, considered a synonym to μαντεύεσθαι. Finally, he more simply prefers to name Apollo ὁ καθαρὸς καὶ ἁμίαντος. It is hard to guess what may be meant by calling Apollo a ‘pure’ god, as the gods are not known, typically, for troubles with miasma. Apollo does, however, have standing as a god of purification—he is often the god supplicated to remove disease, or to provide answers as to why it arose and what must be done to remove it. As a purifying god, his oracle often serves to prescribe the cure. It is interesting that there is a tradition regarding Apollo, that he once required purification himself, after slaying the drakōn at Delphi.

The close link between this epithet of Apollo and prophecy is also interesting. In the LSJ, one quickly notes the variations on the word which link the oracle to the god: Cf. φοιβησις, -εως, ἡ, “inspiration;” Φοιβητεύω, “to be a prophet;” Φοιβητής, -οῦ, ὁ, “prophet;” but also φοιβάω, “to cleanse, purify.” Perhaps this is not surprising as the Delphic oracle, under the god’s pervue, was one of the most important sources of divine guidance in matters of purification in ancient Greece.

Regardless of the ultimate origins of the term, or concern as to whether the god or his oracle has prior claim to the word, at the time of Athenaios, to refer to the god as Φοίβος is to (at least unconsciously) embrace his vatic aspects. This will soon be

793 Cf. Plutarch, Greek Questions 12.
794 Chantraine also provides a list of associated compound words including φοιβόληπτος, “to be possessed or inspired by Phoebos” as well as Φοιβηλάλος, “giver of the oracles of Phoebus.” This apparently was one title of the Pythia. Chantraine provides a large set of related terms.
reinforced by the description of Delphi itself, at the end of the strophe, as a mantic site. Also, the emphasis on blood-relations, and the choice of Phoebus as first referent, allows for a very remote possibility for rootedness with Phoebe here. Athenaios clearly follows the more dominant tradition, having Apollo acquire the oracle by slaying the *drakōn*, but there is potential connectedness in the mind of a listener between Φοίβη χρυσοστέφανη and Φοίβος χρυσεοκόμης, and there is the possibility that some would have been aware of Aeschylus’ version. Very little is known of this Greek goddess, and her title/name appears to have been absorbed by Apollo’s sister Artemis; Virgil refers to Diana as *aurea Phoebe*. If this rootedness were activated, it would produce yet another resonance in apparent tension with the poem, as a remembrance of Phoebe is a remembrance of the language θελούσης, οὐδὲ πρὸς βίαν τινός, in direct confrontation with the battle narratives of the latter portions of the hymn.

*ίνα ... ὑιδαεῖσι μέλψητε*—This purpose clause reaches back to the kletic imperatives earlier in the text: “Come Forth!” and “Come!” The Muses are summoned to Delphi, not to inspire the poet or to authorize his speech, but to participate in the performance. The activity to which they are summoned is quite clear—they are to come and act as a chorus. The vocabulary used is fairly generic and needs only limited comment. ὑιδαεῖσι, a plural form of ὕδη is straightforward. An *ode* is quite generically

---

796 It is worth noting that the Muses, too, can be golden. Hesiod, *Theogony* 916: Μοῦσαι χρυσάμπυκες.
797 Virgil, *Georgics* 1.434.
798 Moens (1930), 16-17.
799 LSJ s.v. ὕδη. This is a contract form of ἄοιδη. While the noun form refers to a song sung with voice, it is interesting to note that the verb form, ἄζιο, is used widely to refer to the sounding of instruments, and even birds.
a song that is sung. It may describe songs suitable for a variety of settings: dirge, hymn, song of praise, etc. It is worth noting that it occurs in the plural here, suggesting an activity that occurs over a lengthy period of time. While we may often be in the habit of studying hymns in isolation, it seems quite likely that audience experienced performances consisting of multiple musical pieces.

μέλπω is also a simple word, occurring quite commonly, but it is rather imprecise with respect to which activity exactly it refers. The LSJ explains that it means to sing, primarily, but in the middle voice it can also mean “to celebrate with song and dance.”

This middle meaning is actually the more common connotation throughout the Greek corpus, even when used in the active. It may generically mean to sing, most notably with a kithara accompanying. It is a suitable term to describe musical celebratory activities. The noun form, μολπή quite clearly refers not to song, but dance. In Euripides, we see: νέων τ’ άοιδαι χορόν τε μολπαί, the songs and dances of youth choruses. It is important to note, however, that it is not dance alone—singing is required.

The song may be sung as a solo, but this is not incompatible with a chorus. In

800 LSJ, s.v. μέλπω.
801 Cf. Homer, Odyssey 4.17: ἐμέλπετο θείος άοιδός φορμίζον, at a party in Sparta, a bard sings with a lyre, and two tumbrels are dancing (μολπής ἔξαρχοντος); Iliad 18.603: πολλός δ’ ἁμέροντα χορόν περιύσταθ’ ὄμυλος τερπόμενοι διόσ ἀδικιστήριε κα’ αὐτοῦς μολπής ἔξαρχοντες ἐδίνευον κατ’ ἅμεσος; Homeric Hymn to Hermes 476: μέλπεο καὶ κιθάριζε καὶ ἀγλαίας ἀλέγουν, “sing, play, and have a care for beautiful things.”
802 Euripides, Trojan Women 547: παρθένοι δ’ ἁμέρον ἄνα γράφων ποδόν βοίν τ’ ἐμέλπον εὔφρον; Maidens sang a happy song while they danced in celebration on the night the Trojan Horse was brought inside the walls of Troy.
803 Euripides, Heraklidai 780.
804 Cf. Euripides, Elektra 718: λεοντός δ’ φθόγγον κελάδες κάλλιστος, Μουσάς θεράπων, μολπαί δ’ ήδέοντ’ ἑραται, The pipe, servant of the Muses, played, and then other songs grew/swelled; Euripides, Herakles 349: άλλον μὲν ἐπ’ εὔφρον στρέφει μολπάς Φοῖβος ιαχεῖ τάν καλλίθρογγον κιθάραν ἔλαυνον πλήκτροι χρυσέωι, after a song of good-fortune, Phoebos then sings a dirge with his kithara; Homeric Hymn to Pan 24: ἔχε
the *Iliad* we read that one of Achilles’ Myrmidon, named Eudorus, was the son of Polymele (Πολυμήλη). His mother is described as beautiful in the chorus/dance (χορῷ καλῆ), and we are told that Eudorus’ father fell in love when he saw her (ὄφθαλμοῖςιν ἰδὼν) among the singers/dancers in the chorus (μετὰ μελπομένησιν ἐν χορῷ). This draws sharp attention to the fact that part of the *raison de être* for young women to participate in a chorus was that they be seen, their beauty be appreciated, and potential male husbands take notice. While the verb may be translated as “to sing,” perhaps a better definition might be, “to participate in the *chorus*.”

Highlighting this distinction allows one to see that the presence of dative ὀιδαεῖστι is not a redundancy here, but a focusing (or perhaps addition) of reference and description. The *theoria* likely had a lengthy repertoire on the agenda for its time at Delphi, and so the Muses are summoned to participate in that sort of moment, of festival celebrated with a rich diversity of performance. Pindar offers a nice *comparandum*:


Songs summon throughout sweet-smelling Delos, And often about the lofty Parnassian rocks the bright-diademed maidens of Delphi stand in swift-footed chorus

---

806 Pindar, *Paean* fragment 52b, 96-102.

---

Pausanias comments that in Athens there was a house of Pulytion, in which Dionysos was worshiped as Dionysos _Melpomenus_, which epithet Pausanias associates with Apollo Leader of the Muses.\(^{807}\) It is worth remembering that for the Athenians, Dionysos is a patron of the arts, particularly of the theater, and at the time of Athenaios, the most famous guild of musicians and poets was the _technitai_ of Dionysos (to which he appears to have belonged, and which group is likely to have performed this hymn). Due to the nature of the vocabulary in the previous lines, it is possible that this verb could resonate as an epithet of Dionysos, continuing the rather unusual transposing of imagery. These Muses are behaving like Muses, and at the same time very much like a chorus for Dionysos.\(^{808}\)

\(\chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\sigma\omicron\kappa\omicron\omicron\acute{\i}\nu\acute{\i}\nu\)\(^{809}\)—The form \(\chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\sigma\kappa\omicron\omicron\acute{\i}\nu\) is exceptionally rare, but the more common spelling \(\chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\kappa\omicron\omicron\acute{\i}\nu\zeta\) is quite well attested.\(^{810}\) The epithet is by no means exclusive to Apollo, but it is quite common. \(\chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\kappa\omicron\omicron\acute{\i}\nu\zeta\) occurs with Phoebus, Apollo,

---

807 Pausanias, _Description of Greece_ 1.2.5: Διόνυσον δὲ τοῦτον καλούσι Μελπόμενον ἐπὶ λαγῳ τοιῷδε ἔρ ὁ ποίῳ περ Ἀπόλλωνα Μουσηγήτην. There is, it seems similar form, Μολπαστάς, which functions as a very rare epithet of Apollo, Cf. _Greek Anthology_ 6.155.1-2: ἄς ἀπὸ Φοίβῳ πέξατο μολπαστή κόρος ὁ τετραετής. Hesychios, _Lexicon_ M 1581 provides a definition: μολπαστῆς>· συμπαίκτης, “playmate.”

808 The Muses often function as a chorus. The _Homeric Hymn to Apollo_ has already been mentioned, but cf. also in the _Hymn to Hermes_ 450-1: Τῆς Χοροί τε μέλουσι καὶ ἀγαλῶς οἶμος άοιδῆς, καὶ μολπῇ τεθαλύη καὶ ιμερώες βρόμος αὐλῶν. Hesiod, _Theogony_ 77 records that one of the Muses is actually named Μελπομένη—dance and the chorus are integral to their ‘identity.’

809 Crusius (1894), 41; Fairbanks (1900), 122; Moens (1930), 17; Furley and Bremer (2001), 87.

810 Crusius argued that this was a form created specifically to be suitable for cretic rhythm, but Moens did not agree on the necessity of this. A number of compounds based upon the χρυσεο- spelling are attested (e.g. Euripides, _Iphigenia at Aulis:_ χρυσεοσάνδαλον; Timotheus, Fragments 15.5.202: χρυσεοκίθαριν; etc.) and while these spelling may be less common, they appear to have been available by convention to poets as needed. It is unsurprising, as the adjective form χρυσαίος, -η, -ον (epic) would seem to offer an easy source for derivation. Cf. Chantraine (1965) s.v. χρυσός.
and as a stand-alone substantive in reference to the god.\textsuperscript{811} Other deities are described as such: e.g. Eros,\textsuperscript{812} Hymenaeos,\textsuperscript{813} Dionysos,\textsuperscript{814} Iris,\textsuperscript{815} Hekate,\textsuperscript{816} the Phoenix (immortal being),\textsuperscript{817} etc. To be golden is a standard mark of the divine, as other compound descriptors illustrate (especially in tragedy): Cf. χρυσοσσάνδαλος (golden-sandaled) Muses,\textsuperscript{818} χρυσοστέφανος (golden-crowned) Persephone et al.,\textsuperscript{819} χρυσοβόστρυχος (golden-tressed) Artemis,\textsuperscript{820} χρυσόθρονος (golden-throned) Muse.\textsuperscript{821}

\textsuperscript{811} Cf. Euripides, Trojan Women, 253-4: ἢ τάν τοῦ Φοῖβου παρθένον, ἀς γέρας ὁ χρυσοκόμας ἐδωκ’ ἀλέκτρον ζώαν; Euripides, Suppliant, 974-6: Κρυσοκόμοις Ἀπόλλων does not welcome songs of mourning; Bacchylides, Ἔµινε, Ode 4.2: χρυσοκόμοις Ἀπόλλων… Πιο[θ]όνικος (especially relevant as a comparanda due to the drakōn reference); Orphica, Ἑµνησία 34.9: Λοξία, ἀγνε, Δῆλη ἁναζ, πανδερκες εἶχον φαεσίμβροτον ὀμία, χρυσοκόμαι: Aristophanes, Birds 216: ὁ χρυσοκόμος Φοῖβος; Pindar, Olympian Odes 6.41: ὁ χρυσοκόμος; Pindar, Olympian Odes 7.32: ὁ χρυσοκόμος; Pindar, Paean frs. 52e.41: Ἀπόλλων … ὁ χρυσοκόμας; Diodoros Siculus, Bibliotheca Historica 7.12.6.4: ἀργυρότος ἁναζ ἐκάργυρος Ἀπόλλων χρυσοκόμαι (this has nice poetic balance to the line, with the color-descriptors balancing the series of epithets in apposition).

\textsuperscript{812} Anacreon, fragments 13.2: χρυσοκόμας Ὅρως; Euripides, Iphigenia at Aulis 548: ὁ χρυσοκόμας Ὅρως.

\textsuperscript{813} Greek Anthology 16.177.2-3: σο παῖναν φύλον ήν καὶ ὁ χρυσοκόμης ῥεμαίας καὶ λυγρῶν αὐλῶν ἀκομαίς λέγετε. The piling up of resonance is observable here, even though Apollo is not mentioned and Aphrodite is the topic. These words seem to cluster when the gods are praised.

\textsuperscript{814} Hesiod, Theogony 947: χρυσοκόμης ὑπὲρ Πάριν κόμην εἶχεν ἐπορφότον. However, while χρυσοκόμης seems common as a divine epithet, mortals are instead generally ἐπορφότοι. However, as Eustathius notes, ἐπορφότοι may describe immortals as well. Cf. Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem Vol. 2, pg. 134.18: Χρυσοκόμης ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς νεῖσεν τὴν Δήμητραν.

\textsuperscript{815} Alceos, Lyric fragment 327.3: εὐπόλλος Ἰρις χρυσοκόμαι Ζηρύριον μίγεισα.

\textsuperscript{816} Lyrica Aedespota fragment 32b.1.1: χρυσοκόμα Ἔκατε παῖ Δίως.

\textsuperscript{817} Herodotos, Histories 2.73: τὰ μὲν αὐτοῦ χρυσοκόμα τῶν πτερῶν τὰ δὲ ἐρωθρα ἐς τὰ μάλιστα. As is fitting for an immortal bird, but one that shares in the mortal experience of death, even if only temporary, the bird is partially golden-plumed.

\textsuperscript{818} Euripides, Iphigenia at Aulis 1040-44: ὅτ’ ἀνὰ Πήλιον αἰ ταλπλόκαμοιΠερίδης μετὰ δαίτα θεῶν χρυσοσσάνδαλον ἔχον γὰρ κρούονοι Πηλέως ἐς γάμουν ἠλθον. The golden-sandaled Muses dance at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis. This word is a hapex, but illustrates a convention.

\textsuperscript{819} Euripides, Ion 1085-6: τὰν χρυσοστέφανον κόραν καὶ ματέρα σεμνάν. Persephone is a golden-crowned maiden. Cf. Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite 1-2: Λίδην χρυσοστέφανον καλήν Ἀρεσσήτθην ἅσσομαι; Hesiod. Theogony 17: Ἡββὴν τε χρυσοστέφανον; Ibid. 136: Φοῖβην τε χρυσοστέφανον; Plutarch, Quaestiones Convivales 747E.11: Ἡββὴν τε χρυσοστέφανον καλῆν τὴν Δίωνήν’.

etc. Apollo is particularly golden—he is not just a god of golden hair, but of the golden bow;\textsuperscript{822} Kallimachos’ \textit{Hymn to Apollo} describes his cloak, clasp, lyre, bow, quiver, and sandals as all being of gold (32-35),\textsuperscript{823} and his \textit{Hymn to Delos} describes the entire island of Delos turning golden at his birth (260-4).\textsuperscript{824} This is particularly noteworthy as Delos (the entire island) was considered sacred, a \textit{temenos} of Apollo. The bright, shining, untarnishing nature of gold suits Apollo, the bright-one, eternally young, as well as the rest of the incorruptible, undying divinities.\textsuperscript{825} To describe Apollo as \textit{χρυσεοκόμαν} is not merely to describe his physical attributes in terms of color (Greek color descriptors have more to do with quality that spectrum) but to evoke his divinity. It is a divine epithet. Additionally, it fills out the triplet in parallel with the Muses: relationship, cult-title, descriptive epithet. Compare Apollo (brother, Phoebus, golden-haired) to the Muses (daughters, holders of Helikon, fair-armed).\textsuperscript{826}

\textit{ἀνὰ δικόρυνβα Παρνασσίδος ταύσοδε πετέρας ἐδραν} \textsuperscript{827}—Δικόρυνβα is an unusual, but clear word. It is a compound formed from the very common \textit{κόρυμβος}, meaning a “projection,” or “protrusion.” This would seem to be the first occurrence of the

\textsuperscript{821} \textit{Lyrica Adespota} fragment 32b.1: ὥ χρυσόθρονε Μοῦσ'.

\textsuperscript{822} Isyllos, \textit{Fragment} (IG4.950) line 51: ὁ χρυσότοξος Φοῖβος.

\textsuperscript{823} Kallimachos, \textit{Hymn to Apollo} 32-5: χρύσεα τῶπόλλων τὸ τ’ ἐνδυτὸν ἢ τ’ ἐπιπορτίς ἢ τε λάρη τὸ τ’ ἄεμα τὸ Λύκτιον ἢ τε φαρέτρῃ, χρύσεα καὶ τὰ πέδυλα: πολύχρυσος γάρ Απόλλων καὶ πουλικτέανος.

\textsuperscript{824} Kallimachos, \textit{Hymn to Delos} 260-4: χρύσεα τοι τότε πάντα θεμεῖλα γείνετο, Δήλε, χρυσὸ δ' τροχέεσσα πανήμερος ἐρρει λίμνη, χρύσειον δ' ἐκόμψιε γενέθλιοι ἔρνος ἐλαιῆς, χρυσὸ δὲ πλήμορε βαθὸς Ινεπὸς ἐλιχθεῖς, αὐτὴ δὲ χρυσόσεοι ἀπ' ὀουδέως εἴλεω παύδα. Four of these lines begin with ‘gold’.

\textsuperscript{825} Cf. Williams (1978), 39, s.v. χρύσεα.

\textsuperscript{826} Admittedly, Zeus does not fulfill this triplet structure, but he is actually \textit{named} unlike the others and it is through the pivot of him as father that the Muses and Apollo balance upon.

\textsuperscript{827} Weil (1893), 577; Crusius (1894), 41-2; Fairbanks (1900), 122; Moens (1930), 18-19; Furley and Bremer (2001), 87.
word, which occurs only twice more before the medieval period. The bare, uncompounded, word is a frequent descriptor of mountains. While unusual, the word simply indicates that Parnassos has two peaks. We see a similar word, δικόρυμβος, also in reference to Parnassos, in line 2 of Limenios’ hymn.

ταῶδε occurs here, and then reoccurs again in line 19, with πάγον (appearing also in line 8 at the end of Strophe 1). It locates and contextualizes the perspective of singer and audience. While the Muses may travel from Helikon and Apollo journeys as well, the actual performance and theoria are present at Delphi already. The hymn may narrate travel and ascent, but the perspective or gaze of the audience and singers is already fixed (in reality) at the temple in Delphi, on the slopes of Mount Parnassos.

“These rocks” is roughly equivalent to saying “here.” Delphi is, of course, rocky. An epigraphical hymn to Apollo from Tenos presents a list of Apollo’s favored places, which includes Δελφῶν ἔχων ἀμφὶνα ὀμῷν κόρυμβα μετέρχομαι, ψυφανὴ δὲ σύρεα ναιεταὶ μετὰ δενδρῶν; et var.

Cf. West (1992b) Greek Music, 289. He says there is no accident to the high rise of melody with two peaks coinciding with twin-peaked Parnassus. The melody helps to describe the image as well.

Even though Homer and the Homeric Hymns avoid using the name “Delphi,” there is no difficulty in referencing the location by means of Parnassos. Cf. Homer Hymn to Apollo 282: ὑπὸ Παρνησίων νιφάντα.

Kaibel (1878) no. 1025, line 4.

828 Cf. Lukian, Charon 5.25: δικόρυμβος ὁ Παρνασσὸς; Philostratos, Life of Apollonios: δικόρυμβος δὲ ἡ κορυφή.


830 Synesius, Hymn 9.66: τρικόρυμβον; Nicetas Choniates, History: Reign of John 2.40.6: ὁρὴ δικόρυμβα; Reign Mani1, pt2, 78.6: ψυφανομός; Reign Alex2.257.2: ἐπικόρυμβας.

831 Cf. West (1992b) Greek Music, 289. He says there is no accident to the high rise of melody with two peaks coinciding with twin-peaked Parnassus. The melody helps to describe the image as well.

832 Even though Homer and the Homeric Hymns avoid using the name “Delphi,” there is no difficulty in referencing the location by means of Parnassos. Cf. Homer Hymn to Apollo 282: ὑπὸ Παρνησίων νιφάντα.
names the site by an alternative name, that of Krisa. Homer describes it as “rocky.”

Again, in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo the location of Apollo’s temple is near a rocky cliff (πέτρη). Euripides, Ion refers to the πέτρας δισσάς (the double rocks) of the mountain.

The phrase begins with the descriptive adjective “double-peaked,” which only receives its associated noun at the end—ἐδρανά. This is a poetic word that one finds in the tragedians and later poets, meaning something like “headquarters,” or “residence.” In the same way that the Muses possess Helikon as their sanctuary, so does Apollo have his own mountain. Of course, there is contrast drawn at the same time. While both sanctuaries center on liminal spaces, mountains, for the sake of poetic variety we see the deep woods of Helikon contrasted against the rugged peaks of Parnassos. Both, however, present on the one hand the more obvious association with Muses and Apollo, but they also latently carry potential Bacchic resonances. The matter of the Muses has already been described, but now we are introduced to a second group of women, at Delphi, in the context of mountaintops.

ἁμ᾽ ᾧγακλυταιεῖς Δελφίσιν — This phrase has caused difficulties for some earlier editors. The adjective is not the difficulty, as there is strong precedent. Prior usage

---

834 Homer, Iliad 2.519-20.
835 Homeric Hymn to Apollo 284.
836 Euripides, Ion 1126-7; cf. also Sophokles, Antigone 1126: διλόφου πέτρας; Euripides, Bacchai 307: δικόρυφον.
837 Weil (1893), 577; Crusius (1894), 42; Fairbanks (1900), 122; Moens (1930), 19-22; Furley and Bremer (2001) vol. 2, 87.
is typically with respect to male heroes and their homes, although both Hephaistos and Hygeia receive this attribute as well. Hesychios defines the term as: ἄγαν ἔνδοξα ἢ ἄγαν διαβεβοημένα. That is, this adjective implies that others hold the associated person or object in high regard. It is semantically linked to the idea of kleos, the fame which heroes achieve by doing great deeds. The prefix ἄγα- is a positive intensifier, attached to a term that will reappear in line 9 in reference to Attica and the Athenian people, and again in line 18 in reference to Apollo. As such, it aids in collectively ‘gathering’ all of the famed ones—we have Muses, Delphian women, the whole of Attica, and the god himself, all gathering in one place together for this festival.

The difficulty for editors has lain with knowing how to understand Δεελφίσιιν, as they have wanted to read it as referring to a specific group of women present and participating in the singing of the paean. Crusius thought it was a college of the priestesses, water-carrying maidens, who participated/aided in the sacrifices and oracles of Apollo’s cult. Moens, committed to the idea that the lyric literally described activity, found it difficult to imagine such a college of priests concerned with sacrifice out singing on the mountaintops. Rather, she imagines a local chorus of women, comparable to the more familiar Deliades. This perspective has been well received, and there is literary evidence to support this idea. It is easily forgotten that Delphi is a polis, with residents of


839 Cf. Hesiod, Theogony 945: ἀγλαῖν Ὀφειστος, ἄγακλοτὸς ἄμφιγυήεις, Hephaiostos, the glorious lame-one; Erythraeos, Paeon for Aesculapios 14: σὸν ἄγακλοτόν ἐδαγγεὶ Ὑγείαι, glorious Hygeia.

840 Hesychios, Lexicon A s.v. ἄγακλοτα.

841 It is certain that Athenian women, at least, participated in the theoria as we have lists among the Pythaiides inscriptions detailing the names of canephores. Cf. FD III, 2 nos. 29, 30, and 26.
Moreover, we find explicit mention of women in groups engaging in ritual behaviors at Delphi. Euripides, *Phoenician Women* (234-8) refers to Phoenician women wishing to join the chorus of the deathless god (ἀθανάτας θεοῦ χορὸς) at Delphi. Pausanias tells of *Thyiades* who rove madly upon the peaks, for Dionysos and for Apollo.

The fact that the gods themselves seem, at times to have been conflated produces interesting latent resonances. A fragment of Aeschylus offers a tantalizing proximity: ὁ κισσεύς Ἀπόλλων, ὁ Βάκχεύς, ὁ μάντις. Sophokles’ *Antigone* has Bacchos among the Muses. Nonnus has Apollo sharing Delphi with his “brother” Dionysos. An intriguing quotation by Macrobius claims that Euripides, in his play *Licymnios*, conflated them explicitly, writing: δέσποτα φιλόδαφνε, Βάκχε, παιάν Ἀπόλλων εὔλυπε. Additionally, another fragment by Euripides describes Dionysos on Parnassos, leaping among choruses of young Delphian maidens: ἐν πεύκαισι Παρνασσὸν κάτα πηδᾷ χορεύων παρθένοις σὺν Δελφίσιν.

---

842 The *Homerian Hymn to Apollo* seems confused as to the population at the first arrival of the god, but the drakōn is an evil to those who dwell there. When the god brings his captured Cretans back to be priests, we find mention that mentions local wives and daughters who cry out (in fear) when the god enters his shrine and causes flame to flare forth with radiance that filled all of Krisa (lines 440-6). Some have wondered if this suggests some sort of ritual ‘cry’ traditional among the locals.

843 They speak with the mountains of Thebes in sight, making mention of it as the land of Bacchos.

844 Pausanias, *Description of Greece*: 10.32.7: οἱ θυίαις ἐπὶ τούτοις ὁ Διονύσω καὶ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι μαίνονται.

845 Aeschylus, fragment 341 (Nauck).


849 Cf. Euripides, fr. 752 (Nauck) Διόνυσος, ὃς θύρσοι καὶ νεβρὸν δορὰς καθαπτός ἐν πεύκαισι Παρνασσόν κάτα πηδᾷ χορεύων παρθένοις σὺν Δελφίσιν.
In light of the resonance available through the description of the Muses just beforehand, the close proximity of these two gods is noteworthy. I note strongly that we do not have to identify these “glorious” Delphians with any specific chorus of women—it is acceptable for Athenaios to evoke an image, one that brings a mortal chorus onto the scene in balance with the Muses. In this case, the balance is exquisite as the mortal women offer a resonance similar to that of the Muses; we are still able to find a latent image of Bacchic revelries being evoked by description of Apolline festivities.

On the other hand, I find an over-literal interpretation of the text as depicting performative action here in Strophe 1 to be unnecessary. What this reference does do, however, is it strikes a parallel with Delos, and its local chorus (the Deliades)—Athens at this time controls the cult of Apollo on Delos, and it was beginning to exert a strong influence now at Delphi. So there are two strong ways in which these simple words (ἀγακλαμκτειεῖς Δελφίσιιν) can resonate—as a chorus of mortals reinforcing the Bacchic resonance evoked by the manner in which Athenaios has described the Muses, and as parallel to the practices of Delos, Athens’ other Apollo cult center.

850 It need not be the Thyiades, as they were likely Athenian and only active at festivals for Dionysos in the winter months. Cf. Furley and Bremer (2001), Vol. 2, page 51. The Phanai involved women with pine-torches, at night, on the mountain. Cf. Euripides, Ion 550-2, 714-17: φανάς Βακχίου and ἴὸ δευράδες Παιρνασσοῦ πέτρας; etc. Of particular importance here would be the Thyiades, wherein Athenian women accompanied by locals would perform rituals on Parnassos in honor of Dionysos. Cf. Furley and Bremer (2001), Vol. 2, page 67; Pausanias Geography 10.4.3.

851 Cf. Stehle (1997), 110. A (possibly) professional chorus in residence at Delos responsible for singing for Apollo, Leto, and Artemis. Cf. also Allen, Halliday, and Sikes (eds.) (1980)[1936], 225, s.v. κοῦραι Δηλιάδες. They were a chorus of young women who took part in several festivals at Delos and are mentioned various places in Greek literature, cf. Euripides Heracles Furiens 687, wherein they sing a paean. There was apparently a similar chorus at Ephesus, the Lydian Maidens.
An important *comparandum* in support of the Bacchic resonance can be found in Euripides’ *Ion* where the chorus sings of Parnassos, and the vocabulary exhibits significant overlap with Athenaios’ hymn:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{iō ~ δειράδες Παρνασοῦ πέτρας} \\
\text{ἐξουσα σκόπελον οὐράνιον ἃδραν} \\
\text{ίνα Βάκχιος ἀμφιπύρους ἀνέχων πεύκας} \\
\text{λαίφηρα πηδά νυκτιπόλοις ἁμα σὺν Βάκχας.}
\end{align*}
\]

Io! Ridges of Parnassos, having rocky-lookout and sky-high seat, Where Bacchos, holding up flaming pine-torches Leaps nimbly along with the night-roaming Bacchant women. 852

**Κασταλίδος εὖνόρος νάματ**853 – The Kastalian spring is a convenient geographical ‘label’ for the sanctuary, the home of the god, itself.854 Much like the Empire State Building for NYC or the Golden-Gate Bridge in San Francisco, as a landmark it is emblematic of Delphi.855 The Kastalian is as famous in its own right as Mt. Parnassos, and frequently occurs in narratives concerning Delphi, Apollo, and the oracle.856 It seems to refer also to a place for dancing.857 Some later authors appear comfortable conflating Delphi, the oracle, and the spring—they function collectively. As such we find the spring being described as “prophetic” in the manner that we are more


853 Crusius (1894), 42; Moens (1930), 22-3; Furley and Bremer (2001), vol. 2, pages 23, 88.

854 Pindar, *Pythian Odes* 5.31: ὁδατὶ Κασταλίας ξινοθείς, one may receive the hospitality of the god “at the Kastalian spring.”

855 Pindar *Nemean Odes* 6.37: παρὰ Κασταλιάν τε Χαρίτων ἐσπέρως ὑμάδῳ φλέγεν. As a place where one may win praise; also *Nemean Odes* 11.24-5: Παρὰ Κασταλία καὶ παρ’ εὐθένδρῳ μολόν ὑγθον Κρόνον, the Kastalian Spring functions as pair with the Hill of Kronos to refer to the games at both Delphi and Olympia. Cf. also Pindar *Olympian Odes* 7.15-17: παρ’ Ἀλφειῶι στεφανωσάμενοι . . . καὶ παρὰ Κασταλίας; and again in 9.17: σόν τε, Κασταλία, πάρα Ἀλφειοῦ τε ἐρέθθηκαν. Cf. Bacchylides, *Ode* 3.20.


857 Pindar, *Paean* fragment 52f.6-9: ὁδατὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ χαλκοπύλῳ ψόφον ἐμὸν Κασταλίας ὀρθανὸν ἀνδρῶν χορεύσιος θῆλθον, mentions the sound of the waters murmuring, while the sound of dancing is absent.
accustomed to seeing with respect to the tripod.\textsuperscript{858} While the Pythia technically gave her oracles from within the \textit{adyton} of the temple of Apollo, we find poetic lines such as this one in Pindar, \textit{Pythian} 4.163: μεμάντευμαι δ’ ἐπὶ Κασταλία—“To inquire of the oracle at the Kastalian [spring].” Plutarch comments that a cult of the Muses was established beside the stream, and the shrine of Gaia, where they were “associates” of the oracle.\textsuperscript{859}

εὐυδρὸς is a commonly occurring word. It is poetic in origin, but appears early in prose authors as well.\textsuperscript{860} It is typically, but not exclusively, used to describe an inhabited place. To be “well-watered” is to be suitable for habitation.\textsuperscript{861} It can poetically add flavor without adding much substance. Euripides and others use it to add a descriptive adjective to riverbanks.\textsuperscript{862} It often occurs in association with springs, in which case it tends to \textit{praise} a region—not only is there a water supply (which is necessary) but water in abundance is a desirable trait for land.\textsuperscript{863} It is worth noting that it may be used more metaphorically as well. An epigram in the \textit{Greek Anthology} describes a spring as “no longer well-watered,” because a murderer washed his hands in it.\textsuperscript{864} This would indicate that it may refer to the quality of water as well as quantity. This is significant in light of

\textsuperscript{858} Lucian, \textit{Zeus Rants} 30.10: πηγῆς μαντικῆς οὐδ’ ἡ Κασταλία. Lucian frequently conflates the specifics of the sanctuary, each capable of being a sort of metonymy for the whole. Cf. Lucian, \textit{Charon (The Inspectors)} 6.7, where the spring is part of Parnassos; Lucian, \textit{A Conversation with Hesiod} 8.12, where there is discussion of the use of prophecy, and Kastalia, the laurel, and the tripod are lumped as a collective group. Earlier use conflates less, but nonetheless frequently groups prophecy in geographical proximity with the stream. Cf. Euripides, \textit{Iphigenia among the Taurians} 1256.

\textsuperscript{859} Plutarch, \textit{On the Pythian Oracle} 402D (17): τὰς δὲ Μοῦσας ἱδρύσαντο παρέδρους τῆς μαντικῆς καὶ φύλακας αὐτὸν παρὰ τὸ νάμα καὶ τὸ τῆς Γῆς ἱερὸν, ἣς λέγεται τὸ μαντεῖον γενέσθαι.

\textsuperscript{860} It appears with a particularly high frequency in Strabo’s \textit{Geography}.

\textsuperscript{861} C.f. Herodotos \textit{Histories} 9.25.10.

\textsuperscript{862} Euripides, \textit{Iphigenia among the Taurians} 399; Pindar \textit{Pythian Odes} 1.79.

\textsuperscript{863} Cf. \textit{Greek Anthology} 7.701.2; 9.330.1; Pollux, \textit{Onom.} 1.239.1.

\textsuperscript{864} \textit{Greek Anthology} 9.258. Rather interestingly, it reports the nymphs as saying: “Εἰς ἕνα Βάσχον,” εἰποῦσα, “νῦμφαι μισγόμεθ”, οὐκ ἐς ἄρη.”
the role of water sources in sanctuaries, particularly at Delphi. This water supply was important due to the need for ritual purification for those engaging in sacrifice. At Delphi, the Kastalian is even more important in this respect as the Pythia would daily bath in the spring for purposes of purification, and Euripides suggests that those who attended the oracle would also first purify themselves in the “pure water” of the spring.

νάμα is a very common word with a seemingly generic meaning, but one precisely fit to this context. The LSJ defines νάμα, -άτος, τό, as, “anything flowing, running water, stream, spring.” The word appears in a variety of contexts, from tragedy and comedy to prose, especially among the philosophers (metaphorical use often). In Homer the verbal form refers to the flow of all bodies of water. However, Chantraine noted that the “flowing” associated with this word seems especially to refer to ‘sources.’ In his view, there is likely a link between the word’s root and Ναίς (Naiad), hence making a strong link between the goddesses of springs and the “flow” with which they may be identified. Alkeios certainly seems to take advantage of this sense, as

866 Euripides, Ion 94-5: Φοίβο Δελφο θέραπες... τάς Κασταλίας ἄργυροιδές... φθοράς δὲ δρόσους.
We also find Ion using water from the Kastalia to cleanse the temple grounds (line 149). Pausanias, Description of Greece 10.6.4.1 explains that a local named Kastalios had a daughter named Thyia, the first priestess of Dionysos, and that Delphos was the son of Thyia and Apollo (note the tight links with the Tyiades and between the two gods). In 10.8.9.3 he describes that as one ascended to the sanctuary, the spring was sweet to drink (πιεῖν ἅδου) and nice to bathe in (λύσθαι καλον).
867 LSJ, s.v. νάμα.
868 Plato, Phaedrus 278B.9: ἐς τὸ Ναμφῶν νάμα τε καὶ μουσέον; Timaeus 75E.3: τὸ δὲ λόγον νάμα ἐξορέον καὶ ὑπηρετοῦν φρονήσει κύριλλοστον καὶ ἀριστόν πάντων ναμάτων.
870 Chantraine (1965), s.v. νάμα.
871 Chantraine cites Frisk (1960-72) Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch as arguing that the term is ultimately derived from *ναφα, meaning ‘source.’
when he describes Zeus sending Apollo to Delphi, the Kastalian Spring (Κασταλίας νάματα), swells when the god approaches (ῥει καὶ ἄργυροις ἡ Κασταλία κατὰ ποίησιν νάμασι), as if possessing a degree of personification and reacting to the presence of the god. ⁸⁷² There is an odd equivocation of Delphi with Helikon, seen not only in the symmetry of ᾱ-ωωνα words, but also in the pairing of deep-forested and well watered.

ἐπινίσσεται ⁸⁷³—At first glance this appears to be an ordinary term. It is a compound formed from the proposition ἐπι + the very common verb νίσ(σ)ομαι. ⁸⁷⁴ When taking a genitive object, it describes travel over and when taking an accusative object, travel to. ⁸⁷⁵ More importantly, that traveling to is often invested with the sense of arrival, return, or visitation. E.g. the term is utilized by Apollonios of Rhodes when describing the hoped for return home by the Argonauts. ⁸⁷⁶ This sense is not absolutely inherent, as Theocritus uses the term to describe what seems like aimless wandering. ⁸⁷⁷

More common is the bare form of the verb, νίσ(σ)ομαι, which the LSJ simply defines as, “to come or go,” noting that it compounds freely with many prepositions. ⁸⁷⁸ However, a closer look at actual use strongly reaffirms the idea of arrival, return, or visitation. A simple coming or going could be represented with a more generic verb such

---

⁸⁷² Alceus, Hymn to Apollo 8, 24-5.
⁸⁷⁴ LSJ s.v. ἐπινίσσομαι. The σ may occur either in the singular or reduplicated fashion.
⁸⁷⁵ Cf. Sophokles, Oedipus Kolonos 689, where a river travels over a plain; Apollonios of Rhodes, Argonautica 4.281 refers to maps and markers guiding those who travel sea and road.
⁸⁷⁶ Apollonios of Rhodes, Argonautica 8.417: καὶ γὰρ τε θεοὺς ἐπινίσσεται ἀτη.
⁸⁷⁷ Theocritus, Idyll 8.43: ἐνθα καλὰ Ναῖς ἐπινίσσεται ·
⁸⁷⁸ LSJ s.v. νίσσομαι. There is wide variation on the use of a single or double σ.
as ἔρχομαι. νίσσομαι, on the other hand, has very interesting shades of meaning attached.

1) Arrival: Euripides’ Cyclops is concerned for sheep wandering off towards the crags.\(^{879}\)

2) Return: Homer uses it to refer to souls unable to return from Hades;\(^ {880}\) Euripides uses it in reference to return to one’s homeland.\(^ {881}\) 3) Visitation: Pindar uses the term to describe Herakles’ habitual frequenting of the Olympic Games once he has planted shade trees;\(^ {882}\) Hesiod uses it to describe the habitual activity of sailing to and fro;\(^ {883}\) Euripides describes Libyan birds, fleeing the rains for drier lands.\(^ {884}\) Usage shows that it cares a strong sense of repeated or habitual travel, with an emphasis on destination—a sense superbly suited for the context.

P. Chantraine notes that the verb νίσ(σ)ομαι is derived from the verb νέομαι, from which is also derived the noun νόστος.\(^ {885}\) As such, it is unsurprising to see νίσ(σ)ομαι and ἐπινίσ(σ)ομαι share some of its flavor. For yet one more clear example: cf. Homer, Odyssey 10.41-2: ἡμεῖς δ’ αὖτε ὁμὴν ὁδὸν ἐκτελέσαντες οἴκαδε νισόμεθα κενεὰς σὺν χεῖρας ἔχοντες—returning homeward. This is enlightening in regards to Athenaios’ text. The word is found in the midst of a strophe concerned with geography, with a summons to Delphi, which is, in fact, the very next word, emphatically displaced in a parallel fashion to Helikon in line 1. Delphi is the destination, not only of the god, but also the

\(^{879}\) Euripides, Cyclops 43: τὰί δή μοι νίσηι σκοπέλους;

\(^{880}\) Homer, Iliad 23.75-6: οὐ γὰρ ἐν’ αὐτὶς νίσομαι ἐξ Λίδαο.

\(^{881}\) Euripides, Phoenician Women 1233-4: ὑμεῖς δ’ ἀγῶν’ ἀφέντες, Ἀργεῖοι, χθόνα νίσεσθε, βίοτον μὴ λιπόντες ἐνθάδε·

\(^{882}\) Pindar, Olympian 3.33-4: καὶ νῦν ἐς ταύταν ἐορτὰν ἱππὸς ἀντιθέοις νίσεται.

\(^{883}\) Hesiod, Works and Days 236-7: οὐδ’ ἐπὶ νηόν νίσσονται.

\(^{884}\) Euripides, Helen 1483: ὄμβρον χεῖμεριον λιποῦσαι νίσονται πρεσβυτάτου σύριγγι πειθόμενα, ἄβροχά ὃς πεδία καρποφόρα τε τῇ γὰς ἐπιπετόμενος ταξεῖ.

\(^{885}\) P. Chantraine (1974) s.v. νέομαι.
muses, as well as the mortals who have come and now sing this hymn. Apollo and mortals are both in the habit of returning to, or visiting, Delphi. The Athenian *theoria* construes itself as a repeating return to praise the god at this location. Apollo himself is said to spend only part of the year at Delphi, voyaging abroad the rest of the time. While it is indeed possible to read ἐπινίσεται in a generic sense, it is far more likely that some level of return or habitual visitation is actively resonating here, rooted in tradition, and actually occurring as the chorus sings.

**Δέλφον**—No real clarification of meaning is needed here. The site of Delphi, sacred and prophetic temenos of Apollo, is the end point of the geographic journey detailed in this first strophe, and the location in which the hymn was performed.

The *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* did not mention Delphi by name, preferring Krisa. Homer too, does not know this name, instead using Pytho in *Iliad* 2.519 and 9.405. However, in the following centuries, poets freely made use of the name; as such, there is no apparent significance to the poet’s choice to use the word. On the other hand, it is quite interesting that Limenios chooses to delay use of this proper noun until his final strophe, the prayer. Here in Athenaios’ text, the word is placed emphatically, forward in position, much as Ἐλίκωδον in the first line. Immediately following ἄνα, we find a string of terms offering more precise description. As with Helikon and the deities mentioned,

---

886 The extant descriptions of Alceus’ hymn to Apollo state that Apollo first travelled to Delphi when granted the sanctuary by Zeus, but that he then travelled to the land of the Hyperboreans. The Delphians then composed and sang a *paean* with a chorus of youths in order to summon Apollo to return. After a year absence, Apollo returns in the spring when the waters of the Kastallian swell. This narrative of departure and return seems to have been embodied yearly by the cycle of festivals. With a three month period in the winter, when Apollo was away, focusing instead on Dionysos. Cf. Furley and Bremer (2001), vol. 1, page 82, as well as Plutarch, *On the ‘E’ at Delphi*, 389C.

Delphi receives its own set of descriptive epithets.

ἀνὰ [πρ]ῶδνα—It is difficult to pin down specifically what is meant by this term. The *LSJ* quite blandly defines it as a “foreland, headland,” terms which themselves need defining. Greek dictionaries are not much help, as Hesychios defines it as τὸ ὑπερέχον, “that which rises out/above.” In a generic geographical sense, it can refer to a high point of land, such as overlooks the sea. Poetic authors use it in several, not entirely incompatible, ways. The term is used to describe both cattle and sheep-grazing highlands, but also steep and rocky mountain heights, desolate places. The only instance of the singular in Homer describes the two Aiantes, standing like a highland (dike) which holds back a flood. Alternatively, rather than holding anything back, Hesiod sees it as a sort of cliff from which rocks may fall. It may be used quite metaphorically, as when it describes beasts or animals, seen as a threat. It is perhaps a

---

888 Fairbanks (1900), 122; Moens (1930), 24.
889 *LSJ* s.v. πρῶν.
890 Hesychios, *Lexicon* Π s.v. πηρήν.
897 Cf. Kallimachos, *Hymn to Artemis* 52-3: ὅπως ἵδον αὐτὰ πέλαλα πηρήσιν Οσσαίους ἐοκότα, monsters that seem like the crags of Mt. Ossa; *Greek Anthology* 9.300: ἀλλ' ὣ μὲν ὄρμηθή πηρήνοι ἄτε, a hunter is rushed by a bull that towers over him.
scholion on Nicander that offers the most helpful insight. He glosses the word with ἔξοχον, “that which is pre-eminent, standing out.”\textsuperscript{898} Context matters here. ἀνά implies motion upwards, up to the πρωτόνα. However, it seems obvious that the chorus does not go mountain climbing here. On the other hand, this sense of upward motion gives good sense, when read contextually. At a distance, surely it is Mt. Parnassus that stands out, or one of its twin crags, and it is the mountain as a whole that one begins to climb, upward. However, as we come closer, upward refers to the elevated rise immediately above—one approaches and ascends the sacred way, upwards along the base of the mountain; and as one ascends, it is the temple of Apollo rising above which stands out, and offers arrival, when one stands on the terrace (at the top), from which one may look out.\textsuperscript{899} The following words give good sense to this interpretation, as they focus in on the location of the temple—the peak of Parnassos is not ‘prophetic.’

\textit{μαντειεῖον}\textsuperscript{900}—This term is a reasonably common descriptive adjective, which is very closely related in sense and meaning from the much more common noun μανταῖον, τό. Both are linguistically derived from μαντικός and μάντις, ὁ. All are Ionic in dialect; the form μαντειεῖος is poetic in usage, with μαντικός, -ή, -όν (also poetic) being

\textsuperscript{898} Cf. Scholia on Nicander, \textit{Scholia and Glosses on Nicanders’ Theriaca} (scholia vetera et recentiora), 218a.1, s.v. πρωτόν.

\textsuperscript{899} Moens (1930), 24 disputed with Fairbanks (1900), who had read this as referring to the Pylaea, the ridge to the west of Delphi where the Amphiktyones met. Moens cannot figure how it would be in route for the procession; therefore she considers it more likely that it refers to the Hyampeian peak of Parnassus, the closer one from which the Castilian spring arises. These details seem at once too arbitrary (one of two peaks, already mentioned in the hymn) and too mundane (this is poetry, and poetically describes the destination).

\textsuperscript{900} Fairbanks (1900), 122; Moens (1930), 24.
more frequently used in prose.\textsuperscript{901} The noun form μανταῖον is typically used to refer to either an “oracle”\textsuperscript{902} or the “oracular response”\textsuperscript{903} one might receive, having inquired at an oracle.\textsuperscript{904} As an adjective, an alternative for μαντικός, the term in parallel manner means “oracular, prophetic,” and may describe a variety of nouns having to do with places, persons,\textsuperscript{905} and things.\textsuperscript{906} The whole of this semantic range is associated with Delphi and its god. While there is a lack of specificity in this first strophe, the tripod of the Oracle will be referenced in Strophe 3. While Apollo is, of course, the god of prophecy and divination, Delphi itself is, in some fashion, prophetic. There are versions of Delphic myth that have the oracle predate the arrival of Apollo, where it is Gaia (or her daughter Themis) who gives prophetic knowledge to visitors.\textsuperscript{907} As Helikon belongs to the Muses, so too does Delphi belong to Apollo. However, while the goddesses received (consistently in myth it seems) Helikon as their allotted portion, Apollo often seems to

\textsuperscript{901} Chantraine (1965) s.v. μάντις.

\textsuperscript{902} Typically in the singular, especially in prose: cf. Thucydides Peloponnesian War 1.28.2.4: ἢθελον δὲ καὶ τῷ ἐν Δελφοῖς μαντεῖῳ ἐπιτρέψατο; 4.118.1.1: Περὶ μὲν τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ τοῦ μαντείου τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Πυθίου; et al. But also in poetry: cf. Euripides, Andromache 926: Φοίβου λιπὼν μαντείον; Aeschylus, Eumenides 3-4: ὡς δὲ τῆς Θέμιν, ὡς δὲ τῷ μητρὸς δευτέρα τῷ ἐξετὸ μαντείον, ὡς λόγος τις; Sophokles, Electra 33: Ἔγὼ γὰρ ἡ μαντείσοι, τὸ Πυθικὸν μαντεῖον.

\textsuperscript{903} Typically in the plural; cf. also in poetry: Euripides, Iphigenia among the Taurians 1254: ἐν ἀψιδῇ θρόνωι μαντείας βροτοίς θεσφάτων νέμων ἀδότων ὧπο; Aeschylus, Eumenides 716: μαντεία δ᾿ οὐκέθ᾿ ἀγνά μαντεύσῃ νέμων.

\textsuperscript{904} LSJ s.v. μανταῖον.

\textsuperscript{905} Especially Apollo. Cf. Euripides, Trojan Women 454: ὁ μαντεῖα ἂνας; Euripides, Orestes 1666: ὁ Λοξίδια μαντεῖος; Aristophanes, Birds 722: μαντείος Ἀπόλλων.

\textsuperscript{906} Aeschylos, Agamemnon 1265: ἐξω τάδε καὶ σκῆπτρα καὶ μαντεία περὶ δέρη στάφη, Cassandra holds a scepter and wears a prophetic crown; Sophokles, Oedipus Tyrannos 21: ἐπὶ ἱσσηνὸν τε μαντεία σποδῆ, prophetic ash; Pindar, Olympian Ode 6.5: βυθὸ τε μαντείᾳ ταιμαίς Διὸς ἐν Πίσα, Zeus’ prophetic altar; Pindar, Pythian Ode 5.68-9: μαντήιον τ᾿ ἀμφέπει μαντήιον, Apollo attends his prophetic shrine.

\textsuperscript{907} Among other instances, cf. Aeschylos, Eumenides 1-16; Euripides, Iphigenia among the Taurians 1234-1282; Aristonoos, Paean; etc. For varying discussions of the early history of the oracle as well as the range of ancient accounts of its history, cf. Sourvinou-Inwood (1987), Morgan (1990), Quantin (1992), and Strolonga, (2011).
have fought for his. Strophe 4 of Athenaios’ hymn will recount the struggle with the
*drakōn*, prior guardian of the sanctuary and tripod. Here it is Delphi that is described as
*μαντειεῖον*, even if it is the god who gives the prophecies that mortal visitors seek.

Some editors have found that it is not entirely clear to which noun this adjective
belongs: *Δελφὸν, πρῳόνα, or πάγον*. I think it is best to take *all* of these as jointly
describing the god’s destination. However, the emphatic placement of *Δελφὸν* suggests
that we may take the two nouns and adjective occurring after the preposition ἀνὰ as a
more tightly knit group, more specifically locating the god. That is to say, Delphi is the
god’s destination, but being a large area, greater precision is provided—the seat of
prophecy on the hillside.\(^{908}\) This is important as it brings together both the performance
space of the chorus singing the hymn (and their poetically envisioned companions
described herein), the destination of the god as he travels, as well as the location of
historical focus in the latter part of the hymn—the tripod and the combat with the *drakōn*.
Additionally it fills out the grouping of threes, of which this author seems so fond: the
heights, the spring, and the hillside. Due to the emphatic and final positioning of *πάγον*
after the verb, at the end of the strophe, it is perhaps best to read this adjective as the most
tightly linked with this word, albeit functioning in parallel with *πρῳόνα*. The association
of this adjective with either *πάγον* or *πρῳόνα* is unique in Greek literature. All are
common words, but this is the only instance in which either is described as *μαντεῖον*,
much less both. It is clear what is meant, and the reference to prophecy and the highland

\(^{908}\) One might say that in this string of nouns in asyndeton, Delphi functions as an antecedent for the cluster
following the preposition.
is common in hymns to Apollo, but this particular formulation is, as so often with Athenaios’ hymn, unique.

ἐφέπων\textsuperscript{909}—In the same way that there appears to be a repetitive imperative verb of summoning in lines 1 and 3, we find verbal repetition in lines 7 and 8. Apollo was as visiting (ἐπινίσεται) his sanctuary; the god is a habitual, frequent traveler who returns to Delphi again and again. We find a clear evocation of repetition in the presence of ἐφ- prefixed to the verb here. This participle also describes the god’s movement. There is a slightly different flavor to be found in ἐφέπων, however. The emphasis of the prior verb was the idea of habit. Now he is described with a verb of motion that promotes a sense of epiphany. ἐφέπω emphasizes not only the motion, but also the end point. We may translate it, “to come upon, encounter, to face.”\textsuperscript{910} Homer uses it to describe arriving at the moment of one’s death—meeting one’s fate.\textsuperscript{911} Telos is built into this word. The active form is uncommon in Attic, and it is more common to find the middle construction used in the sense of “following after.” This would of course make sense for the Muses and the Delphian women, but the god—he leads.

An additional meaning may be activated. It is less common, but we see it in Pindar, \textit{Pythian Odes} 1.30: ὃς τοῦτ’ ἐφέπεις ὀρος. Here, due to context, it is abundantly clear that the word means not “travel” but “rule over.” This sense is superbly suitable to

\textsuperscript{909} Moens (1930), 25.
\textsuperscript{910} \textit{LSJ} s.v. ἐφέπω.
\textsuperscript{911} Homer, \textit{Iliad} 7.52: οὐ γὰρ πώ τοι μοῖρα θανεῖν καὶ πότιμον ἐπισπεῖν, not yet your fate to die and go to meet your doom; \textit{Iliad} 21.100: πρὶν μὲν γὰρ Πάτροκλον ἐπισπεῖν ἀφεῖμιν ἠμαρ, up Until Patroklos came to his fated day; etc.
the context here in Athenaios’ hymn. Apollo arrives at his sanctuary. A nice
comparandum which possibly offers up both meanings is found in Aristonoos’ paean,
line 47: σώιζων ἐφέποις ἡμᾶς, ὦ Ἰε Παίαν—preserving us, may you rule over (come to)
us, O Ie Paean! In either sense, we find emphasized the arrival and epiphany of the god.

Πάγον—This word is quite simple and easy to read. It mean “hill,” and in the
context of the strophe it transparently refers to the rise of the sacred way, with the temple
of Apollo at the top. The geographical emphasis of the poem ends here, with a strongly
localized sense of arrival. The Muses, the god, the chorus, the locals—all are now
gathered before the temple, ready to sacrifice and ready to perform. While some
commentators have preferred to read the hymn as actively self-referential, that is to say
narrating events as they occur, I find this less than convincing, as we would expect it to
be sung after the sacrifice, which occurs in Strophe 2. In Strophe 2, immediately
following description of sacrifice, we do get description of musical performance, and it
would be here, if ever, that the text is self-referential. It is instructive to note that πάγον
will occur again in the third strophe (line 19), there as ἀκρονιφῇ τὸνὸς πάγον—a
conflation of the geographic descriptors in Strophe 1. This place will then be described as
the location of prophecies, repeating μαντεῖον once again, this time in association with
τρίποδα, and deployed as a pivot into the account of Apollo’s combat with the drakôn by
which he acquired this place.

---

912 Moens (1930), 24.
Strophe 2

[Ἡν] κλυτᾶ μεγαλόπολις Αθήνας, εύχαει[ι]-
[σ]ςι φερόσταον ναίουσα Τριτωνίδος δά[πε]-
δον ἅθραυστον· ἄγιοις δὲ βωμοῖσιν Ἀ-
φαίστος αἰεὶ· νέων μήρα ταούρων· ὠμο-
oὸ δὲ νιν Ἀραγ ἁτμὸς ἐς /Οὐλυμπον ἄνακιδν[a]-
tαι· λιγὸ δὲ λωτοῖς βρέμων ἀείσωλοιοις μ [έ]-
λεσιν ὠιδαίν κρέκει· χρυσέα δ’ ἀδύθροου[ς κι]-
θαρὶς ὀμνοῖςιν ἀναμέλπεται.

[ See here ] — The Famed Great-Polis of Attica!
Dwelling on the plain of Arms-Bearing Tritonia
Through prayers, Unbroken—
On holy altars Hephaistos kindles into flame the thighs of young bulls
Joined with this, Arabian vapor rises up to Olympos,
The shrill Lotus-reed, roaring with nimble numbers, plays a song,
And the golden, sweet-voiced, kithara, with hymns raises up its strains

Strophe 2 turns from invocation, travel, and arrival to a description of the event itself: the theoria is assembled, the altars burn with sacrifice, instruments and voices are raised in song. There is an emphatically present tense to this strophe which has led previous readers to assume that what is described is actually occurring as the hymn is sung. While this is appealing, it is forgetful of the rest of the hymn. It is unlikely that the first strophe was sung as participants were assembling, and the following strophe will describe episodes located in the past. It is quite possible that the lyrics to this strophe do in fact describe what has taken, or will take, place. In this case, however, the presence of the particle δὲ in lines 11, 13, 14, and 15 becomes significant. I am inclined to interpret these conjunctions as suggestive of sequence rather than concomitance. What we have here is 1) animal sacrifice, 2) incense, 3) aulos music, and 4) a hymn sung to the kithara.
While it is difficult to be certain of precisely what occurred, at what time, and in what sequence, the Pythaïdes inscriptions are suggestive of a full program of performance paired with a significant amount of sacrificing. These list includes a large number of participants, artists who are divided according to specialty, and this list is explicitly suggestive of a variety of performances (such as theater and various instrumental performances), in addition to the *paean* by the chorus.

[ ἤν ]913—The initial supplement to the beginning of line 9 supposed that a kletic imperative was called for here, in parallel to that found at the beginning of line 1. H. Weil’s initial proposal of ἴθι found little traction however. O. Crusius made arguments for a contracted form of πάρεστι (πάρα or πάρ) but neither of those appeared satisfactory to other editors. Weil later proposed an alternative of ἤν (crediting Th. Reinach with the suggestion), a supplement which has proved persuasive and was adopted by later editors. While not certain, the supplement is reasonable and Philodameos’ *paean* to Dionysos offers a helpful *comparandum*: ἤν, τότε βακχίζε μὲν.914 This hymn is interesting here as the author seems to conflate Apollo and Dionysos throughout. (E.g. Ἕνώ [Ἰόβ]ακχ’ ὃ ἰὲ Παιάν, occurs several times throughout the hymn.)

**Κλυτά**—This descriptive adjective bears little comment, except to note that in the fiercely competitive context of the Hellenistic milieu, particularly as Rome rose in power, the Greek poleis grabbed at anything that could increase their reputation. To be κλυτά is

---

913 Weil (1893), 576-7; Crusius (1894), 34, 44, 53; Weil (1894), 360-1; Reinach (1909013), 154; Moens (1930), 26.

Athenians were proud of their history as a *polis* with a rich history of politics, art, rhetoric, and war. They had κλέος. In the same manner as the first strophe described deities, now Athens is treated to rich, descriptive, epithets. Apollo will be called κλυτὸν in 18, and the parallel is perhaps reinforced by the nearby placed μεγάλον, most likely describing his father Zeus. In this way, Athens makes a claim to fame that makes their reputation something similar to Apollo. It is informative to realize that, at this point in history, during the 2nd century BCE, Athens is no longer a great military force, and is attempting to assert *cultural* and *religious* influence in the region. Hence their aggressive acquisition of control over the island of Delos and Apollo cult there, and now, more recently, their role in re-establishing the Amphictyony at Delphi and the re-establishment of long failed festivals such as the Pythaïdes.915

**μεγαλόπολις**916—Another word that is transparent in meaning at a glance, but which is in fact rather unusual when carefully examined. Here it is clearly employed as an epithet for the city/polis/region of Attica. The word is quite rare in the Greek corpus, the closely related μεγαλοπολίτης being far, far, commoner. Very few cities were described as such in older Greek Literature: Troy, Syracuse, Athens, and Alexandria.917 Writers in late antiquity become somewhat freer in their usage, but in the case of Athenaios’ hymn, it is (I believe) important to place an emphasis on prior texts.


916 Weil (1893), 577-8; Weil (1894), 361; Crusius (1894), 43-4. Fairbanks (1900), 123; Weil felt that this epithet must have been equivalent to the μεγαλοπολίτης used by prose authors. Moens (1930), 26; Furley and Bremer (2001), vol. 2, 88.

917 There was, however, a city that was actually named Megalopolis, in Arcadia. It was founded in the 4th c. BCE (c. 371) after the Thebans ended Spartan hegemony over the region. The Thebans summoned the Messenians to return to their ‘fatherland’ to found the city.
Euripides described Troy in this way (ironically) in his *Trojan Women*: ā δὲ μεγαλόπολις ἄπολις ὀλωλεν οὐδὲ ἔτ' ἔστι Τροία. 918 Pindar praised Syracuse in *Pythian* 2: Μεγαλοπόλις δ' Συράκοσαι, and Athens in *Pythian* 7: αἰ μεγαλοπόλις Ἀθῆναι. 919 A scholiast would explain that the term was applicable to Syracuse by reason of it being a composite of four earlier cities: ἐπειδὴ Ἀρχίς τέσσαρας πόλεις καταστρεψάμενος εἰς μίαν συνήγαγεν. 920 Athens may be deserving of the term for a similar reason, as the *polis* held the tradition that there had once been an integration of the various demes into a single civic union; the Synoecism of Theseus was celebrated each year in the month of Hecatombaion. In this case, it is perhaps not surprising that the term is not applied to other poleis. Yet, a Scholiast on Pindar would seem to suggest another possibility, that Athens deserved this epithet not simply for its size, or the process by which it grew, but for its excellence. 921 It is perhaps in this sense that we may understand the attribution of this term to the city of Alexandria. 922 It is an interesting phenomenon that Philo repeatedly employs this term to refer collectively, not to a single *polis* or group of poleis, but to the entire kosmos. 923 This usage is adopted by other, later writers as well. 924

918 Euripides, *Trojan Women* 1291.
919 Pindar, *Pythian Ode* 2.1; 7.1.
920 Scholia on Pindar (scholia vetera), *Pythian Ode*, scholion 1a, line 1. It would seem that the Arcadian city followed a similar model, as it was founded intentionally, by a gathering together of a citizen body of significant magnitude to be capable of being a useful political balance against the Spartans—as opposed to the more usual growth by expansion of other cities that began from smaller colonial groups.
921 Scholia on Pindar (scholia vetera et recentiora partim Thomae Magistri et Alexandri Phrtii), *Pythian Ode* 7, scholion 1, line 1 ff. This understanding may be further argued by reference to the *Vitae Pindari Et Varia De Pindaro* 6.2: ἠχθρωδ' ἰδικεμένων τὸν Ἀθηναίων πρὸς τοὺς Θηβαίους, ἐπεὶ ἐπεν ἐν τοῖς ποιήμασιν' ὁ ταί λιπαραί καὶ μεγαλοπόλις Ἀθήναι, ἐξημίσασαν αὐτὸν χρήματι Θηβαίοι, ἀπερ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ἔπεσαν Ἀθηναίοι.
923 Cf. Philo, *On Joseph* 29.2; *Life of Moses* 2.51.8; *On the Creation of the World* 19.2; et alia.
The orthography of this word is quite exceptional. The meaning is obvious—Attica is here referenced. The preferred spelling would be Ατθίς, -ιδος, ἴ. There is consistency on the part of either the poet or the stone-carver (it is difficult to know precisely who would have been responsible for the orthographic choice here), as the double θ occurs again in line 17: Αθθίδα.

The use of a double theta following an alpha (αθθ-) in Greek is not unprecedented, but would seem to be extremely limited. The most common occurrence would be the transliteration of Μαθθαῖος (Matthew) as found in the New Testament, Josephus, the Septuagint, Eusebius, et al. Various throughout the PGM this ‘exotic’ spelling is used for exotic utterances. There are also a few occurrences in the Greek Anthology wherein καταθνήσκω conjugates to aorist κατέθανον, which in later ‘epic’ usage shortens to κάτθανον and κάθθανον. The orthography may be ‘explained’ but any justification or necessity for this occurrence here remains tenuous. One wonders if some performative technique having an effect on pronunciation is at work here, as seems likely elsewhere.

---

924 Cf. Chrysippos, *Fragments on Logic and Physics* 1010.14; Eusebios, *Praeparatio Evangelica* 7.9.3.4; et alia.
925 Weil (1893), 577-8; Weil (1894), 361; Crusius (1894), 43-4; Moens (1930), 27.
926 One may find some other occasional evidence of similar spelling in other foreign transliterations, Cf. *Greek Anthology, Epigrammata Sepulcralia* 1.2: εὐπρέπεια Αράθθον.
927 Cf. *Greek Anthology, Epigrammata Sepulcralia* 164.5: 581.3. An explanation of this formation can also be found in Eustathius, *Commentary on Homer’s Iliad*, Vol.3, pg.377, line 6: διό καί τό κάροτα ἄντι τοῦ κατὰ φάλαρα, περὶ οὗ καὶ προείρηται, καί τό κάτθανεν ἄντι τοῦ κατέθανεν, ὅφεὶ οὖν διὰ δύο γράφεσθαι διασέχον τῶν <φ> καί τῶν <θ>, οἷον καρ φάλαρα καί κάθθανεν, ὅμως δι’ ἀντιστοίχων αὐτοῦς πιλῶν συμφώνων γράφεται, ἵνα μὴ εὐφράστη ἐν Ελληνικῇ λέξει διασέχοισθαι.
928 F. Graf notes anecdotally that the -θθ- would require more breath for pronunciation, something acceptable in a solemn song, but less likely to survive in everyday speech. If so, I would imagine that the
Beyond the unusual orthography, the word choice itself is somewhat odd. Attica is a region, not a people or *polis*, yet here it is personified. At this date, this poses no real problem—Callimachos’ had already personified the island of Delos in his hymn. This is the noun, as opposed to the commonly used adjective Ἀττικός, -ῆ, -όν which interestingly tends to be limited to describing things, only rarely being associated with persons, and even then mostly with women, not men. It is too much to read any sort of gender onto the participants in this chorus based on some sort of ‘collective’ noun here. It is better to see the *theoria* poetically conflated with a personified Attica—a part for the whole. It is not difficult to see how this might be appropriate. The Pythaïdes inscriptions suggest a *theoria* of 300-500 people, depending on the year. What is more, the embassy included the most important citizens of the *polis*. Participants included the nine archons, the herald of the Areiopagos Council, the hoplite general, the priest of Apollo, a mantis, two *exegetai*, the full corps of *ephebes* and cavalrymen, the *archetheorio* of various sub-*theoria*, female *kanephorio* and *pyrophorio*, representatives from the noble families and the Marathonian Tetrapolis, as well as other selected by lot. Additionally, the guild of the *Technitai* Dionysos sent a delegation to provide for artistic performances of all sorts, not just the *paean*. There are many artists in the crowd as well.

double theta would sound old-fashioned, or perhaps archaic, as the –tθ- would phonetically represent contemporary pronunciation.

929 Cf. Euripides, *Iphigenia at Aulis* 247, where Theseus brings ships from Attica, compared to those coming from other regions, such as Boeotia, et al. In fact, the word is often paired with γῆ; cf. Cf. Euripides, *Iphigenia at Aulis*: 247 γης ἵπτεν Ἀτθιδος.

930 Weil (1893), 577-8 assumed that Αθηνίς here quite literally referred to women marching at the front of the embassy, which performed as it climbed the Sacred Way. Crusius (1894), 44 tended to think that the κλυταὶς Δελφίσιιν of Strophe 1 would be included as well. Moens (1930), 27 rejected this, as she argued that the hymn only describes the female escort occurring while the god travelled, in Strophe 1. There is no clear referent to them elsewhere in the hymn. She strongly felt that the personification here was simply a matter of the *theoria* standing for the whole of the Attic state, including the women, but also their memories, traditions, customs—all of it.
The Attic *polis* is its citizens, particularly the magistrates, aristocrats, sacred personnel, and artists—it is the land too, but here the whole is ‘personified’ collectively. Attica has come to praise the god.

The pairing of *μεγαλόπολις* with *Ἀθήνης* is unprecedented and never repeated. It is as if the polity of Athens is here personified as a famous citizen not of the Athenian *polis*, but of the Greek kosmos—a perspective which is enriched by the Delphic context. The sanctuary at Delphi played host to embassies from all Greek poleis, many of which had built treasuries or erected impressive monuments within the temenos. To call Attica *μεγαλόπολις* in this context may say less to the size of the city, and more to its statute as *compared to* the other Greek poleis. That is to say, Athens is outstanding among its Hellenic peers—or so its *theoria* claims in its song.\(^931\) At the time of this hymn’s performance, there were only three cities so described as *μεγαλόπολις*.\(^932\)

\[\text{εἰσχαιεῖσι}^933\]—Editors have had some difficulty with this word, not just regarding the odd orthography (addressed in the epigraphical commentary), but also with how to interpret this line of text. Grammatically the line seems simple, but the complexity of word order and poetic brevity causes difficulties when determining how to associate this dative and the genitives (Athene). H. Weil understood the word as a dative of accompaniment—meaning something like, “The Athenians are pious people, and so the

\(^931\) Crusius (1894), 44 argues in support of personification by reminding the reader that Kallimachos had already engaged in a similar manner in extended form in his *Hymn to Delos*.

\(^932\) Cf. Strabo, *Geography* 8.4.5.6; 12.3.37.22; Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 8.27.14.8; 8.27.15.2. There was, interestingly, a city in Arcadia actually named *Megalopolis*.

\(^933\) Weil (1893), 577-8; Crusius (1894), 44-5; Fairbanks (1900), 123; Moens (1930), 28-30; Furley and Bremer (2001), vol. 2, 88.
land of Attica is ἄθραυστον.” Crusius preferred to link the prayers tightly with ναίουσα. Rather than a description of the people, it describes how they dwell, and he considered that it might also function as a dative of means. Moens liked Weil’s view, but noted that another option possibly made sense as well. Pointing to a passage in Herodotos where Athene begs for Athens to be preserved against the invading Persians, Moens considers that the goddess in this hymn may be connected with the prayers (as a subjective genitive) rather than the plain (a descriptive genitive). That is, “by Athene’s prayers, the plain is ἄθραυστον.” While unspecified in Herodotus and this hymn, Moens assumed the prayers would be directed towards Zeus. The participle ναίουσα, however, is awkward if we accept this reading, as it so emphatically sustains the active agency of the Athenian polis, and the placement of the words fights against Moens’ reading. Athenaios has woven the words: prayers – arms-bearing – dwelling – Tritonia – plain – unbroken. It is helpful to see this sequence in terms of association: prayers – goddess – people – goddess – region – region. The final ‘region,’ however, ἄθραυστον should be seen as applying to the people as well. If Attica is unbroken, so are its people, particularly as the preceding line just recently personified the region, imagining it as present, the polis being embodied by the theoria. To list the sequence again: prayers – goddess – people/region – goddess – people/region – ἄθραυστον. I see no reason why one cannot take εὐχαε[ίς]σι as a dative of accompaniment/means, applicable to the whole community of Attica, which would include not only the mortal polis but the divine polis as well, and Athene most specifically. It is important to recall the content of the Pythaïdes inscriptions. The theoria

934 Herodotos, Histories 7.141: οὐ δύναται Παλλᾶς Δί’ Ὑλόμπιον ἐξιλάσασθαι, λυσσομένη πολλοῖς λόγοις καὶ μητῆς πυκνῇ, and further on: τεύχος Τριτογενέων ήμιλον διδοὺ εὐρόσα Ζεὺς Μοῦνον ἀπόρθητον τελέθην.
of 128/7 BCE was sent to Delphi “on behalf of the health and safety of all the citizens, children and women, as well as friends and allies.” Moreover, among the inscriptions for 98/7 BCE we find mention of attendance by the priestess of Athene, who was honored by the Delphians for her participation:

...ἀ τὰς Αθάνας ἱέρεια Χρυσίς, Νικήτου θυγάτηρ, καὶ τὰν τε ἐπιδαμίαν καὶ ἀναστροφὰν ἐποίησατο κάλαν καὶ εὐσχήμονα καὶ ἀξίαν τοῦ τε δάμου τοῦ Αθηναίων καὶ τὰς ἀμετέρας πόλιος.

...Chrysis, The priestess of Athene, daughter of Niketos, and she accomplished both sojourn and return in a manner that was noble and graceful, and worthy of both of the deme of the Athenians and our polis.  

While there was a cult to Athene Pronaios at Delphi, it seems more likely that the priestess participation in the theoria for the Pythaïdes would remain focused on Apollo. All of Attica seeks Apollo’s blessings, and we must assume that the prayers here are to Apollo, not Zeus or Athena.

φερόπλοιο—This is an exceedingly uncommon word, here deployed as an epithet for Athene. A simple compound of the verb φέρω and the noun ὄπλον, it quite transparently means “arms-bearing.” The unusual (and therefore poetic) nature of this word is enhanced by the use of the epic genitive. As a descriptor for the goddess Athene, it is imminently suitable, in spite of having no prior precedent. She is typically portrayed


937 Weil (1893), 577-8; Crusius (1894), 45; Moens (1930), 30.

938 The only other occurrence is found in Maximus, On Beginnings 8.380.
with spear, helmet, and armor. Similar forms can be seen: φέρασπις (shield-bearing), πάνοπλος (fully-armed), and ὀπλοχαρής (delighting in arms). Athenaios presents the eminently suitable and recognizable in a novel way.

ναίουσα δά[πε]δον—We find a distinction made here between mortals and immortals. God have places as their portion (and a similar claim is made for Athens in line 17) but mortals “dwell.” There is a parallel drawn between the Muses of Strophe 1 and Athens in Strophe 2, but there is no confusing the difference. This is emphasized by the word choice here, as ναίω bears the sense of “abiding” in a place. After the emphasis on ownership and travel in Strophe 1, we shift to an emphasis on stability. This is picked up in the object of the verb. δά[πε]δον very blandly refers to a “level surface,” usually referring to the “ground.” It is an uncommon word, generally poetic in use. The prefix δα- functions in a similar way to ζα- as an intensifier. πέδον (flat, ground) is the more common form. I suspect that the intensified form is highly suggestive of a flatness that is ‘made’ in some way. (Cf. Homer, Odyssey 10.227, where it refers to the floor of a room; Odyssey 11.577, where it describes the surface on which Tityos is stretched; Aristophanes, Wealth 515, the field of earth one plows). The usage here is very nice, as Athene has a “hill” sanctuary of her own in Attica on the Acropolis, in parallel with

939 Proclus, Hymns 7.3.
940 Euripides, Helen 1316.
941 Orphic Hymns 32.6.
942 Weil (1893), 577-8; Moens (1930), 31.
943 LSJ s.v. δάπεδον. Cf. Herodotus Histories 4.200, where the ground of a city is ‘thumped’ to find the hollow tunnels below being created by Persian sappers.
944 Chantraine (1968), s.v. δάπεδον, δά - , ζά.
Helikon (Muses) and Parnassos (Apollo). The gods dwell on the heights, and the mortals on the plains that spread below. This is particularly vivid as an image for the Athenians, as the city is so distinctly below, on the flat ground. The divine gods dwell above, and mortals ascend to meet with them, but return afterwards to the stable “flatness” below where they live their lives.

Τριτωνίδος—This word is a somewhat obscure epithet for Athene. Moens felt that it was a shortening of τριτογένεια, which is possible but not necessary. This word provides a good example of how affordances work. As an epithet, there would have been no confusion in the minds of the audience that it referred to Athene. However, there very likely was some confusion among the audience as to why it described her.

First, Τριτωνίς may derive either from the numeral τρίτος (third) or from the proper noun τρίτων. The association with “three” may be interpreted as referring to her as the third-born child of Zeus after Apollo and Artemis, or to her birthday as the third day of the month (meaning her festivals would tend to cluster upon that day in the same way that Apollo’s tended to fall on the seventh day).

The derivation from a proper noun bears some unpacking, as there are several possible strands of myth that may offer affordances here. First, in Boeotia, there was a small temple to the goddess, with a stream nearby named Triton, and the locals explained that the goddess was born by the banks of this stream. Secondly, the Arcadians made a

---

945 Fairbanks (1900), 123; Moens (1930), 31; Furley and Bremer (2001), vol. 2, 88.
similar claim. When Megalopolis was founded, many of the inhabitants of Aliphera in Arcadia left to join. There in Aliphera stood sanctuaries of Athene and Asclepius, and Pausanias writes that the locals worshipped Athene more than any other god, saying she was born and raised there. They have an altar to Zeus Lecheate (birthing), whom they say gave birth to her there. Nearby is a stream named Triton. Pausanias the mythographer notes that Athene was the daughter of Zeus and Metis, whom Zeus swallowed, requiring that he himself give birth by having his head split open by Hephaistos (or Prometheus). The Arcadians apparently claimed that Triton was derived from τριτώ, an Arcadian dialectic for κεφαλή, “head.” Hence Athene was known as, “head-born,” so too was the river by which she was born.

An alternative derivation can be found in Herodotus. The historian explains that he heard that Jason, having built the Argo, put a bronze tripod in the boat, and set sail for Delphi, but was blown off course to Libya. He and his crew (the Argonauts) found themselves trapped somehow in Lake Triton, unable to find the channel leading back to the sea. The god Triton, to whom the lake belonged, appeared and demanded the tripod in exchange for guidance. Giving up the tripod, Jason and his crew were guided to the channel. Triton put the tripod in his own temple, prophesying that when one of the crew’s descendants should steal it back, then 100 Greek cities would have to be founded on the shores of the lake. It is interesting to note the presence of Delphi, a tripod, and prophecy here. Herodotus continues, explaining that around this lake live the Auseans and Machlyes who jointly celebrate a yearly festival for Athene. These locals say that Athene

948 Pausanias, Geography 8.26.6.
949 Apollodoros, The Library 1.3.6.
here was the daughter of Poseidon and the lake (perhaps a goddess?), but due to conflict, she chose to have Zeus as her father instead.\footnote{Herodotus, \textit{Histories} 4.179-180. This lake is referred to in Pindar, \textit{Pythian Odes} 4.178, although he seems to have a different version of how the Argonauts get there.} Hence she is Triton-born, but had nothing to do with Zeus’ head. It would seem that this may be the version alluded to by Euripides in the \textit{Ion}:

\begin{quote}
καὶ τὴν ἑπ’ ἐμοῖς σκοπέλοις θεᾶν λίμνης τ’ ἐνυδρου Τριτωνιάδος πότνιαν ἀκτήν
\end{quote}

And [I call upon] the goddess upon my high hills, and the lordly headland of deep-watered Triton.\footnote{Euripides, \textit{Ion} 871-3.}

It is impossible to know which version is intended by Athenaios, much less how an audience would have heard the epithet. Nevertheless, it would have been quite clear that Athene was invoked.

\textit{ἄθραυστος}—The \textit{LSJ} defines this word simply, as “unbroken,” but there is some interesting flavor to be noticed.\footnote{Weil (1893), 577-8; Fairbanks (1900), 123; Moens (1930), 30; Furley and Bremer (2001), vol. 2, 88.} The word is a compound, formed by adding an alpha privative to the adjective \textit{θραυστός}, which deepens the sense a bit. It can mean “frangible, brittle,” or, ”capable of being broken down.”\footnote{\textit{LSJ} s.v. \textit{ἄθραυστος}.} This form is itself associated with the verb \textit{θραύω}, which means, “to break in pieces, shatter.”\footnote{\textit{LSJ} s.v. \textit{θραστός}.} Taken collectively, and read in the negative sense, we can go beyond merely “unbroken” and see some potential meanings here. The nature of the verb is vividly illustrated in Euripides’
Hippolytos 1239. The chariot-driver has lost control of his horses, and they rush madly onward, dragging the driver behind. Θραύων σάρκας here describes what happens to a body as drags along the ground, banging into rocks and such. Something similar can be seen in Aeschylus’ Persians 196 where the verb describes a chariot torn to pieces as two horses fail to run together. First, the Athenians, as a megalopolis, view Attica as a kind of synoikos, and we might see here a claim to their national unity. Whereas most poleis in the Greek mainland remain small, in control only of their immediate surroundings, Athens is a megalopolis and possesses a territory. The unity of the various demes stemmed in part from Athens’ rather innovative (in the early years) form of democracy. Secondly, we may see this not in a political sense, but a military one. Athens has survived conflicts with Persia, Sparta, the Macedonians, the Gauls, etc. yet it remains unbroken. (N.B. the term does not imply undefeated, and as such is a nice way for the poet to sidestep the matter of national catastrophes in many of these cases and instead focus on the fact that Athens survived and endured.) 956 This is potentially a poignant reading if indeed the Pythaïdes has its early origins in the recovery of fire for the sacred hearth after the sacking of the acropolis by the Persians.

ὁγίοις βωμοίοις ἁφαιστος αἰείθε—The holy altars require no explanation—we see here a typical scene of sacrifice—however, this expression is

956 Cf. Euripides, Cyclops 292: ἱερᾶς τ’ ἀθραυστος Ταινάρου μένει λιμήν, here meaning, “inviolate” or “unattacked, plundered;” Euripides, Hekuba 17: πύργοι τ’ ἀθραυστοι Τρωϊκῆς ἦσαν χθόνος, when Troy’s towers stood “unharmed.” Hesychios, Lexicon s.v. ἁφαιστος: ἰσχυρός, ύγιής, ἀβλαβής, ἀθραυστα, ἀπρόσκοπα.

957 Crusius (1894), 46 noted ἁφαιστος this is not a typical metonym, but did cite a few examples. Fairbanks (1900), 123. Moens (1930), 31 discussed the metonymy at length, citing a catalog of sources.
unique. Athenaios uses the Doric and Aeolic alternate spelling for ἥφαιστος here. In this context, the god Hephaistos functions as a metonymy for fire. There is precedent for this. First, fire and the god are often closely associated in Greek poetry—we find Hephaistos’ flame in reference to the fires of sacrifice and flame that is unquenchable. His name is compounded as an epithet for fire that distinguishes between flames that are sacred or not, and there is precedent for the full metonymy of “Hephaistos” as a word for fire itself, specifically for sacrificial flame. As for αἰθή<ι>, this verb only occurs in the present and imperfect, bringing to fore the inceptive and descriptive flavor of fire as it takes hold and burns. The related adjective αἰθός captures nicely the complexity of its semantic range. It can describe things that are burnt or singed, but also things that glint, gleam, and shine. Hephaistos has a nice resonance with both of these senses, as the smithy is a place of cinders, ash, and fire but it

---

958 As also in Pindar, Olympian Ode 7.35; Sappho, fr. 66.  
960 Cf. Homer, Iliad 17.88: φλογὴ εἰκέλος Ἡφαίστου ἀσβέστῳ.  
961 Cf. Euripides, Orestes 621: ἐς ὄρθις δῷμι ἀνηφαίστῳ πυρὶ; NB, there is the difficulty of interpreting whether this suggests that typical the use of Hephaistos as a word for flame ought to necessarily carry some weight of ‘holiness.’ Cf. Sophokles, Antigone 122: στοράνωμα πῦργον πευκάνθῳ Ἡφαίστου ἔλει, where pine-fed flames to seize the crowns of the towers—one is forced to consider if there is a certain ‘justness’ to the destruction carried by the semantic effects of the word chose for fire.  
962 Cf. Homer, Iliad 2.426: σπλάγχνα δ´ ἀμπείρατες ὑπείρεσιν Ἡφαίστου; Sophokles, Antigone 1006-7: ἐκ δὲ θυμάτων Ἡφαίστος οὐκ ἐλαμπεῖ.  
963 West (1992b), 290 noted that the chromaticism over βομμοιοῖσιν seemed an appropriate musical representation, perhaps, of flickering altar flames.  
964 Cf. Aristophanes, Thesmophorozusai 246: Αἰθός γεγένημαι πάντα τὰ περὶ τὴν τράμιν. The In-Law being dressed as a woman complains that his “ass” has been singed to remove the hair.  
965 Cf. Pindar, Pythian 8.46: αἰθῆς ... ἐπὶ ἀσπίδος. The shield flashes. It is perhaps interesting that the thing flashing on the shield here is a δράκοντα ποικίλων.
produces flashing arms, much like those worn by Athene in line 10, or perhaps the scales of the *drakōn* in Strophe 3.

νέων μῆρα ταύρων⁹⁶⁶ — Once more, the poet describes something eminently recognizable by means of unprecedented formula and word choice. This particular formula has no other extant occurrences.⁹⁶⁷ It seems likely to be at least somewhat associated with an Homeric formula: ἢ εἰ δὴ ποτέ τοι κατὰ πίονα μηρὶ ἐκη ταύρων ἥδ' αἰγῶν, τὸ δὲ μοι κρήην ἐξέλωρ.⁹⁶⁸ Here the priest Chryses invokes the wrath/protection of Apollo by reminding the god of his previous sacrificial offerings. To burn the thighs of bulls at Delphi is not an unusual event, but it is one that must ever remain loaded with a sense of united tradition and purpose. Apollo is a god capable of defending and avenging those who honor him. The *Iliad* begins with such a story, of Apollo shooting his arrows from afar. The popular *Homeric Hymn* tells of his violent acquisition of the Delphic oracle by means of his bow, slaying a monster that was a great evil to the locals. Athenaios’ hymn will briefly recount this event, as well as the god’s warding off foreign invaders in more historical times. The closing of the hymn (mostly lost), if we may compare it with the later hymn by Limenios, likely contained a prayer for the future protection of the god. Moreover, the Pythaïdes inscriptions note that the purpose of these embassies was to sacrifice:

---

⁹⁶⁶ Crusius (1894), 46-47.

⁹⁶⁷ Not only is νέων μῆρα ταύρων a hapax, the association of νέων with ταύρων also appears to be unique.

⁹⁶⁸ Homer, *Iliad* 1.40-1. Cf. Also Homer, *Iliad* 3.179-80: Ποσειδάωνι δὲ ταύρων πόλλ' ἐπὶ μὴρ' ἐθέμεν, as well as Lukian, *Timon* 9.3: μηρὶ ταύρων τε καὶ αἰγῶν πώτατα καύσαντος ἥμιν ἐπὶ τῶν βωμῶν, as well as Lukian, *On Sacrifice* 3.8: καὶ τοσαῦτα σοι μηρὶ ταύρων τε καὶ αἰγῶν ἐκασσά ἐπὶ τῶν βωμῶν. It is interesting (albeit likely insignificant) that goats appear to often be paired with the bulls, but are absent in this hymn.
The Athenians sent [the *theoria*], according to the oracle of the god, on behalf of the health and safety of all the citizens, children and women, as well as friends and allies and they sacrificed the ancestral sacrifices magnificently to the god...

---

This particular adverb has been crucial to earlier attempts to read this strophe as descriptive of a concomitant act—everything happens at once, and the hymn narrates the activity. The LSJ provides definitions that encourage this definition:

“together,” “at once,” “together with,” “along with,” “close at hand,” and “close to.”

This adverb takes a dative as its object when describing time, and here we find *viv*, which is problematic for this reading. However, close association such as indicated by this adverb need not be constrained to chronological simultaneity. There is a degree of flexibility to the use of the term, even with dative objects. Sophokles uses it to refer to accomplishing a task, “With the aid of the gods,” and Homer uses it to describe, “Traveling among the clouds.” Both of these uses are imprecise, and meant to be suggestive rather than explicit; they reveal the adverbial force employed: that of means, manner, accompaniment, and association. To force only the temporal aspect upon this description is to overlook the range of flavors available to adverbs. Moreover, when

---

969 *FD* III, 2 no. 48, line 8-10.

970 Crusius (1894), 46; Moens (1930), 33; prior editors have forced *viv* to be read as a dative, which is problematic. On the other hand, as an accusative object it would seem to offer only a very bland sense of geography—that these further events happen in the same place that the sacrifice occurs. It is perhaps better, I think, to take the full semantic range of ὁμονω ὡς a whole.

971 LSJ s.v. ὁμονω; Smyth §342, 1701.

taking an accusative, this word refers to location. It is far more likely that the poet intends to express that the Athenians offer not only sacrifice, but also burn incense and present a variety of musical gifts. This is a very large theoria, and the day’s events are extensive; the god is richly praised. The adverb allows the full range of activities in honor of the god to be taken together, but does not require simultaneity. I think it best to combine the full spectrum of ‘locus within which’: means, manner, location, time, etc.

νιν—This word is the Doric form of the third-person pronoun, and is employed much as μιν functions in Epic and Ionic dialects as an alternative for οὐτόν and οὐτήν (rarely οὐτό, occasionally as a plural). N.B.: it typically parses as being accusative in case (Cf. Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite 280: ἄξεις δ’ οὐτίκα νιν ποτὶ Ἰλιον ἱνεμόεσσαν; Aeschylus, Agamemnon 162: τοῦτό νιν προσεννέω; etc.). However, in the case of this hymn, this appears problematic, and earlier editors have wished to read it as a dative. There is potential precedent for this, but the prior use of dative νιν consistently stands for a person, whereas the poet here seems to wish it to refer collectively to the act of animal sacrifice just described.

The grammar may feel awkward, and indeed, the choice of the less common νιν over μιν certainly adds flavor to the text, but it is unlikely that the audience would fail to

973 Weil (1893), 578; Crusius (1894), 46; Fairbanks (1900), 123; Moens (1930), 32-3.
974 LSJ s.v. νιν. Smyth §325D, E.
975 Elsewhere, cf. Sophokles, Women of Trachis 145; Sophokles, Oedipus Rex 868; Euripides, Suppliant Women 1139; Theognis, Elegies 1.364 (sometimes written μιν); Pindar, Paean 4.242; Pindar, Fragments 7; etc.
976 Cf. Pindar, Pythian Odes 4.36: οὐδ’ ἀπίθησε νιν (epic form of ἀπειθέω, expects a dative object); Pindar, Nemian Odes 1.66: φάσε νιν δόσειν μόρον; Kallimachos, Pallas’ Bath 96: καὶ νιν Αθαναία πρός τόδ’ ἔλεξεν ἑτος; as well as the Orphic Argonautica 781: ὃς νιν ἐδοξέ. 
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understand the meaning. It has perhaps been unappreciated how powerful this tiny word may be here, as it collects the previous lines and content of Strophe 2; it gathers up the description of the *theoria* and the sacrifice proper, and bundles it into a single pronoun, which then becomes a collective *backdrop* (of both time and place,) against which the contents of the next several lines may be projected. *νίν* provides the context and foundational activity for the additional, accompanying, activities. The incense, song, and dance do not function or occur independently, but as foregrounded components of this act of seeking to please the god. The Pythaïdes inscriptions note that there was magnificent sacrifice, but the following lists of names reveal that there was also a performance of the *paean*, as well as a variety of contests, including song, dance, and perhaps theater—memorable and gratifying delights. The pronoun provides the context, the preceding adverb tightly links the events, and the repeated use of the particle *δὲ* breaks up the offerings into meaningful and separate clauses as well as activities.

Ἅραψ ἄτμος ⁹⁷⁷—In a day where we tend to light fires at night, or cook over a gas or charcoal grill during the day, it is easy to forget the nature of smoke—what a thing of beauty it is as it rises into the sky, ascending until it blurs and diffuses beyond our ability to make it out. Even more, we tend to burn combustibles as fuel for fires, which produces an acrid, dirty, smoke. In ancient Greece, other materials were put to the flames as well. ⁹⁷⁸ W. Burkert described the practice in his inimitable fashion: “Nothing lends a more unique and unmistakable character to an occasion than a distinctive fragrance; fire

---

⁹⁷⁷ Crusius (1894), 47; Fairbanks (1900), 123; Moens (1930), 33; Furley and Bremer (2001), vol. 2, 88-9.
⁹⁷⁸ I have heard that wine burns with a white smoke, and a sweet scent.
speaks not only to eye, ear, and physical sensation but also to the sense of smell. The sacred is experienced as an atmosphere of divine fragrance.” He noted that Homer already sang of “fragrant altars.” Homer, Iliad 8.48; 23.148; Odyssey 8.363. Also Hesiod, Theogony 557: καίωσα’ ὀστέα λευκὰ θυηέτων ἐπὶ βομὼν. Although here note that poets describe scent with the verb θύω. The verb originally referred to the smoke of fumigation (hence the smell) and later became synonymous with sacrificing. NB that FD III,2 48 relies on this verb/noun to describe their sacrifice.

It appears that the Greeks were importing frankincense and myrrh by 700 BCE at the latest, coming from southern Arabia via Phoenician traders. These exotic olfactants were quickly put to use in cultic practice. Incense seems to have played a stronger role in some cults than others, particularly that of Aphrodite. However, we find it in Apolline contexts as well. Sappho, fr. 44 refers to both frankincense and myrrh being mingled as a male chorus calls upon Paeon, the Far-Shooter and skilled Lyre-Player.

To offer incense was a sacrifice itself. However, it could also be but one component of a larger series of actions designed to please the deity. Athenaios’ meaning is clear, but the vocabulary he employs bears some comment. Ἀραψ is kind of metonymy, where the incense burned is described by its geographical place of origin. This word has become our own word “Arab,” and was used in a similar manner among the ancient Greeks to refer to Arabia and those who lived there. However, it is quite

979 Homer, Iliad 8.48; 23.148; Odyssey 8.363. Also Hesiod, Theogony 557: καίωσα’ ὀστέα λευκὰ θυηέτων ἐπὶ βομὼν. Although here note that poets describe scent with the verb θύω. The verb originally referred to the smoke of fumigation (hence the smell) and later became synonymous with sacrificing. NB that FD III,2 48 relies on this verb/noun to describe their sacrifice.


981 Cf. Sappho fr. 2.3-4: βῶμοι δὲ τεθημάμενοι [λι]βανότῳ. The altars smoke with incense in a description of a sanctuary characterized by attention to sensory details (leaves, flowers, trees, water, etc.).

982 Sappho, fr. 44. 30-3: μύρρα καὶ κασία λιβανός τ’ ὀνεμείχητο.

983 Cf. Burkert (1985), 62 wherein he notes, “…to strew a granule of frankincense in the flames is the most widespread, simplest, and also cheapest act of offering.”

984 LSJ s.v. Ἀραψ. Most often in the plural, Cf. Strabo, Geographica 16.4.20.23: εἰς δὲ καὶ ἄλες εὐώδες ἐν Ἀραψι, there are fragrant salts in Arabia. One finds parodic use in Plautus, Miles 2.5.2: arabicus odor.
exceptional in poetry. One primarily finds it later in Nonnos. Incense from Arabia was common, but the use of this term suggests that Athenaios chooses to emphasize its foreignness, eschewing the more expected forms derived from λιβανωτός, the tree from which it is harvested. The use of this incense is so traditional by this point (over five centuries of use) that the use of Ἀραψ is somewhat surprising, drawing attention to the fact that this most Greek practice relies on something not Greek. An exotic word would seem to transform an ordinary action into something exotic, rare, perhaps pricey, and therefore magnificent.

ἀτμός basically means “steam” or “vapor,” and is therefore suited for describing the effect of burning frankincense. The meaning is equal to ‘smoke,’ as one finds Hesiod using it to refer to vapor rising from the earth under Zeus’ blows as he fought Typhoeos. Hesiod likens it to what rises above a crucible. In addition, Aeschylos has Cassandra use it to describe the scent of a grave, a scent the chorus has just described as belonging to a sacrificial altar. Immediately following Cassandra’s correction, the chorus clarifies that they were talking about a “Syrian ἀγλάσιμα” pervading the house. The ambiguity here suggests that the term does not refer to the scent itself, but the means by which it is carried. In the Eumenides, he uses it to refer to the breath of the Erinyes. Hesychios puts us on firmer ground with his definition—it is that which rises up from a ‘moist’ thing. The

---

985 Cf. Nonnos, Dionysiaka 36.326: Ἀραψ ἐμελαίνει το θόρηξ, Arabian armor; 26.23: δό τ’ οὐκ Ἀράβεσσιν ὑπερφιάλοσιν ἀνάσασις, “that you do not rule over the proud Arabs.” It is, of course, obvious that later texts do not serve as intertexts for earlier texts, but they can, in fact, reveal possible latent connections, and there is something very interesting about yet another occurrence of this word in Nonnos.

986 Hesiod, Theogony 861-866.

987 Aeschylos, Agamemnon 1311: δέμοιος ἀτμός ὀσπερ ἐκ τάφου πρέπει. NB Aristotle, Problems 908a defines smell as a type of ἀτμός.

988 Aeschylos, Eumenides 138.
Greeks saw the rising of vapor from heated substances as being the separation of the ‘moist’ and the ‘dry.’ He provides interesting synonyms: καπνός (smoke) and πνοή (breeze, blast, breath). Athenaios uses the word for burning incense, and there is poor precedent for this. There is, however, a later source which maps quite nicely onto this context. It is obvious that later texts do not serve as intertexts for earlier texts, but they can, in fact, reveal possible latent connections, and there is something very interesting about yet another occurrence of this word in Nonnos. In Book 5, after Cadmus has slain the drakōn, sacrifice is offered, and we told that an ἀτμός “curled/twisted” its way through the air, an ἀτμός of Assyrian libanos (the tree from which Frankincense is harvested). There is no precedent for these two terms appearing together. Again, Athenaios offers a clear meaning, but prefers unexpected vocabulary, allowing for an interesting set of potential resonances. The exoticism of Ἀραψ is combined with a noun that that has some very interesting semantic ‘baggage’ attached to it. Incense is supposed to smell good, but ἀτμός has rather inconsistent quality to it.

ἐς Ὄλυμπον ἀνακίθνηται—Aside from the orthography problems with Ὄλυμπον (the reversal of O and Y) this is a simple, yet interesting phrase. There is a clear sense in describing the smoke rising to the ‘realm of the gods,’ which is how this must be understood. After all, the poet has spoken as if the god himself is at this place in Delphi, and there is no sense conveyed that Apollo has somehow run off to one of the

---

989 Hesychios, Lexicon s.v. ἀτμός.
990 Nonnus Dionysiaka 5.29-30: καὶ θυόεις ἐλέλυκτο δι’ ἥρος ἀτμός ἀληθές Ἀσσυρίς λιβάνοιο.
991 Weil (1893), 578; Crusius (1894), 47; Moens (1930), 32-3.
mountains named Olympos. Olympos in this line is not a real mountain, like Helikon of line 1, or Parnassos of line 5 and the local context in which the paean is performed. This is the Olympos of the mythical realm, where the gods dwell. There is an interesting cognitive dissonance to the explicit geography of this hymn, with emphasis on mountains, which belong to the gods, and this less tangible mountain mentioned here. Perhaps it is here in this phrase that the poem pivots again. In Strophe 1, we have an imagined theoria of the god and goddesses joining with the mortals. Strophe 2, as it describes the altars and sacrifice, sets us down within a real scene. Mortals may imagine the gods to be present, but their lack of visibility requires some degree of ‘othering’ in order to resolve the cognitive dissonance. As the incense rises to this ‘other’ place, not quite on the map, we find the mortals busy doing what mortals do when they worship—they engage in song and dance. Here we do not find the sort of scene found in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo (lines 182-206), where Apollo and the Muses, along with other deities, sing and dance—even though it is clear that this is the sort of event suggested by the summons of Strophe 1. Rather, the mortals do this. This is particularly clear in line 15-16 where the kithara is played. Apollo does not play, and the presence of the adjective χρυσέα attached to the kithara reminds us the he is the divine player of the stringed instrument. Moreover, it is the kithara that is found here, rather than the phorminx or lyre. Singing of the incense rising “up to Olympos” leaves the singers grounded, in the world of mortals.

ἀνακιδναται is a slightly more complex word, in form rather than meaning. This particular compound is unprecedented, but other closely derived forms are quite common. The compound ἀνακιδναμαι is an unexpected form, as κίδνημι (active in form)
tends to compound as ἐπικιδναμαί, “to spread over,” which obviously does not suit the nature of incense. 992 The closely related σκεδάννυμαι, meaning “to scatter” or “to disperse” offers a helpful parallel, as it does compound with ἀνα-, as well as other prefixes. 993 There is no confusion over the meaning of the term, and no difficulty in allowing the compound to occur. However, once again Athenaios manages to recognizably describe the familiar in an unfamiliar way. There is yet another poetic advantage to what he has done here, as he has once again managed to fit in ἀνα-. The preposition appears to be a favorite device of his to fill two short syllables, and he brings it back again and again. 994 He uses it at least five times in this short hymn.

λιγύς 995 — This adjective stands in contrast to the word that will follow λωτοῦς, the participle βρέμων. Something that is λιγύς is easy to hear because it is clear, which for the Greeks, meant thin or high-pitched. It freely compounds with nouns that it appropriately describes, especially in epic and lyric poetry. In early usage it is a positive attribute: there are clear-voiced heralds, 996 clear-voiced Muses, 997 clear-toned

992 LSJ s.v. ἀνακιδναμαί; κίδνημι; ἐπικιδναμαί. Cf. ἐπι- compounds in Homer, Iliad 2.850 (water); 7.451, 458(fame).
993 LSJ and Chantraine (1968) s.v. σκεδάννυμαι. It occurs only in the present and imperfect. Cf. Homer, Iliad 8.1; 23.227 (dawn). For ἀνα- cf. Plutarch, Pyrrhus 22: τοῖς βέλεσι τοῖς βαρβάροις ἀνασκεδάζας, where the barbarians are scattered by arrows. Crusius noted that the Σ often drops from composite forms in poetry, that ἀνασκεδάννυμι and ἀνασκιδνήμι are both demonstrable forms, and he noted, most helpfully the comparable lines in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter, 277-278: ὀδίμη δ’ ἵμαρκεσα θηρύντων ἀπὸ πέπλων | σκίδνατο, where a lovely smell spreads from her fragrant robes; also applicable is Pindar fr. 130.6f ὀδίμα δ’ ἐρατόν κατὰ χόρον κίδναται | αἰεὶ θὰ μηγήντων πυρὶ τηλερανθαί παντοτὰ θεῶν ἐπὶ βοιμοῖς. There is no difficulty to this word, nevertheless poetic innovation is present.
994 Weil (1893), 578 noted the usefulness of this short word.
995 Moens (1930), 34; Furley and Bremer (2001), vol. 2, 89.
996 Cf. Homer, Iliad 2.50 and Odyssey 2.6: κηρύκεσαι λιγυφθόγγοι.
instruments, and piercing nature sounds. Depending on the noun with which it associates, the particular effect of the clarity would seem to range from far-carrying, that is to say piercing, to instruments and voices with pleasing attributes, which we often find translated as “sweet.” Later uses that are post-Hesiod seem to be overwhelmingly located in tragic lyric and associated with lamentation and mourning. It is employed to describe shrill wailing, and the sorrowful sounds of the nightingale. There is precedent for the association of this adjective with the metonymy lotos. The full range of meaning seems appropriate to the aulos, as it is an instrument capable of a wide range of effects dependent upon the skill of the musician. One may bring sweet tone forth, or force a shrillness, depending upon the demands of context and nomos.

λωτοῦ—Another metonymy, this is a common word used to refer to a diverse array of plants, but frequently employed to musical instruments made from wood. More than any stringed instrument, the presence of the aulos signifies a ritual context. It was the instrument commonly played throughout the ritual of sacrifice (excepting the

997 Cf. Homer, Odyssey 24.62. Μούσα λίγεια; Hesiod, Shield 206: Μούσα Πιερίδες, λιγύ μελομενης ευφως. An interesting passage is found in Plato, Phaedros 237A-B, wherein Socrates invokes the Muses, and suggests that they are λίγεια due either to quality of their song, or because they are in some way connected with the musical race (γένος μουσικὸν) of the Ligyians (Λιγύων).
1000 Aeschylus, Persians 332: λιγέα κοικύματα.
1001 Sophokles, Oedipos at Kolonos 671-3: ἡ λίγεια μινύρεται θεαμώσα μάλιστα.
1002 Euripides, Heracles 892-3: ἐμοι χορὸς μὲν ἕδυς, εἰ λίγεια | λωτοῦ χάρις ἐνι δατὶ.
1003 Weil (1893), 578; Crusius (1894), 48; Moens (1930), 34; Furley and Bremer (2001), vol. 2, 89.
1004 West (1992b), 86 noted that pipes might be made of a variety of materials, including bone, ivory, or metal as well as wood.
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moment when the victim is slain, where it is replaced by the vocal *ololugma*, which in many ways is comparable). Euripides offers a useful precedent:

σελαγεῖτο δ᾽ ἄν᾽ ἄστυ
πῦρ ἐπιβόμιον Αργείων·
λωτός δὲ φθόγγον κελάδει
κάλλιστον, Μουσάν θεράπον

Altar-fire blazed throughout the city of the Argives, and the Lotos-Pipe, servant of the Muses, sounded its most-beautiful voice.\(^{1005}\)

In poetic usage, it is commonly depicted as present for times of celebration (which would include, but are not limited to, sacrifice): E.g., when the Trojan *parthenai* dance about the wooden horse,\(^{1006}\) and when the Muses arrive for the marriage of Peleus.\(^{1007}\) It is not always a joyful sound, however, as it is also the instrument of choice of mourning and lamentation.\(^{1008}\)

Additionally, the *aulos* (the *λωτὸς*) was particularly associated with Apollo and the Delphic narrative. Strabo tells us that in the early 6\(^{th}\) c. BCE, the Amphyctiones expanded the competitions at the Pythian Games by adding athletic contests and additional musical formats to the original practice of *kitharoedes* performing a *paean* for the god. He tells us specifically of *aulos*-players and *kitharists* who played without

\(^{1005}\) Euripides, *Electra* 714-17.

\(^{1006}\) Cf. Euripides, *Trojan Women* 544-5: Λιβως τε λωτός ἐκτύπει Φρύγια τε μέλεα, παρθένοι δ᾽ ἄεριον ἄμα κρότων ποδόνβουας τ᾽ ἐμελλὼν εὐφρον.

\(^{1007}\) Cf. Euripides, *Iphigenia at Aulis* 1036-1046: τίν᾽ ἄρ᾽ ὑμεναίος διὰ λωτὸν Λιβωμετά τε φιλοχόρου κιθάρας σωρίγγων θ᾽ ὑπὸ καλαμώσσαν ἐπατασαν ἵχθων. There is a significant amount of resonance in this passage, due to the piling up vocabulary, especially as the passage continues, describing the wooded slopes of Pelion: ἐν ὅρεσι κλέουσαν Πηλιάδα καθ᾽ ύλαν.

\(^{1008}\) Cf. Euripides, *Helen* 170-2: ἔχουσαι Λιβων λωτὸν ἢ σῶριγγας ἢ φόρμιγγας. This is music for lamentation, which Helen was call a *paean* in line 177. She, instead of invoking the Muses, instead calls up the Sirens, daughters of Earth.
singing (χορὶς φῶς). They performed a certain melos that he says was called the nomos Pythikos. This particular nomos was a musical representation of Apollo’s famous duel with the drakōn, previous guardian, and prior possessor of the Delphic Tripod. To make mention of the aulos in this hymn is to continue to flesh out the image of altars burning with sacrifice, and to concomitantly evoke the long and famous tradition of musical competitions at Delphi, thus bringing into focus both aspects of the theoria’s raison d’être—to sing and to sacrifice.

The pipe is, however, not limited to Apollo, and it is worth noting its use in Bacchic contexts, in light of the possible resonances that have been observed in this hymn; of particular interest here are is an occurrence in Euripides’ Bacchai:

μέλπετε τὸν Δίωνυσον βαρυβρόμων ὑπὸ τυμπάνων, εὐδία τὸν εὐδιὸν ἁγαλλόμεναι θεόνεν Φρυγίαντα βοᾷς ἐνοπαίσι τε, λωτὸς θυάτηρ εὐκέλαδος ἱερὸς ἱερὰ παίγματα βρέμη σύνοχα φοιτάσιν εἰς ὅρος εἰς ὅρος.

Celebrate Dionysos with song, with deep-roaring drums! Cry out, honoring his Divine-Shout with Phrygian shouts and cries, whenever the tuneful Lotos-Pipe roars its sacred, playful, strains, joining together with those who roam from mountain to mountain.1010

Lines 145-6 just prior describe Bacchus as holding aloft a flaming torch, which is fragrant with smoke of the Syrian libanos tree (this is frankincense). The elements of worship are strikingly similar, even if the mood seems quite different.1011 Whether or not an audience member would think of the Bacchae, the λωτὸς would be familiar to them,

1009 Strabo, Geography 9.3.10. τι μέλος ὃ καλεῖται νόμος Πυθικός. This event will be treated in greater depth and detail in the final chapter.
1010 Euripides, Bacchae 155-16.
1011 Euripides, Bacchae 687 also mentions the Lotos, here the wild choruses of women lie on the ground. The messenger informs that they are not drunk with wine, or λωτοῦ ψόφῳ. The music of the aulos here is represented as a possible intoxicant.
not just as an instrument present at sacrifice, or festival performance, but also more wild forms of revelry.

βρέμων

—Little need be said of this participle here, as the semantic range associated with this word and other closely related has already been discussed at length in Strophe 1. Two things must be noted, however. First, this word does not repeat the epithet of Zeus found in line 2, ἐριβρόμου. This descriptive form actually does have precedent elsewhere as a component in epithets relating to Zeus. While it is not a repetition, per se, the fact remains that this term could easily resonate with line 2 in the ears of the audience. The second factor that must be noted is that this word pushes against the adjective λαγὸ that has just been sung. Rather than any “clear” or “sweet” tone, this participle instead emphasizes noisiness, suggesting that the pipes produce a brash sort of sound. Nevertheless, it is not entirely unsuitable in its association with the aulos—Aristophanes mockingly conjures up a chorus of ‘clouds’ rather than Muses, and has them sing of sacrificial ritual for the gods, and spring, when the city Dionysia is celebrated with rival choruses and μοῦσα βαρύβρομος αὐλῶν (deep-roaring music of the pipes).

Here, of course, we find βρό-rather than βρε-, but in some ways this makes it even more useful as a possible resonance. As noted in Strophe 1, loud-roaring pipes were used as battle signals, and to make use of βρέμων here, potentially sets up some expectation for the battle narrative to come in the Strophe 3. Pindar used it of the voice, and the lyre—the following phrase of this strophe will mention stringed

---

1012 Moens (1930), 34; Furley and Bremer (2001), vol. 2, 89.
1013 Aristophanes, Clouds 313.
1014 Greek Anthology 6.195: αὐλῶν ἐριβρεμέταν.
instruments. Finally, however, we find that the apparent tension between the “clear” and “loud” has a literary precedent in Aeschylos, but in the context of lament.

This word will be treated in much greater depth when addressing the matter of the *drakōn* in line 23. Only a portion of that discussion is relevant to the context of the pipes and music. At its most generic level, this adjective means, “quick moving, nimble.” Yet the Greeks employ it very broadly. In this context, we may imagine that it suggests a *nimble* melody—that is, a tune that either progresses rapidly, with flurries of notes, or perhaps instead a song with frequent and interesting interval jumps. Greek melodies accompanied by lyrics are severely limited by the positioning of pitch accents over specific vocabulary. A purely instrumental piece is free to ascend and descend at will. Perhaps in addition to “nimble” as a fair translation, we might consider this word as suggestive of *interesting*, or even *colorful*, melodies. On the other hand, if we take into consideration the possibility that the pipes may accompany a chorus; perhaps this may describe the motions of dancers.

---

1015 Pindar, *Nemian Ode* 11.7: λύρα δέ σφι βρέμει καὶ ἀοιδά.
1016 Aeschylus, *Suppliant Women* 112-115: τοιαῦτα πάθεα μέλεα θρεομένα λέγω, λαγέα βαρέα δακρυοπετή, η̣ ἣ ἤ, ἤλέμοις ἐμπετὴ. Such are the sad sufferings that I speak and cry of, grievous, keening, tear-falling sufferings—iē, iē! It is worth noting this context, and the cries of ἤ, as the unexpected exclamation of ἤ in Strophe 4 will suggest something disturbingly similar.
1017 Weil (1893), 578; Crusius (1894), 48; Fairbanks (1900), 123; Moens (1930), 34.
1018 LSJ, s.v. αἰώλος.
1019 The term is later considered synonymous with ποικίλος. Weil suggested it might be glossed with πολυφώνοις (many-voiced).
μ[έ]λεσιν ὀἰδαῖν\(^{1020}\) — These words echo lines 3 and 4, where the Muses were commanded to come sing and dance as a chorus for Apollo. In this context, refocused firmly into the realm of mortals, we now see these words applied to what must be a chorus of mortals. While the preceding words have been strongly suggestive of instrumental performance, this pair makes it quite clear that singing to the accompaniment of the pipes is also part of the performance. Athenaios has chosen to do something interesting with his phrasing here, as he has delayed ὀἰδαῖν all the way the end of the clause. The text reads λιγὺς λυτοῦς βρέμων ἀειόλοις μέλεσιν ὀἰδαῖν κρέκει, and up until ὀἰδαῖν it is quite easily read as an instrumental performance. There are two verbal components—a participle and a finite verb, and the word order is suggestive that we might find two different kinds of performance, poetically conflated. That is to say, both instrumental performance as well as an accompanied chorus may be suggested. To illustrate, I note that the Pythaïdes inscription wherein we find the name of Athenaios lists two aulos players (Nikokrates son of Diophans and Pamphilos son of Pamphilos) but also lists an auloidon, an aulos player that accompanies a vocalist, named Theobios son of Aristomenes.\(^{1021}\) It seems possible that both kinds of pipe playing occurred at the festival.

κρέκει\(^{1022}\) — Some editors have found this an unexpected verb as it typically refers to a “strike,” such as occurs in the plucking of strings with a plectrum.\(^{1023}\) But there is no

\(^{1020}\) Crusius (1894), 48; Moens (1930), 34; Furley and Bremer (2001), vol. 2, 89.

\(^{1021}\) FD III, 2 no. 47.

\(^{1022}\) Weil (1893), 578; Crusius (1894), 48; Fairbanks (1900), 123; Moens (1930), 34; Furley and Bremer (2001), vol. 2, 89-90.
difficulty. The word means, “to weave,” and as such could be considered to make reference to the sounds of the loom as it is operated, but it is an easier transference to compare the upright threads of the loom with the string of the kithara or lyre, and see the word as a reference to “operating” the stringed-device. As a comparable transference of idiom we might compare the use of ῥάπσαμαι (to stitch) and ῥαφώδεω (to recite poems). In the same way that bards ‘stitch’ their poems together, kithara players ‘weave’ their tunes.

Once established as a way of describing the playing of the kithara, it becomes easy for it to specifically describe the act of playing itself—the striking with plectrum. However, if we keep the general sense of operating the strings, then we can transfer a very generic sense of “playing” an instrument over to the *aulos* without need to explain away the problem of there being no plectrum or “striking.” What is more, there is precedent—Aristophanes uses the verb with *aulos* to poetically refer to the song of the nightingale.\footnote{Aristophanes, *Birds* 682-4: ἀλλ`, ὦ καλλιβάν κρέας κρέας αὐλόν φοβήμασιν ἠρνομενὸν ἄρης τῶν ἀναπαίστων, But, weaving the handsome-sounding *aulos*, with springtime cries, begin the Anapests!} Theokritos uses it in an epigram with a stringed instrument, but a careful reading will notice that there is flexibility in how one must translate:

\[
\text{Λῆς ποτὶ τὰν Νυμφᾶν διόμοις αὐλοίσιν ἀεὶσαι ἀδυ τί μοι; κήψῳ πακτίδ᾽ ἀειράμενος ἄρξεῖμαι τι κρέκειν,}
\]

Play me something sweet on the twinned *auloi*? And I too will start to play (strike?) something, taking up my *paktis*.\footnote{Theokritos, *Epigram* 5.}

Firstly, while the πηκτίς is primarily understood as a Lydian stringed instrument, it seems to have been played with the *fingers*, not a plectrum (plucking and striking are...
not at all the same thing). And what is more, this term can also refer to the shepherd’s panpipe.

In either case, “to strike” is unsuitable in reference to this instrument, and “to play” seems more appropriate. Moreover, while Hesychios may define κρέκαι as κιθαρίζει, the Suda in contrast glosses κρέκουσα with ἀθλοῦσα. κρέκει here should simply be understood as meaning “to play.”

χρυσέα ἀδύθρου|ς | κιθαρίς—See Strophe 1 for a discussion on the role of “golden” as a divine epithet, implying “immortal.” Here, however, the context is quite mortal, and the instrument referenced is made of perishable materials, yet the lingering presence of this adjective reminds us that stringed instruments belong to Apollo. To describe an instrument as “golden” is quite common in Greek literature in either simplex or compound form. Pindar names the golden phorminx as a possession of Apollo and the Muses, and Aristophanes’ chorus invokes Apollo as the god who has the golden lyre, and Hesychios notes χρυσοκίθαρις in his Lexicon. Apollo tends to play the lyre or phorminx, and so the kithara is not commonly golden, but the nature of the divine

1026 LSJ s.v. πηκτίς.
1027 Cf. Greek Anthology 9.586: Πάν φίλε, πηκτίδα μή μιν τεοὶ ἐπὶ χεῖλεσί σῶρων, Dear Pan, stay here trailing the paktis with your lips.
1028 Hesychios, Lexicon K s.v. κρέκει.
1029 Suda, Lexicon K, s.v. κρέκουσα.
1030 Crusius (1894), 48; Fairbanks (1900), 123; Moens (1930), 34-5.
1031 Pindar, Pythian Odes 1.1-2: χρυσέα φόρμιγξ, Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ ἱππολόκυμων σύνδικον Μοιξῖν κτέανον.
instrument is transposed upon the mortal instruments described at this sacrifice. It is possible that this line is self-referential to the paean itself, as it would likely have been accompanied by a kithara, but Pythaïdes inscriptions suggest that there could easily have been songs sung to the kithara above and beyond the grand paean, as well as instrumental, even competitive, performances.

If a golden kithara is somewhat unusual, the descriptor ἁδύθροος is quite exceptional. It is a rare, but not unknown compound formed from the adjective ἡδύς (ἁδ- is the Doric form) and the noun ῥόος (ῥοῦς is an Attic spelling). It means “noise,” but of a specific kind—namely that “of many voices.” In poetry it can describes musical sounds; ῥόος compounds with other words, and so there is no real difficulty when encountering unusual variants. Compounded with ἡδύς, it quite clearly means “sweet-sounding,” and if the plurality of ‘noise/voices’ is retained, it appears to be superbly suited to describing a stringed instrument. This form is rare, but we find it in Euripides, where it describes the music of the pan-pipes, and again in the Greek Anthology, it is an epithet of Dionysos.

---

1033 LSJ s.v. ῥόος. Homer, Iliad 4.437 uses it to refer to the sounds of the poly-lingual Trojans when gathered: οὗ γὰρ πάντων ἥν ὁμὸς ῥόος οὐδὲν γῆρος.
1034 Pindar, Nemian Odes 7.81: πολύφατον ῥόον ἔμνην, the much-famed sound of hymns. It is interesting to see it appear as the compound ὰμόθροος in Nonnus, Dionysiaka as description of auloï, Cf. 7.49; as well as διδυμόθροος (getting at that multi-voiced nature), Cf. 10.335; 12.148.
1035 Euripides, Elektra 703: Πάνα Μοῦσαν ἁδύθροον πνείοντ᾽.
1036 Greek Anthology 9.524.8.
A hymnos is slightly more precise in meaning than an ode, but only insofar as it limits the song to the praise of a deity; it says little beyond this. \(\alpha ν\alphaμέλπεται\) clearly harkens back to lines 3 and 4 where we find the chorus of the Muses summoned, as well as 14-15 immediately prior wherein aulos songs are referenced. The reoccurrence of \(\alpha ν\alpha\) seems to reinforce the tightly bound form of this hymn, but Athenaios manages to fill his two short syllables with a delightful effect. As the kithara raises up its song, we find an echo of the burning incense, and even the bones on the altars—worship rises up to Olympos. These hymns ascend to the god to be a pleasing agalma in the same way as the other performative acts that intend to bring honor and delight to Apollo. Once more, as with the aulos, the poet suggests a conflation of performances here—we find the plural of hymnos here. The kithara has a voice of its own, and the use of the dative, \(\upsilon\muνοισιν\), quite strongly suggests the voices of the chorus. Again the Pythaïdes inscription is helpful. We find a total of seven kitharists (including Limenios the son of Thoinos) but also two kitharoides, who play the kithara as accompaniment for voices. Here the strophe ends.

1037 Weil (1893), 578; Crusius (1894), 48; Moens (1930), 35.

1038 Cf. Furley (2007), 129-131. Part of the confusion over what hymnos signifies as a form or genre stems from the fact that the Greeks appear to use the term loosely and inconsistently. E.g. Pindar’s hymns seem arbitrarily excluded from other categories such as paean, and the Homeric Hymns seem quite suitable for solo rhapsodic performance as opposed to the choral context one expects from cult song.

1039 Strabo, Geography 9.3.8.24 narrates the early expansion of events at the Pythian Games, and he notes that the original event of kithara accompanied songs was then added to by solo instrumental kithara playing (κιθαριστὰς χωρὶς φόδης).
Strophe 3

16 θαρις ὑμνοισιν ἀναμέλπεται. Ὁ δὲ [ (visual strophe break)
17 ὠών πρόπας ἑσύμοις ΑΘΗΙΔΑ ΓΑΡ ΛΑΧΩ[

---

column 2

18 ἤξιε κλωτὸν παῖδα μεγάλου [Δίος
19 ἦρ' ἀκρονιφή τόνδε πάγον, αἄμβροτ
20 πᾶσι θνατοῖς προφαίνει[
21 τρ]ίποδα μαντειεῖον ὡς εἰει[λεξ . . . ἐ-
22 φρ]ουόρειει δράκων, ὅτε τέ[
23 ]ηῆσας, αἰώνον ἐλκτάν[
24 ]σοφήμαθ' ἰεὺς ἀθώπε[ντ'
25 ]δὲ Γάλαταί μῦρης[
26 ]ν ἐπέρασε' ἀσέπτ[
27 ]ς. ΑΛΛ' ὕω γεένναν[

The whole swarm of [] who have Attica as their allotted portion
They [] the Famed Son of Great Zeus
] this snow-peaked hill, immortal [
] to all mortals he shines forth prophecies [
Prophetic Tripod, as you took [
The drakōn guarded, when you [
] twisting coils [
] hisses you shot, implacable [
] and the Galatian Ares [
] piercing through, unholy [

ό δὲ [ ]ωόν1040—It is nearly certain that this fragmentary word would have been a plural noun functioning as the genitive object of the following two words: “the whole swarm of ________.” Various options have been proposed, but it is impossible to

1040 Weil (1893), 577; Weil (1894), 361; Crusius (1894), 48-9; Powell (1925), 145; Moens (1930), 37; Furley and Bremer (2001), vol.2, page 90.
have any certainty regarding the different options for restoration. As such I comment only briefly on the options.

Weil initially proposed θεωρῶν, assuming the performers were referenced, in parallel with line 9. The supplement of νεώρων proposed by Crusius was more compelling while it was thought that this text dated to the 138/7 performance; there is no record of a chorus of technitai, but rather it is believed that a youth chorus performed, albeit under the direction of two guild members. A better reading of the traces on the stone led Weil to modify his proposal to τεχνιτωῶν, which kept the sense. This became the default reading, and was affirmed once editorial consensus dated the hymn to 128/7.\footnote{FD III, 2 no. 47, dated to 187/7 BCE details the guild-members present at the Pythaïdes that year, specifically naming those who participated in the great chorus: τοὺς ἀνυσμένους τὸν παιόνα εἰς τὸν θεὸν. 39 names are recorded on the list, including that of Athenaios, whom most believe to be the author. The text names this the “great chorus.” Τοῦ μεγάλου χοροῦ.} An additional argument for this supplement has been the presence of the word in Limenios’ hymn (line 20). Furley and Bremer found the arguments concerning date of performance to still be somewhat unconvincing. As such, they proposed that we might supplement χορευτωῶν, a meaning appropriate for either date, but one they were inclined to favor only in the case of a 138/7 performance; they still found it preferable to retain τεχνιτωῶν if the 128/7 date was sustained. I find both their supplement and concerns to have little grounding. I find no reason to reject χορευτωῶν, even if the dating permits the technitai to be present, at least in terms of their justification for 138/7. However, there is a larger difficulty concerning the grounds of their arguments. All editors have assumed that the word must refer to the performers alone, based in part on the proposed
restorations for ζει in lines 17/18. Yet, the language of the hymn here is inclusive, even if descriptive. Surely we do not read the “whole swarm” in this line, or Attica personified in line 9 in Strophe 2 as referring to just a single small sub-group of the entire theoria? If, perhaps, nearly 500 Athenians were present, the technitai would represent only a small portion of the group as a whole. Moreover, just because Limenios uses a word does not require Athenaios to have done so; Limenios quite clearly uses it to refer to the guild-members as a subset of the whole, or as an additional group, as he joins λαὸς αὐτὸ[ο]χθόνων to the group of technitai with the conjunction ἦδε. 1043

The practice of supplementing and interpreting one text by comparison to another similar text, rather than embracing a rich tradition of variance, slavishly avoids the reality that poetic creativity thrives on difference and innovation. As no more suited term immediately presents itself, I leave this lacuna blank; it is my view that a satisfactory supplement must adequately serve here to encompass the whole of the theoria. I find it a far preferable solution to leave the word fragmentary, and instead allow the strongly poetic and description language of the extant words to carry the weight of meaning. As will be seen, it would appear that ἑσμὸς has more of interest to say here than any of these mentioned restorations is likely to have contributed.

πρόπας – This compound adjective is an intensified form of πᾶς, πᾶσα, πᾶν. The adverb πρό frequently combines as a prepositional prefix, with various uses, but often

1042 Most editors have assumed that it is some form of κιθαρίσει. Cf. Weil (1893), 575; Crusius (1894), 35; Moens (1930), 38; Furley and Bermer (2001), 90.

1043 Limenios 19-20.
with the sense of intensification. πᾶς in a generic sense obviously needs no intensification, but nevertheless this compound is quite common in epic as well as tragic poetry, particularly in lyric chorus. The most common usage is a pairing with ἡμαρ to describe an activity that continues “on and on” all day long. In Homer’s *Iliad* the gods feast all day long, with the Muses and Apollo providing music and song, and in the *Odyssey*, we see mortals feasting all day as well. While not always a matter of song and/or feasting, it functions nearly as a formulaic expression for “all day.” Other uses emphasize the collective function of the word: Homer’s catalogue of ships opens with a reference to, “the leaders of the ships, and all the ships;” Aeschylus uses it to poetically refer to a geographic collective or a collective household; Sophokles, *Oedipus Tyrannos* gives perhaps the most comparable usage, in reference to a whole company being sick. While most commonly used poetically to describe duration of time, it has clear precedent as having collective force: the whole of ____ taken as one. It is in this function that it is paired with the following ἐσμός, continuing the practice of describing crowds, perhaps mixed and complex, in united praise of Apollo.

1048 Aeschylus, *Prometheus Bound* 407: πρόπασα δ’ ἡδη στονόνεν λέλωκε χώρα, all lands; Persians 548-9: νῦν γὰρ πρόπασα δὴ στένειαὶ Ἀσία ἐκκενουμένα, all the land of Asia.
1049 Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 1011: πρόπας δόμος, the whole house.
1050 Sophokles, *Oedipus Tyrannos* 169-170: νοσῆ δὲ μοι πρόπας στόλος. Also comparable is Aeschylus, Persians 434: καὶ πρόπαντι βαρβάρων γένει, the whole race of barbarians.
It is perhaps especially relevant in this context, as a description of the sacred embassy sent by Athens. Depending upon the dating of this festival and performance, it is quite possible that an impressive group of performers is present (from 300 to 500 people, perhaps), not only as dancers and singers of this hymn, but as an even larger crowd of artists who have come for additional performances.

ἑσμὸς — The LSJ defines this word as “that which settles,” especially “a swarm of bees.” In common usage, the association with bees is frequent, but the concept of a collective swarm is also extended poetically to other groupings, including humans. Plato describes a clan relocating like a swarm of bees; Aeschylos applies the term to the sons of Aegyptos; Aristophanes describes women swarming outside the gate, and applies it to human behavior in general; the Greek Anthology includes examples wherein it describes a group of lovers. More than bees can swarm, yet they remain a

---

1051 Moens (1930), 38; Furley and Bremer (2001), 90.
1052 LSJ s.v. ἑσμὸς.
1053 NB that a the swarm may be at rest, crammed together, or may function as an analogy. Cf. Pausanias, Description of Greece: 9.31.2.5: ἑσμοὶ μελισσῶν; Appian, Civil War 2.10.68.21: μελισσῶν ἑσμὸς ἐπὶ τοὺς βωμοὺς ἐκάθισε; Herodotus, Histories 5.114: δὲ τῆς κεφαλῆς καὶ ἡδή εὐσύςς κούλης, ἑσμὸς μελισσῶν ἐσόδος ἐς αὐτήν; Xenophon, Hellenika 3.2.29: ὡς δὲ ἤσθετο δ ὁ δήμος ὅτι οὐ τέθνηκεν ὁ Θρασυδαῖος, περιπλήσθη ἡ οἰκία ἐνθην καὶ ἐνθεν, ὀσπερ ὑπὸ ἑσμοῦ μελιττῶν ὁ ἤγεμών; Diodorus Siculus, Bibliotheca Historica 19.2.9.2: πρὸς ἡν μελισσῶν ἑσμὸς προςκαθήτας.
1054 Plato, Laws: 708B: ὅταν μὴ τὸν τὸν ἐραστῶν ἠγητηα τρόπον, ἐν γένος ἀπὸ μιᾶς ὑν χώρας οἰκίζεται. Kallimachos, Aetia 12.3 (very fragmentary) likely uses the term in a similar manner to refer to Chersicrates, a Bacchiad from Corinth, leading a colony (as a swarm) to Corcyra: ἑσμὸν ἄγων. For commentary on these fragments, cf. pgs. 171-2 in vol.2 of A. Harder (2012) Kallimachos’ Aetia.
1055 Suppliants 30: ἑσμὸν ὑβριστήν Αἰγυπτογενῆ.
1056 Aristophanes, Lysistrata 353: ἑσμὸς γυναικῶν.
1057 Aristophanes, Wasps 1107: ἔχελεγέντες γὰρ καθ’ ἑσμοῦς ὀσπερ εἰς ἀνθρήνια.
1058 Greek Anthology 6.1.2: τὸν ἔραστῶν ἑσμὸν; 9.621.5: ἑσμὸν ἔραστὼν.
comparable metaphor for mortals—they may sit at peace, like a swarm of doves. The metaphorical use may be extended further, in order to perhaps animate otherwise inanimate objects or abstract concepts: swarms of sicknesses, swarms of words as a debate, or swarms of crowns (victories). There is an unusual use in Euripides, Bacchai wherein streams of milk bursting from the ground are described as ἑσμοὶ. There is another interesting attachment to this text found in Hesychios. Under the lexicon entry for θίασος, the specific usage in Bacchai 56 is glossed by him as ἐσθ᾿ ὅτε δὲ καὶ τὸ Βακχικόν· ἢ ἑσμὸς γυναικῶν. While Euripides did not use the term this way, it would seem that the appearance and behavior of Bacchic revelry may be described with this metaphor, which is interesting, as there is a continued sense that the author of this hymn wishes the chorus to be envisioned in such a manner. This gets clearer and more interesting when one recalls Kallimachos, Aetia 2.2, wherein he describes the ἑσμὸς of Muses. The immediately following words will make it quite clear that these lines are meant to echo the first lines of the hymn, and therefore it is quite possible that the Bacchic resonances of the initial lines are meant to transfer to this mortal, Athenian theoria as well.

1059 Aeschylus, Suppliants: 223 ἐν ἁγνῷ δ᾿ ἑσμὸς ὡς πελειάδων ἐξεσθε.
1060 Aeschylus, Suppliants 684: νοῦσων δ᾿ ἑσμὸς.
1061 Plato, Republic 450B: οὐκ ἵστε ὅσιον ἑσμὸν λόγον ἐπεγείρετε.
1062 Greek Anthology 16.361.2: ἑσμὸς ἀρχηγῶν, Καλλιόπα, στεφάνων; Greek Anthology 16.370.4: νηρίθμων στεφάνων ἑσμὸν ἑλόντες.
1063 Euripides, Bacchai 710: γάλακτος ἑσμοῦ.
1064 Hesychios, Lexicon Θ, 573.2 s.v. θίασος.
1065 Kallimachos, Aetia 2.2: Μουσέων ἑσμὸς.
Chantraine notes that ἑσμὸς is linguistically associated with the verbs ἕζομαι and ἵημι which, in this case, have combined with the suffix –σμος; hence the *LSJ* definition including a sense of “settling.” On reflection, there is a descriptive sense to these links, as those things which swarm engage in three easily noticed actions: 1) they burst into motion, 2) they swim, and 3) they come to rest. Collectivity can be perceived while in motion, but the ‘group’ is explicitly constituted when gathered and at rest (e.g. birds, bees, humans, etc. having been assembled) as well as when, as a whole, they stream forth. All three images are appropriate to the sacred *theoria* as the personification of Athens, having come to Delphi. This image surely parallels the swarming and arrival of personages described in the first strophe.

Ἀθθίδα λαχὼν—There is a clear parallel here with line 1 of the poem, brought sharply into focus with the repeated use of λαχὼν. The chorus of the Muses has Helikon as their allotted portion, and so does the *theoria/chorus* of Athens. Additionally, there is a repetition from line 9, with the reference to Attica. Each of these parallels occurs in the first line of each strophe, aiding in neatly dividing the hymn into sections, yet binding them tightly together. This third strophe in many ways reprises vocabulary and themes from the first strophes, assuming that the audience remembers what they have just heard. In the same way that older texts must shape the meaning/reading of later texts (such as the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*’s influence upon Athenaios’ hymn), prior strophes arranged episodically will inform and provide context for later strophes.

1066 Chantraine (1965) s.v. ἑσμὸς. Smyth §840.5. A verb of action becomes an abstract substantitive.
1067 Moens (1930), 38.
The Ἀθήνας of line 9 was personified, as if Attica herself was present, embodied in the citizen polis. Here, Ἀθήνα is not personified; instead, it is now quite simply the Attic territory, a geographical place, distinct from the people who dwell there. The parallel with the first line, not only marked by the use of λαχῶν, but also the word order wherein the object precedes this verb, is made quite clear.1068 Once this parallel is recognized, it immediately suggests that the Athenians possess their land in the same way that the Muses possess Helikon—as a divine right. This is unsurprising, as the Athenians viewed themselves as being autochthonous, born from the very dirt, always having been there. In this sense, compounded with the use of ἄθραυστον in line 11, the audience may very well have heard this line as a claim to singular, unique, Athenian glory. That the same people hold the land that they have always held, that no one else has ever possessed, and this by divine right. No other Greek polis can say this.

Again, the orthography is exceptional, but points to an intentionality on the part of either the poet or the engraver, raising a question as to whether performative issues might have had meaningful impact. Pronunciation of words is often secondary to vocalization demands when singing. Melody and music come first, enunciation follows.1069

1068 Although this is clearly the geographic region here, due to word order it is possible to see it as the personified version in asyndeton again, up until λαχῶν is sung—at this moment the clarity of meaning snaps into focus, and simultaneously the parallel with line 1 becomes obvious.

1069 Examples from the modern context can easily be found in Christian hymnals. “Loved” will often be pronounced in a parallel fashion as “beloved,” if demanded by the meter, and singers will think nothing of the shift in syllable emphasis.
κλυτὸν παιδα μεγάλου |Διος— here is little need for detailed philological comment on this line. However, it is worth considering how it functions within the hymn as a whole. The adjective κλυτὸν resonates strongly with the “glorious Delphian women” of line 6, as well as the “famed great-polis” of Athens in line 9 (“famous” comes up once in each strophe). παιδα echoes strongly both with the genealogies given for the Muses and Apollo in lines 2 and 3 of strophe 1, as well as the latent hints of the Bacchic which so clearly lie beneath the surface of this text. Dionysos is also the κλυτὸν παιδα of Zeus. Μεγάλου here has little flavor, but does resonate with μαγαλόπολις in line 9. Athens is both κλυτά and μεγαλό-, and we see the traits echo here. They are not synonyms. Fame comes from deeds, and Athenaios will shortly narrate two of Apollo’s famous deeds. Athens was great in scope, and we may assume that μεγάλου here (if as seems likely it applies to Zeus) will describe the scale of Zeus’ power and authority. Athenaios is careful in this text to avoid triggering narratives when applying epithets to divinities other than Apollo. None of the descriptive adjectives applied here to Zeus or Athena call any mythical episodes to mind, but merely describe characteristics. To be fair, none of Apollo’s epithets have been truly narrative in nature either, but he receives explicit narrative here, in this third strophe. There is precedent for this vocabulary. Apollo has been praised as κλυτὸς, and named the παι μεγάλω Διος in hymns before.

Weil (1893), 575; Crusius (1894), 35; Moens (1930), 51; Furley and Bremer (2001), vol.2, page 90.
Paean of Makedon Kaibel epigr. Suppl. 1025c.
Alkaios, fragment 1 (Bergk).
ἀκρονιφῆ τόνδε πάγον—As in line 8, the word πάγον is quite simple and easy to read. It means “hill,” and in the context of the first strophe it refers to the spot where the chorus stands to perform, quite likely directly before the temple of Apollo, at the top of the Sacred Way. It is here that The Muses, the god, the chorus, the theoria representing Athens, and the locals all are now gathered, to honor the god. This place is the place of worship, of prophecies, of performance, and of sacrifice. The repetition of this word signals an end to the reprisal as it earlier signaled the end (and advent/epiphany) of the first strophe. This reprisal has taken the contents of the second strophe and packed them into the first line (line 17, concerning Athens): Athens has been compared to the Muses, Apollo has been named, and the geography of Delphi has been presented, now in a highly conflated manner—note the repetition as well of τόνδε, from ταῦσθε in line 5, except here, instead of rocky, we pivot to snowy.

ἀκρονιφῆ is a new word which occurs nowhere else. Like much of Athenaios’ vocabulary, he offers a word with obvious and transparent meaning, which yet manages to be innovative. While the exact word is a new coinage, the image it represents has significant precedent as either half compounds freely. Sophokles and Kallimachos both describe Parnassos as “snowy,” and Euripides describes Parnassos as “snow-struck.” Limenios’ hymn transfers the epithet to Helikon, which also manages to be “rocky.” But mountains in poetry tend to be snowy in some way, as it emphasizes
their height.\textsuperscript{1077} ἀκρονυφής is slightly more descriptive than these other terms, however, as it locates the snow precisely on the summit, not the whole. The presence of snow foreshadows the episode of the Gallic invaders, which will be narrated in a few more lines, as it was an avalanche and snowstorm that defeated the barbarian horde. There is a hint of the Dionysiac when emphasizing the peak, particularly when snowy (winter), as this would be the season when Apollo is away with the Hyperboreans and Delphi is given to the revels of the Bacchic god, the other famous son of Zeus. There would be winter torch-lit dances in his honor.\textsuperscript{1078}

τόνδε πάγον manages to represent the whole of Delphi, the rocky and snowy peaks of Parnassus, here described as snowy, together with the prophetic hill. It actually presents a nice sequence: the snow-covered peak, the rocky heights, and then the tripod—as if we were zooming in. Having arrived at this place, Athenaios now pivots to say more about this place. Here is where the tripod is kept, the seat of prophecy, and here is where Apollo slew the drakōn in order to acquire this oracle. Again, the rights of ownership are shown in some contrast—both Athens and the Muses hold their realms by divine apportionment, but Apollo possesses Delphi through combat.

\textsuperscript{1077} Cf. Euripides, Helen 1323-5, where Demeter wanders about the χιονοθρέμμονάς heights of Mount Ida, and the woods that are both rocky (πέτρινα) as well as snowy (πολυνιφέα).

αὐμβροτ | πᾶσι θνατοῖς προφαίνει

The operation of the oracle is described here, and only brief comment is needed. The oracle (Pythia, tripod, Apollo, et al.) serves in the role of bridging the gap between mortals and gods. While the bulk of polis religion in Greece was intensely local, and closed to outsiders, Delphic cult was exceptionally open, permitting even non-Greeks access to the oracle provided they offered sacrifice (and paid any ‘fees’). The verb here, “to make manifest,” applies broadly to communication with mortals; it applied to portents as well. Like these ‘signs,’ oracles required some degree of interpretation. Herodotos in his Histories, book 1, takes a great deal of interest in the difficulty of interpreting the communications from the divine, and the disastrous consequences of getting it wrong.

Athenaios has generated a poetic contrast here, between the words of the god and those who come to hear them. A mortal (βροτός) is one who will experience death (θάνατος). This is in contrast with the gods who do not die. These two roots provide descriptors for the gods by the addition of an alpha privitive—athanatos and ambrotos. Athenaios here varies his binary opposition. The oracles of the gods are divine; as such, they belong to separate category, and it is to be expected that mortals have difficulty understanding divine things.

1079 Weil (1893), 575; Crusius (1894), 35; Moens (1930), 41.
The tripod at Delphi needs little comment. References to the tripod in the temple of Apollo at Delphi are so common as to be ubiquitous. This phrase serves a nice pivot as the adjective μαντειειόν reaches back to the end of strophe 1, where we read πρωγόνα μαντειειόν—as in the first strophe where geographic movement brought us progressively closer to the destination at the top of the Sacred Way, something similar has occurred in this strophe, moving from the snowy peak, to the hill, and now to the tripod itself, the destination once more tagged with this adjective. As a pivot, the phrase reaches back with the adjective, and swings forward to the narrative of how Apollo acquired the oracle through combat with the drakōn as well as his defense of his sanctuary from invaders who would plunder it. The tripod serves as a focal point, where gods and mortals meet and speak in the same way as the sacrificial altar both bridges and defines the irreconcilable gap between mortals and immortals.

The tripod at Delphi is prophetic due to its role in the functioning of the oracle, but also potentially in its own right. As part of the means by which prophecy occurred, the tripod is perhaps most famous for serving as the seat of the priestess who would be enthused and speak for the god. A well-known vase painting shows Themis (she is labeled) seated on the tripod, holding a laurel branch in her right hand, and a flat krater in her left, likely full of water from the Kastalia, being approached by King Aegeus of Athens (he is labeled). A column with capital in the background suggests the context of the temple. At Dodona, an oracle of Zeus, it seems that a great number of bronze

---

1085 Cf. A. Furtwängler and K. Reichhold, *Griechische Vasenmalerei* (1904-32) pl. 140.3. An Attic red-figure cup by the Codros Painter, 44-430 BCE, in the Staatliche Museen, Berlin. = Figure 6, page 58, in
cauldrons sat on tripods, and their reverberation (or singing?) had something to do with the giving of certain kinds of oracles.\textsuperscript{1086}

\begin{quote}
\textit{ὡς εἰεῖ[λες …. | ἐφρουούρειει δράκον}\textsuperscript{1087}—Damage to these lines has unfortunately robbed us of Athenaios’ version of this famous narrative. εἰεῖ[λες as a word needs little comment, except this word stands in stark contrast to the use of \(\lambda\sigma\rho\gamma\alpha\nu\omicron\) which appeared in line 1 (the Muses possess Helikon) and more recently in line 17 (The Athenians possess Attica). Apollo, at least in this version of the myth, does not possess the Tripod (and hence Delphi and the Oracle) by original allotment, but has acquired it by force. He is not \textit{original} here, in the way that the Athenians considered themselves to be \textit{autochthonous}, or in the way that the Muses received Helikon through allotment (most likely by Zeus after the defeat of the Titan). There is a great deal of diversity among the Greeks in how they narrate Apollo’s acquisition, and how they describe the \textit{drakōn}. It is here, perhaps most visibly for this hymn, that we see something characteristic to Greek myth—its propensity for change.

History, myth, poetry, and truth blur together for the Greeks in a way that our own age finds uncomfortable. In his Poetics (1451a-b), Aristotle differentiates poetry and history: history concerns things that actually were (particular truths), while poetry addresses things that could have been (universal truths). This is an oversimplification, however: Greek poetry spoke of past events thought to be real, such as the Trojan War,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item Johnston (2008); the tripod is emblematic of the oracle at Delphi. A silver coin c. 420-30 BCE from Croton, Sicily depicts Apollo shooting and erect but coiled serpent standing directly underneath the tripod—perhaps Apollo is portrayed as a youth (Cf. Apollonios of Rhodes, \textit{Argonautica} 207-11). HN p. 96, fig. 54 in Historia Numorum, B.V. Head, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed., Oxford. = fig. 2 in Fontenrose (1959).
\item \textsuperscript{1086} Cf. Johnston (2008), 62ff.
\item \textsuperscript{1087} Fairbanks (1900), 123; Moens (1930), 41-43; Bélis (1992), 77; Furley and Bremer (2001), 91.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
and Greek historians happily confessed to inventing speeches for historical characters. Yet we still find a practice that is fundamentally alien to the modern epistemology that holds that ‘true’ and ‘real’ are synonymous. Greeks were aware that their mythology and historical accounts lacked consistency—it is the exceptional historian who was willing to suppress variants completely, and no poet was content to merely reiterate word for word the tale of another. Greek theater largely concerned itself with mythical topics, recognizable to the audience. But, in order to impress and win, the author had to change and innovate, not just presentation but also content, in a way that could surprise the audience and speak to it in a relevant manner.

Poets confidently offered conflicting accounts of moments foundational to cultic practice and thought, and this appears to have been ‘normal’. It is a mistake to seek the ‘original’ form of a myth, or desire a single textual or artistic expression to serve as the canonical form against which all others could be judged. Even the texts attributed to Homer and Hesiod failed to bring harmony to Greek mythology and cult. The attributes, genealogies, benefits, actions, and cultic rituals of their deities continued to be wildly divergent. Once we let go of a need to identify the ‘correct’ version of a Greek myth, it becomes much easier to embrace their ahistorical nature, to accept them as at once both true and fictional, and to enjoy the diversity of expression. Very few myths illustrate the polyphonic nature of Greek narrative as well as the story of Apollo and the drakōn. Not only is there wide divergence in vocabulary used to reference this foe, but also instability in gender, and a seemingly chaotic range of possible events and chronologies. A more thorough examination of variation will be conducted in Chapter 5, and a brief summary
will suffice here. Athenaios’ audience could (note the lack of necessity) have compared and contrasted his account of violent seizure with the following: violent seizure of place, but not oracle; violent seizure of the oracle; receipt of the oracle as a gift; and receipt of oracle by persuasion. Other variations are possible as well, since later authors weigh in with different accounts of their own.

The use of the word ἐφρουρέω is somewhat exceptional, it seems that in many versions the presence of the drakōn is understood in the sense that the monster guarded the oracle on behalf of Gaia or Themis. Later commenters take it for granted that the verb applies. Athenaios makes it clear that he differentiates his text from the version in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo. Not only does the oracle appear to exist already

---

1088 Fontenrose (1959) and Ogden (2013) excellently catalogue the variants, not only of the Apollo narrative, but other mythological narratives that seem similar, albeit with different names assigned to the varied roles (e.g. Cadmus and Zeus both have their own snaky foes to vanquish). The amount of ink spilled in argument over the significance of gender and/or previous owners of the oracle in this narrative is impressive. For significant pieces, each pointing to a very rich bibliography on the matter, cf. Sourvinou-Inwood (1987), who argues that, based on archeological evidence against the ‘previous owners’ myth, there is no good reason to buy into any narrative of gendered acts of violence, but rather we should see all variants as collectively endeavoring, in their own way, to increase the prestige of the oracle; Strolonga (2011), who discards any focus on gender for a didactic emphasis on the importance of reciprocity and gift-giving in each of the variants; Quantin (1992), who reads tragedy as shaper of cult, suggesting that Apollo embodies Athens, and mediates a transformation of Gaia as oracular force in Hesiod to an origin story behind the more regulated oracle at Delphi—he sees no cultic or archaeological continuity, but rather an invented connected conceived in order to coincide with political and cultic needs; in this case the myth of previous owners becomes positive and useful. More aggressive readings of gender, politics, and society as motive force behind change in myth can be found in works by well-known scholars.

1089 Homeric Hymn Apollo 294-374.

1090 Euripides, Iphigeneia in Tauris, 1234-1282.

1091 Aeschylus, Eumenides 1-11.

1092 Aristonoo’s paean 25-32. It is notable that it is Athene here who persuades Themis to hand over the oracle to Apollo, and that here she is named τριτογενής, similar to line 10 of Athenaios’ hymn. There is some discomfort lurking in this version, as it also mentions Apollo’s need to be purified in Tempe, traditionally attributed to his having killed the serpent.

1093 Apollodoros, Library 1.4.1: ὡς δὲ ὁ φρουρὸς τὸ μαντεῖον Πόθων ὄψις; and the Scholiast on Apollodoros, Argonautica 705-11 page 181, 14: <Δελφούνης> ἐκάλειτο ὁ φυλασσόν τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς χρηστήριον.
in this case, but the serpent is also male, whereas the gender was female in the *Hymn* (drakaina).\(^{1094}\) His version seems more in line with that favored by Callimachos in his hymns.\(^{1095}\)

In addition to the various renditions of this combat, it is necessary to consider that other texts and traditions might also resonate with an audience. Apollo is not the only god/hero to face a serpent, specifically a *drakōn*. The word (and its female equivalent) appears commonly throughout Greek literature. I list here only a few select instances that suggest conflict:\(^{1096}\) Bellerophon slew the Chimera who had the tail of a *drakōn*;\(^{1097}\) Zeus dealt with Typhon, who has 100 *drakōn* heads sprouting from his shoulders;\(^{1098}\) a *drakōn* watched over the golden-fleece, and Cadmus slew the *drakōn* of Ares.\(^{1099}\) Additionally, there are some fascinatingly parallel passages, not focused on the snake, per se, but which make mention of one or the other of them, and also present quite resonant vocabulary in near proximity. As an example, Sophokles, in the *Antigone* writes a chorus which describes the battle of the seven against Thebes, and the fury of the battle itself is metaphorically described as a *drakōn*:

\[
\text{στὰς δ᾽ ὑπὲρ μελάθρων φονώσαισιν ἄμφιχανών κύκλω}
\text{λόγχαις ἐπτάπυλον στόμα}
\text{ἔβα, πρίν ποθ᾽ ἀμετέρον}
\text{αἰμάτων γένυσιν πλησθῆναι τε καὶ στεφάνωμα πύργων}
\]

\(^{1094}\) Cf. *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 287-8: ἐνθάδε δὴ φρονέω τεύξειν περικαλλέα νηὸν ἀνθρώποις χρηστήριον.

\(^{1095}\) Cf. Callimachos, *Hymn to Apollo* 100-1; *Hymn to Delos* 91-3.

\(^{1096}\) This is by no means a comprehensive list.


\(^{1098}\) Hesiod, *Theogony* 825.

\(^{1099}\) Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 9.5.1.10, 12; Apollodoros, *Library* 3.1.1.
And standing above our roofs, gaping with blood-thirsty spears
In a ring about the 7-fold gates—he left,
Before his jaws were sated with our blood
Before Hephaistos (fire) seized the pine-roofed crowns of our towers.
Such a clash of Ares (war) stretched about his back
A difficult conquest for the foe of the *drakōn*.

Again, in Euripides’ *Phoenecian Women*, a chorus passage mentions the cave of
the *drakōn* (ζάθεα τ’ ἄντρα δράκοντος), and in close proximity beforehand the singer
mentions a double-crested peak (δικόρυφον) and a rock (πέτρα) lit by flashing lightning
(recall the ritual sighting of lightning signaling the original Pythaïdes festivals). The
mountain is also described as sacred (ἱερόν) and snow-struck (νιφόβολόν)—but it is
Dionysos’ mountain, near Thebes, described here. The chorus wishes they were in Delphi
instead, free to participate in the chorus (ἀθανάτας θεοῦ χορὸς), and the verb they employ
to describe dancing is εἰλίσσων, the very word used by Athenaios’ to describe the
*drakōn*. It is impossible to be certain regarding intertexts, as the audience would have
to remember in order to recognize. However, the vocabulary overlap is such that there is
an easy resonance between the texts: Delphi and Thebes, Apollo and Dionysos, *Drakōn*
and *Drakōn* seem transposed upon each other in this text.

The passage, even though the snake referenced is that of Thebes, makes possible
an important observation—the *drakōn* is foe. Even here in Euripides, Apollo and the
*drakōn* are positioned as opposing choices and locations. Even more provocatively,

---

1101 Euripides, *Phoenecian Women* 226-238.
Dionysos is tightly bound to the Theban context here, and it is fascinating to recall how Bacchic imagery continually threatens to manifest in Athenaios’ hymn. He sings of Apollo, Delphi, and the Muses, but his employment of vocabulary with deep ‘roots’ in alternative traditions produces a text which continually threatens to subvert itself and become a different narrative.

αἰόλον ἐλικτᾶν

— While the use of ἑφρ)[ουορεια δράκων falls well within the bounds of tradition, the next two adjectives, while clearly suitable, are innovations it seems on the part of Athenaios. This vibrantly descriptive adjective is polyvalent in potential meaning. Various words in this hymn offer possible intertextual resonances, eager to present a rootedness to well-read listeners. This adjective is especially helpful for realizing the role of audience subjectivity for meaning. The word, in its simplest meaning, describes something as “quick moving, nimble.” However, the actual usage of this word throughout Greek literature reveals a stunning breadth of application. As a result, it is quite difficult to guess precisely what any individual audience member may have envisioned as this word was spoken.

There are three possible ways in which this term could have been understood—all quite suitable and relevant to the narrative. There is no ‘wrong’ interpretation here, nor is there a need for only one connotation to be active. This adjective affords a selection of meanings, from which the audience may choose as they wish: 1) the adjective may

\[102\]

Weil (1893), 575; Fairbanks (1900), 123; Moens (1930), 43; Bélis (1992), 77.

\[103\]

LSJ, s.v. αἰόλος.
reference the quick and agile movements of snake;\textsuperscript{1104} 2) as a description it may emphasize appearance rather than motion, referring to the scattering of light striking upon the serpent’s scales;\textsuperscript{1105} and 3) as the word is suggestive of the wriggling of worms, grubs, and larva to be found in a rotting corpse, it is quite possible that the death and rotting of this foe is already foreshadowed.\textsuperscript{1106} There are some additional resonances here, which are unlikely to be intentional, but are still worth mentioning: the adjective forms compounds, such as \textit{αἰολόστομος}, which as “shifty-speech” applies to oracles.\textsuperscript{1107} Similarly, the simplex may describe rhetoric\textsuperscript{1108} and lies.\textsuperscript{1109} One must remember as well, that this adjective was employed in line 14 to describe the sound of the \textit{aulos}—this calls to mind the \textit{nomos Pythikos}. There is precedent for the association of \textit{αἰόλον} with snakes—the well-known omen in Homer, \textit{Iliad} 12 when a portent (\textit{τέρας}) of Zeus appears: an eagle flies overhead, clutching a snake (referred to as both \textit{δράκοντα} and \textit{ὄφιν} here), which, once it has fallen to the earth, is described as \textit{αἰόλον}.\textsuperscript{1110} This sort of

\textsuperscript{1104} Cf. Homer, \textit{Iliad} 19:404: πόδας αἰόλος, Xanthos the horse has flashing feet; \textit{Odyssey} 22.300: αἰόλος οἴστρος, a stinging fly darts about. Additionally, \textit{Homeric Hymn to Apollo} may resonate here, as the dying \textit{drakōn} (in line 361) withers about: ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα ἠλίσσετο.

\textsuperscript{1105} Cf. Homer, \textit{Iliad} 5.295: τεύχε... αἰόλα παμφανόντα, armor glitters; 7.222: σάκος αἰόλον, a gleaming shield, again in 16.107, as well as in Sophokles, \textit{Ajax} 1025 and elsewhere. The glittering nature of armor is easily transferred to the scales of the snake. An interesting comparison is to be found in Sophokles, \textit{Trachiniai} 94: αἰόλα νύξ, where “spangled night” refers to the twinkling of stars. In similar fashion, Kallimachos uses it to describe a dog, which we must assume is “spotted,” Cf. \textit{Hymn to Artemis} 91. Sophokles seems to rely on this sense when he has Philoktetes describe his flesh in this way in \textit{Philoktetes} 157: ἐμάς <γε> σαρκὸς αἰόλας. Chantraine (1968) s.v. αἰόλος explains that in later usage it becomes synonymous with ποικίλος. Glittering, spotted, mottled, etc. – all apply to describing a monster/snake.

\textsuperscript{1106} Cf. Homer, \textit{Iliad} 22.509: αἰόλαι ἐνοία, the wriggling worms will eat Hektor’s corpse. Here it is possible that the account in the \textit{Homeric Hymn to Apollo} is activated, in which the etymology for Pytho is explored. The poet in lines 363-74 has Apollo command the dead snake to “rot” (πύθευ).

\textsuperscript{1107} Cf. Aeschylus, \textit{Prometheos Bound} 661-2: ἢκον δ᾽ ἀναγγέλλοντες αἰολοστόμωσις ἄρεις.


\textsuperscript{1109} Cf. Pindar, \textit{Nemian Odes} 8.25: μέγιστον δ᾽ αἰόλῳ ψεύδει γέρας ἀντέταται.

\textsuperscript{1110} Homer, \textit{Iliad} 12.200-9.
writhing about is found also in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo, where the dying drakōn (line 361) flops about bleeding and gasping: ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα ἐλίσσετο.

While not previously used in reference to the guardian snake of Delphi, ἑλικτάν makes perfect sense. There is a clear comparandum in Sophokles, Trachiniae 11: ἀλλοτ’ αἰόλος δράκων ἑλικτός, where we find a description of how Achelous came to woo Deianeira in the form of three beasts, including a drakōn. If indeed this text resonates, the idea of physical contest remains strong. Much like with αἰόλον, the adjective ἑλικτάν seems capable of being read in more than one way; it is equally applicable to both motion and posture, insofar as snakes have winding coils. Kallimachos’ Hymn to Delos comes to mind, where the giant snake (Ὄφις μέγας) is described as having all of Parnassos wound about in 9 coils. (περιστρέφει ἐννέα κύκλοις). Pictorial description is helpful here as well, as it is common for the serpent to be depicted as standing erect, with curves, and in some cases spiraling coils. Athenaios here employs adjectives which do not appear in other extant texts narrating this combat. These terms have been applied to snakes before, and their meaning is transparent and obvious, yet once more he offers something ‘new.’

---

1111 Kallimachos, Hymn to Delos 91-93.

1112 A wall painting in the House of the Vettii in Pompeii shows Leto carrying both her children in her arms (as small children), confronted by a snake erect upon several coils, depicted within a cave entrance. Academia dei Lincei, Monumenti Antichi VIII (1898) pl. 11, p. 366 – fig. 3 in Fontenrose (1959). In addition, a Black-figure lekythos shows a similar scene, this time Artemis appears grown, but the baby Apollo shoots his bow at the coiled serpent, held in his mother’s arms. Bibliothèque Nationale, Cabinet des Médailles, Paris. CVA, France 10, pl. 86. 6-8 – fig. 1 in Fontenrose (1959). A silver coin c. 420-30 BCE from Croton, Sicily depicts Apollo shooting and erect but coiled serpent standing directly underneath the tripod-perhaps Apollo is portrayed as a youth (Cf. Apollonios of Rhodes, Argonautica 207-11). HN p. 96, fig. 54 in Historia Numorum, B.V. Head, 2nd ed., Oxford. = fig. 2 in Fontenrose (1959).

1113 For a survey, see Chapter 5.
συρίγμαθ\textsuperscript{1114} – The \textit{LSJ} defines this word as “the sound of a pipe,” “whistling,” and various types of “hissing.”\textsuperscript{1115} The range of resonance available through this word choice is illuminating. Most immediately relevant to the context, Greek literature gives evidence that snakes were described as making this sort of sound.\textsuperscript{1116} Its use in reference to pipe instruments is also quite relevant. Most obvious, the term denotes the sound produced by the σῦριγξ (pl. συρίγγες), an instrument composed of hollow pipes of different lengths arranged side-by-side, without reeds; one played it by blowing horizontally across the open ends.\textsuperscript{1117} It was the instrument of shepherds and Pan, but frequently referred to concomitantly with the more prestigious \textit{aulos}.\textsuperscript{1118} Delos apparently had a 6\textsuperscript{th} century statue of Apollo depicting three Graces in his hand, each holding a different instrument: lyre, panpipe, and \textit{auloi}.\textsuperscript{1119} While it does not appear to have been typical in cult, it is a recognizable instrument, and its sound seems to have been easily conflated with the sound of the \textit{auloi}, instruments which were likely to have

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{1114} Weil (1893), 575; Crusius (1894), 35; Moens (1930), 44; Bélis (1992), 77; Furley and Bremer (2001), 91.

\textsuperscript{1115} \textit{LSJ}, s.v. σύριγμα.

\textsuperscript{1116} Oppianos, \textit{Cynegetica} 2.245: σκοκοῖς φυσιῶν συρίγμασιν ιοφόρος θήρ. The deer lures the snake out with blasts of breath, the snake fights, hissing; Eusebius, \textit{De laudibus Constantini} 9.8.2: καὶ τῶν δράκοντων τὰ συρίγματα. The hissings of snakes; Epiphanius, \textit{Panarion (= Adversus haereses)} 1.366.16: τὰ δεινὰ κοκύματα καὶ τὰ δρακοντειδῆ συρίγματα, snake-like hissings; \textit{Ibid.} 2.336.12: τὸ συρίγματος τοῦ δράκοντος; Origen, \textit{On Lamentations}, Fragment 57.2: ὃς ἔχθρος ἡμῶν διάβολος περιέρχεται ὡς λέων ὀρθόμενος ζητῶν τίνα καταπίην καὶ ὡς δράκων ὅπλα ἡμᾶς ἀφεῖς τὰ <συρίγματα>, he compares the devil to a roaring lion and a hissing snake.

\textsuperscript{1117} Cf. M.L. West (1992b) \textit{Ancient Greek Music}, 109-112. On page 292, West commented that he felt the melodic inflection over this word was mimetic of hissing.


\textsuperscript{1119} Cf. Pseudo-Plutarch, \textit{On Music} 1136a; West (1992) \textit{Ancient Greek Music}, 111.
\end{footnotesize}
been played as part of the musical accompaniment of the hymn. Hesiod’s *Shield* provides a useful *comparandum*, as he describes maidens and youths in choirs, dancing to the sound of the σῦριγξ.\(^{1120}\)

It is in the combination of these senses—instrument, the sounds of the instrument, music, and *drakōn*—that the most important resonance is activated in the Delphic context. Strabo tells us that in the early 6th c. BCE, the Amphyctiones expanded the Pythian Games by adding athletic contests and additional musical formats to the original practice of *kitharoedes* performing a *paean* for the god. He tells us specifically of *aulos*-players and *kitharists* who played without singing (χωρὶς φοδῆς). They performed a certain *melos* that he says was called the *nomos* *Pythikos*.\(^{1121}\) This particular *nomos* was a musical representation of Apollo’s famous duel with the *drakōn*, previous guardian and possessor of the Delphic Tripod. Strabo explains that it followed a set format of five divisions: ἄγκρουσις, ἄμπειρα, κατακελευσμὸς, ἱσμβοι and δάκτυλοι, and σῦριγγες (syringes). The *syringes* depicted the death of the beast, which Strabo explains involved imitating the failing, last breaths of the *drakōn*.\(^{1122}\) Due to the fragmentary nature of the strophe, it is difficult to tell whether συρίγμαθι’ refers to the threats and attacks of the serpent or to its death, but in the Delphic context it is quite clear that this famous battle is evoked here, and it is quite likely that a tradition of both depicting and describing this event in musical fashion is also evoked, and one can only wonder what sort of potential

\(^{1120}\) Hesiod, *Shield* 278: ὑπὸ λγυρῶν σωρίγγων ἱσαν αὐδήν.

\(^{1121}\) Strabo, *Geography*. 9.3.10. τι μέλος ὁ καλεῖται νόμος Πυθικός.

\(^{1122}\) Strabo defines each ‘limb’ of the composition, calling this last porting the ἔκλειψις (ekleipsis), that is, the failure, cessation, extinction of the foe *The σῦριγγες* seems to represent the hissing and wheezing of the *drakōn* as it gasps out its life and dies. Cf. Homeric Hymn to Apollo 363: ἕων ἀποστείουσα’.
virtuosic effects may have occurred at this moment in the song, beyond the written melody.

\[\text{\textit{ίιεις ἄθωπε[ντ}}\]

—While the verb here is quite generic, we may assume that the author meant to describe Apollo as an archer, killing his foe with arrows. He is god of the bow already in Homer, as he unleashes his plague upon the Achaeans in book 1, and the Homeric Hymn to Apollo first introduces him as a god from whom the other deities shrink, until his mother Leto takes, and hangs up his bow.\(^{1124}\) In texts detailing his combat with the \textit{drakōn}, the use of arrows is often explicit.\(^{1125}\) In the face of this, the terrifying violence of the god, the \textit{drakōn} is \textit{ἀθώπευτος}. To be described as such presents the foe in a flattering light. At its most basic, the word describes someone as not amenable to flattery—an odd sort of descriptor for the serpent.\(^{1126}\) However, recalling that it is the guardian of the tripod, and noting the fact that Artistonoos’ version of the myth has Athene persuade Themis to hand over the oracle to Apollo, the word here may suggest that the serpent is dedicated, unpersuadable. Apollo must take the tripod by force, and the \textit{drakōn}, as an implacable guardian, is a worthy foe.\(^{1127}\)

\(^{1123}\) Weil (1893), 575; Weil (1894); Crusius (1894), 36; Moens (1930), 44; Furley and Bremer (2001) 91.

\(^{1124}\) Homer, \textit{Iliad} 1.75; Homeric Hymn to Apollo 1-9.

\(^{1125}\) Homeric Hymn to Apollo 357: πρὶν γὲ οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἐκάρπωτος Αpolloν καρποφόρον. Elsewhere, cf. Kallimachos, Hymn to Apollo 101-2: τὸν μὲν σὺ κατήναρες ἄλλον ἐπ’ ἄλλῳ βάλλων ὑκόν ὀιστόν Απόλλωνιος Ρόδης, \textit{Argonautica} 2.706: Διδυμὺν τὸξον ἐξενάριξεν; etc.

\(^{1126}\) LSJ s.v. \textit{ἀθώπευτος}. Cf. Euripides, \textit{Andromeda} 459: ὡς ἄθωπευτόν γὲ σε γλώσσης ἀφήσω τῆς ἐμῆς.

\(^{1127}\) For precedent, cf. Greek Anthology 6.128: \textit{Ἀθώπευτος} θήρ, of a wild boar.
In spite of the very fragmentary nature of this strophe, particularly at the end, there is little difficulty in identifying the episode which the poet describes here. Athenaios surely refers to the invasion of the Gauls, who marched on Delphi under the leadership of Brennus in 278 BCE. The Gauls had achieved significant military success against the Macedonians, and had divided their forces. Justinus claims the full force numbered 300,000, of which 65,000 went to Delphi. He puts the numbers of defenders at 4,000. The horde made an attempt on Delphi, but was defeated by a composite force led by the Aetolians (or Athenians and Boetians, depending on the source). The Gauls were crushed by an avalanche when part of the crag of Parnassos dislocated and fell on the army. Later Delphic ‘orthodoxy’ claimed that Apollo had personally intervened to protect his sanctuary, appearing in the sky, accompanied by Athena and Artemis. The god had told the Delphians not to remove their food and drink, and the invaders gorged themselves and attacked while drunk. (One ancient author claims that their army went insane and attacked itself.) Various portents were claimed to have been observed: thunder, lightning, earthquakes, ghosts of heroes, etc. The oracle, it was claimed, had told the priests that the god himself would come to their aid, accompanied by the “white maidens.” The white maidens were interpreted by some to refer to the snow, but it was also claimed that during the battle, the priests saw Apollo, Athena, and Artemis arrive at the temple of Apollo and rush off to the battle. The priests then ran to the front lines shouting that the gods had come. Shortly thereafter, an

\[1128\] Weil (1893), 575; Crusius (1894), 36; Fairbanks (1900), 123; Reinach (1909-13), 155; Moens (1930), 45-8; Furley and Bremer (2001), vol. 2, page. 91-2.

\[1129\] Cf. Nachtergaele (1977), 15-205; Pausanias, Geography 19.5-23.14; Polybios, Histories 1.6.5-6; 2.20.6; Diodorus Siculus, Bibliotheca Historica 22.9.5; Cicero, On Divination 1.37, 81; Kallimachos, Hymn to Delos 173ff; Justinus, History 24.8.4.
earthquake was felt and a large chunk of the mountain fell away and crushed the Gallic force. This was followed by a freezing snowstorm with hail, putting the invaders to flight. A statue was found in Delos depicting Apollo with his foot on a pile of Gallic shields. The Soterion festival owes its origins to the aftermath of this event. Invitations were sent in 246/7 BCE to participate in a festival the following year, in honor of Apollo and Zeus the Soter (savior). The event included music, poetry, athletics, and sacrifice; it was celebrated every 4 years.

The phrase employed by Athenaios here is highly poetic, due to the use of ἄρης. He has already employed a similar technique in Strophe 2, wherein Hephaistos = sacrificial fire. In this context, Ares may be understood to refer both to the army, and to the destruction in which it engaged. The use of Ares in this way has quite a bit of precedent. Aeschylus and Euripides both use the term to refer to military forces. The most relevant comparandum, however can be found in Callimachos’ Hymn to Delos. The poet makes mention of this very episode here, and it would seem likely that there is an easy association between these two texts:

1130 Archaeological Museum, Delos, inv. A.4124 = fig. 2.4 in Furley and Bremer (2001), vol. 1, page 133. It is thought to possibly be a 2nd c. BCE copy of a Delphic original.
1131 Appian, Ilyrica 5.
1132 Cf. Dempsey (1918) 169-175; Furley and Bremer (2001), 132-3; Nachtergaeel (1977), 305.
1133 Cf. Aeschylus, Persians 87: ἐπάγει δουρικότοις ἀνδράσι τοξόδημον ἄρη, a bow-wielding army; Persians 951: ἵλινον νύφορακτος ἄρης ἐπηρακτής, fortune in war; Euripides, Andromeda 106: ἔλλαδος ὁκίς ἄρης – the swift force of Greece; Iphigeneia at Aulis 237: ὁ Μυρμιδών ἄρης, the Myrmidon host; Rhesus 239: δεσπότου πέρσαντος Ἀχαιῶν ἄρη, the Achaean army; Apollonios of Rhodes, Argonautica 1.1023-4: ἄλλα ποι ἀνδρίων Μακρίων ἐσταυροῦσαν Πελασγικὸν ἄρεα κέλεσας Πελασγικὸν ἄρηα, a Palasgian war party; Kaillimachos, fragment 226: Αἰτωλῶν ἄρηα; Nonnus, Dionysiaka 25.50: ἄρης . . . ναύτης, a navy.
This same phrase is found in fragment D of Limenios’ hymn as well. Apollo’s military prowess, particularly as a defender, is clearly referenced here. There is some discomfort in the close proximity, and hence comparison, between this episode and that of the *drakōn*, for Apollo is himself the invader in this prior event. The difference may be found, perhaps, in the words which follow a significant lacuna, but which clearly belong to this episode.

While it may be true that Apollo took the tripod by force, there is no suggestion that he brought any harm or destruction beyond the death of the *drakōn*. The monster, in some parts of the tradition, had itself been harmful to the local inhabitants, so the initial advent of the god may be seen as an improvement. The Gauls, on the other hand, were less interested in control of the tripod or sanctuary, and more focused on plunder and destruction. While ancient authors seem uniform in their claim that the invaders were driven away, some authors suggest that damage was done before this was accomplished. Appian claimed that the sanctuary was sacked/robbed before the Gauls were driven off, and some versions of the above account suggest that at least the *polis* was taken. The association of Ares (as a military force) as a force of destruction has precedent: 

---

1134 Callimachos, *Hymn to Delos* 172-3.
1135 ὁ βαρβαρός Ἄρης.
1136 Cf. *Homer* *Hymn to Apollo* 304; Callimachos, *Hymn to Apollo* 103-4.
πέρσαντες Ἀχαῖόν Ἄρη. The Achaean army ‘sacks’ their foe. However, Athenaios uses a rather homophonic word: περάω rather than πέρθω. In the aorist, the similarity is stronger: ἐπέρασα versus ἔπερσα. Translators have struggled with this verb in the context of Athenaios’ hymn. Furley and Bremer preferred, “brutally attacked,” bringing out the easy auditory confusion, while M.L. West instead wrote, “crossed into,” staying close to the generic meaning. While this may seem to be a simple choice, a closer examination of the use of περάω reveals some interesting observations. While it may indeed mean simply, “to pass through,” it is also the case that this description of motion is quite easily applied to weapons. In this application, “passing through” becomes “piercing,” which Homer used to describe the action of spears and rain (which resonates in an interesting way with the claims of hailstorms stopping the Gauls).

Perhaps it is best to retain this sense of penetration, which is ambiguous, but broadly resonates in this context. Athenaios seems to be binding the Gallic episode with the drakōn in some way, and the idea of piercing resonates well with the drakōn fight—Apollo slew the serpent with arrows. ἄσεπτ[ poses no great difficulty here, as the barbarians are behaving impiously as they attack a god’s sanctuary. Unfortunately, most of this episode is lost, and the reconstructions by various editors demonstrate more imagination than certainty.

There is something distinctly odd about Athenaios’ connection of the Gallic horde with the story of the drakōn. While his serpent is clearly male, there is, as has been seen,

1138 Euripides, Rhesus 239.
1140 LSJ s.v. περάω. Cf. Homer, Iliad 21.593-4: πάλιν δ’ ἀπὸ χαλκὸς δρούσε βλημένου, οὐδ’ ἐπέρησε, the spear rebounds from the armor; in contrast, Cf. Iliad 4.502: η δ’ ἔτεροι διὰ κροτάφοιο πέρησεν αἰχμή χαλκινή, the spear passes through the soldier’s temple. Homer, Odyssey 5.480: οὐτ’ ὀμβρὸς περάασκε διαμπερέχες, the brush is too thick for the rain to penetrate; again in 19.442.
a confusing tradition over its gender. It is too much to claim with any surety that this
close proximity of episodes is intended to generate a certain resonance, but a powerful
affordance must be noted here in brief. There is a passage near the end of Euripides’
Bacchai that is somewhat confusing in its own right; it offers so many potential
resonances with Athenaios’ hymn that it must be quoted at length here. Dionysos
pronounces judgment upon Kadmos and his wife for the events that have transpired,
leading up to the death of Pentheos. It is important to recall that Kadmos founded Thebes,
in accordance with an oracle, in part by the slaughter of a drakōn and the planting of his
teeth. (I emphasize important vocabulary):

\{Διο.\} δράκον γενήση μεταβαλών, δάμαρ τε σή
ékθημωθείσ’ ὃφεος ἀλλάξει τόπον,
ἡν Ἀρεός ἔσχες Ἀρμονίαν θητός γεγός.
όχον δὲ μόσχων, χρησιμός ώς λέγει Διός,
ἐλάτος μετ’ ἀλόχου βαρβάρον ἡγούμενος,
πολλάς δὲ πέρσεις ἀναρίθμωι στρατεύματι
πόλεις· ὅταν δὲ Λοξίου χρηστήριον
dιαρπάσωσι, νόστον ἄθλιον πάλιν
σχήσουσι.

Changing your shape, you will become a drakōn,
And your wife will also exchange her form,
Becoming a wild beast, a snake,
She whom you (even being mortal) have as wife,
Harmonia daughter of Ares.
You will drive a chariot of young bulls, so says the oracle of Zeus,
With your spouse, leading barbarians,
And you will sack many cities with a numberless army;
And when the oracle of Loxios has been fulfilled,
They will have a wretched return home.\(^{1141}\)

Shortly thereafter, Cadmus gives this news to his daughter:

\{Κα.\} ὦ τέκνον, ὡς ἐς δεινὸν ἡλθομεν κακὸν

\(^{1141}\) Euripides, Bacchai 1330-8.
<πάντες>, σύ θ' ἡ τάλαινα σύγγονοι τε σαὶ
ENTITY(0.22, 0.17, 0.29, 0.19) 
ἐγὼ θ' ὁ τλήμων· βαρβάρους ἀφίξομαι
ENTITY(0.3, 0.17, 0.48, 0.19) 
γέρων μέτοικος, ἐτι δὲ μοῦστι θέσφατον
ENTITY(0.4, 0.19, 0.57, 0.21) 
ἐς Ἑλλάδ' ἀγαγεῖν μιγάδα βαρβάρων στρατόν.
ENTITY(0.49, 0.19, 0.68, 0.21) 
καὶ τὴν Ἄρεως παῖδ' Ἁρμονίαν, δάμαρτ' ἐμήν,
ENTITY(0.57, 0.21, 0.74, 0.23) 
δράκον δρακαίνης <σχῆμ'> ἔχουσαν ἄγριας
ENTITY(0.66, 0.23, 0.82, 0.25) 
ἄξω 'πὶ βωμοὺς καὶ τάφους Ἑλληνικοὺς,
ENTITY(0.7, 0.25, 0.88, 0.27) 
ἡγούμενοι λόγχαισιν·

O child, to such a terrible evil we have come,
You, miserable one, and your sisters—and I, wretched as well.
I, being old, will leave, going off to live with barbarians
And what is more, it is prophesied of me,
That I will lead an army against Greece, of barbarians from many places.
And Harmonia, child of Ares, my wife—I as a drakōn will lead her as a wild drakaina, against the altars and tombs of Greece, at the head of the spearmen. 1142

There is no certainty that the audience at Delphi would have remembered this passage, or that Athenaios consciously relied on it as he wrote, but there is no mistaking the easy association afforded here. There have to this point been many opportunities, however, for Euripides, especially his Bacchai, to resonate within this hymn. It seems possible that Athenaios has, instead of only relying on the Apolline tradition, freely borrowed vocabulary from elsewhere, particularly other texts which concern snakes. He perhaps weaves other traditions into his work, and by borrowing from and re-contextualizing these previous traditions, he innovates within the Apolline, injecting familiar, yet foreign, affordances into his poetry and narrative.

1142 Euripides, Bacchai 1352-60.
Strophe 4

27]ς. Ἀλλ’ ἵω γεένναγ [ 
28]ν θάλος φιλό[μ 
29]ς δαάμοιο λο[ 
30]ρων ἐφορο[ 
31]τεονκ[ 
32]ς[ 
33]ς[ 
34] ]

But Io! Offspring [ 
] young-shoot [ ]-loving [ 
] deme [ 

Ἀλλα. 1143—This is a word of transition. 1144 In poetic usage it has three main functions: 1) it is often found paired with imperatives and subjunctions, deployed in order to remonstrate, to encourage, or to persuade; 1145 2) it is used to set up an address, or vocative, particularly to refocus the address after discussing something else; 1146 3) and it frequently is deployed after the use of a vocative. 1147 In most cases it aids in marking transition in conversation. Moens suggested that it also, here, served to mark a change in meter and topic, signaling a prosodion in glyconics, similar to that found in Limenios’

1143 Weil (1893), 576; Crusius (1894), 37; Reinach (1909-13), 155; Moens (1930), 48-51; Pöhlmann (1970), 65; Bélis (1992), 79; Furley and Bremer (2001), 92

1144 Denniston (1954), 14 [quoted from Furley and Bremer (2001), 92] says, “Ἀλλά in commands and exhortations expresses a break-off in the thought, a transition from arguments for action to a statement of the action required. Hence Ἀλλά in this sense usually occurs near the end of a speech as a clinching and final appeal.”

1145 LSJ s.v. Ἀλλά; Cf. Homer, Iliad 6.526: Ἀλλ’ ἵομεν; 11.611: Ἀλλ’ ἱπτε νῦν, Πάτροκλε δίφιλε, Νέστορ’ ἐριο.

1146 Cf. Pindar, Olympian Ode 2.12: Ἀλλά’ ὁ Κρόνου παῖς Ῥέας; Olympian Ode 4.6: Ἀλλά Κρόνου παῖ, ὃς Ἀτίνοι ἔχεις.

hymn (line 33 – supplemented, however). Pöhlmann disagreed, arguing that the meter remained cretic. Furley and Bremer see it as marking an apostrophe, in a manner that seems common for literary prayer. One finds this word at the end of prayers, often followed by the name of the deity prayed to.\textsuperscript{1148} We may expect that the undamaged text presented something like Pindar’s \textit{Olympian Ode} 7.90: \textit{ἀλλά’ ὦ Ζεὺς πάτερ}, or Limenios’ hymn 26: \textit{Ἀλλὰ Λαατο[θε̹ς ἔρατογ[έφαρον].}

\textit{iō} \textsuperscript{1149}—While \textit{Ἀλλ’} may have been a common way to turn towards direct address of a divinity, it is followed by an extremely unusual exclamation. This word is not unusual, seeing as it appears frequently in lyric section in drama. It is, rather, unexpected due to its typical use—distress. At its most basic sense, the word represent a loud noise, such as the cry of a man, woman, lyre, wind, or even perhaps fire; that is to say, the English “wail” might well describe the onomatopoeic effect of the word.\textsuperscript{1150} It frequently occurs in pairs, rarely in triplets. It is common to tragedy, particularly Euripides. In tragedy, this expression most often expresses sorrow and suffering. An audience or specific addressee is not always assumed, as the speakers may give utterance for their own benefit in “monologue,” as the chorus demonstrates in Euripides, \textit{Medea} 1274: \textit{iō}

\textsuperscript{1148} Cf. \textit{Homeric Hymn to Demeter} 490; \textit{Theognis} 781, Aeschylus, Persians 628, 640; Sophokles, \textit{Oedipos Tyrannos} 903, \textit{Philoktetes} 1040; Euripides, \textit{Hippolytos}. 82; Aristonoos \textit{Paean to Apollo} 41; etc.

\textsuperscript{1149} Crusius (1894), 37; Reinach (1909-13), 155; Moens (1930), 51.

\textsuperscript{1150} LSJ, Chantraine (1968) s.v. \textit{iō}. It is derived from \textit{ιώθ}. For examples of it use as a noun, cf. Homer, \textit{Iliad} 4.276: ὑπὸ ζώφρονοι \textit{ιωθ} (wind); and 11.308: ἐς ἀνέμου πολυπλάγκτου \textit{ιωθ} (wind); 16.127: πυρός δήσιον \textit{ιωθ} (fire).
τλάμον, ὦ κακοτυχὲς γύναι. However, just lines before, the children have been heard to cry: ἰὼ μοι. Here it is a cry for aid, with the desire that someone should hear and come. This sense of invocation can often be seen explicitly, addressing both mortals (cf. Euripides, Phoenician Women 296: ἰὸν ἰῶ· πότνια πότνια, μόλε πρόδομος) and gods (cf. Euripides, Electra 1177: ἰὸ Γᾶ καὶ Ζεῦ πανδερκέτα βροτῶν). Frequently the invocation of a deity is tightly bound up explicitly in a moment of sorrow or distress, as in Euripides, Alcestis 213: ἰὼ Ζεῦ, τίς ἂν πᾶι πόρος κακῶν γένοιτο. There is a degree of ambiguity to the expression that is nicely portrayed by Sophokles in his Philoktetes. When the boat arrives at its island destination, the sailors hear a cry of suffering at a distance: ἰωάν. However, just moments later, as Philoktetes hails these visitors, he re-contextualizes the term: ἰὸ ξένοι. Here the greeting (or invocation) quite unambiguously brings the full semantic force of the word into play—it is the hail of one who suffers, or who cries out for divine aid in the face of troubles. Knowing this, when we see it appear in Sophokles’ Oedipus Tyrannos, when the chorus prays, the full force of the plight of Thebes comes to the fore. They invoke Athene first, then Apollo: καὶ Φοῖβον

---

1151 Cf. also Sophokles, Antigone 850: ἰὸ δόστανος; Sophokles, Oedipus at Kolonos 199: ἰὸ μοί μοι (Oedipus cries out as he leans on Antigone); Euripides, Iphigenia at Aulis 1283: ἰὸ ἰὸ· νιφόβολον Φρυγῶν νάπος Ἰδας ὑρεα; Aeschylus, Suppliants 125: ἰὸ ἰὸ, ἰὸ δυσάγκριτοι πόνοι. 1152 Cf. also Euripides, Suppliant Women 628: ἰὸ Ζεῦ; Aeschylus, Seven Against Thebes 96: ἰὸ, μάκαρες εὔδοροι; Sophokles, Trachiniai 220-2; ὁ κασσός ἄρτι Βακχάλην ὑποστρέφων ἀμίλλαν ἰὸ ἢ Παιν. 1153 Euripides, Medea 1270. 1154 Cf. also Euripides, Medea 1251: ἰὸ Γᾶ τε καὶ παμφας ἀκτις Ἀλίσων; Euripides, Hippolytus 672: ἰὸ γὰ καὶ φῶς· πᾶι ποντε ἐξολόξω τύχας; Euripides, Electra 1190: ἰὸ Φοῖβος; Euripides, Hercules 886: ἰὸ μοι μέλλως. {Χο.} ἰὸ Ζεῦ. 1155 Sophokles, Philoktetes 216. 1156 Sophokles, Philoktetes 219.
This offers a fine textual precedent (Crusius noted it), however the status of those who suffer the plague in Thebes quite markedly strains any attempt to deny that this is a plea by those who suffer. This has gone unnoticed by previous readers of this hymn, yet it colors the intent of this final strophe in unexpected ways: Apollo, who has shown his might in the past, particularly as protector, is now invoked by the Athenian theoria who sacrifice on behalf of their people and land in order to seek the god’s blessing and protection. However, it is an invocation of desperation, not delight.

While several lines of Euripides have already been provided here as examples, there are a few more which offer interesting precedent and which possibly resonate with this text. There is no necessity of intertextuality here, but the use of ἰὸ in these cases also occurs in proximity to other vocabulary that might sympathetically resonate with Athenaios’ text. In light of Διὸς ἐρίβρομοι in line 2 of this text, certain texts of Euripides provide provocative parallels:

ἰὸ Νέμεσι καὶ Διὸς βαρύβρομοι βρονταὶ κεραύνιόν τε φῶς αἰθαλόεν.

Iō Nemesis, and Deep-Thundering Thunders of Zeus, and his Light-Gleaming Lightning

ἰὸ βάκχαι, ἰὸ βάκχαι; Iō Bacchai! Iō Bacchai!

ἰὸ, ἰὸ δέσποτα δέσποτα, μόλε νυν ἡμέτερον ἐς θίασον, ὁ Βρόμιε Βρόμιε.

Iō, Iō, master, master! Come now to our thiasos, O Bromius, Bromius!

In light of the many references to mountains in Athenaios’ hymn:

---

1157 Sophokles, Oedipos Tyrannos 162.
1158 Euripides, Phoenician Women 182.
1159 Euripides, Bacchai 578, 582.
ἴω ἰώ· νυφόβολον Φρυγῶν νάπος Ἰδας τ’ ὀρέα.1160

Ἰὸ Ἰὸ! Snow-struck Phrygian thickets and Idean mount.

These are expressions of woe. It is impossible to say for certain if an audience member would have recalled any of these texts, much less thought that they mattered, as the contexts are quite different. However, there is an easy association demonstrated here between the cry of ἰὼ and loud-thundering Zeus, loud Bacchus, and mountaintops. ἰὼ with Apollo is unexpected, particularly as one might instead expect the formulaic ἰὲ Παιάν as found repeatedly in Aristonoos’ paean, and many places besides.

The combination of ἰὸ with the preceding ἄλλ’ is unprecedented, and yet the use of each as an expression of invocation and focus is easily comprehended. The audience expects the name of the god upon whom the chorus calls to now be uttered. The remainder of this strophe is heavily fragmented, but as the poet has a habit of richly naming persons in this hymn, it may be expected that Apollo would now have been splendidly titled, and quite likely with epithets and descriptions that have yet to be utilized in the poem, particularly as the meter has shifted, allowing for a different sort of musical flair to be demonstrated. While most of the text cannot be restored, it is likely safest to assume the possibility of each remaining word being a reference to the god.

θάλος1161—The word metaphorically refers to a child but directs focus and emphasis to the parent. This neuter tends only to appear in the nominative and accusative

1160 Euripides, Iphigenia at Aulis 1283.
1161 Furley and Bremer (2001), 92.
cases, and is derived from θαλλός, ο which essentially means a “young branch.” θάλος as a metaphor is seems to rely quite strongly on this word, and makes a great deal of sense in our own idiom, as we still often refer to a “family tree.” Examples: Hektor is called such by his mother, Odysseos refers to Nausikaa as a “bloom entering the dance,” Demeter describes Persephone this way, as does Metaneira her son, Herakles is Amphytrio’s glory, Anchises will see his “bloom,” Aeneas, both Orestes and Elektra are a “bloom” for Agamemnon, etc. The word is frequent in myth, and contextually appears not merely to describe age or relationship, but emphasizes the status granted to the parent—the glory or joy of having this offspring. Indeed this sense is apparent in the verb θάλλω, to which both nouns are related. This verb means, “to bloom” and “to be luxuriant, rich.”

While the fragmented nature of these lines makes it impossible to be sure of anything, this word strongly suggests that Apollo’s mother Leto would have been named, or at least referenced/evoked at this point. We find her mentioned as his mother in Limenios’ hymn in the opening section where Apollo is described (line 5), again in the episode where he fights the drakōn (line 26), and again in the final prayer (line 35, 

1162 A triplet references, culminating with θάλος. Homer, Iliad 22.82: τέκνον ἐμὼ; 22.84: φίλε τέκνον; 22.87: φιλον θάλος. She worries that Achilles will kill him, causing her to grieve at her loss.
1163 Homer, Odyssey 6.157: τοιὸν θάλος χορὸν εἰσοιχεύσαν. Her family is fortunate.
1164 Homeric Hymn to Demeter 66: γλυκερὸν θάλος, in grief at her loss.
1165 Homeric Hymn to Demeter 187: νέον θάλος, the only son of the house.
1166 Pindar, Olympian Odes 6.68: σεμνον θάλος
1167 Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite 278: ἵδε θάλος ὑφθαλμοῖσι. 
1168 Euripides, Electra 15: ἄρσενά ὅ Ὁρέστην θῆλο τ Ἡλέκτρασ θάλος; also Cf. Euripides, Iphigenia Among the Taurians 171: Ἀγαμεμνόνιον θάλος, of Orestes.
1169 LSJ s.v. θάλος; θαλλός; θάλλω; Chantraine (1968) s.v. θάλλω.
restored). To associate Apollo with his mother is common, but this represents something of a shift in Athenaios’ hymn as he was named Zeus’ son, and Leto would first appear here, unless perhaps she were to have been mentioned in the lacuna of the drakōn episode. The sense is clear here, however. In this prayer we find Apollo invoked again, with rich description, among which seems to be language that describes him as the sort of child that a parent (here Leto, or possibly Zeus) is blessed and fortunate to have.

γεένναν—This is a poetic form for γένος, a common word in poetry, especially theater. In the context of this prayer, we may assume that this word would be paired in some significant way with θάλος, as both words refer poetically to offspring. This reinforces the view that Leto (most likely) or Zeus would have been referenced in the lacuna. Most persons or places in this hymn are presented with a cluster of descriptive adjectives or nouns that flesh out and enrich the referent. Unlike with the others, however, γεένναν may actually offer a hint of narrative potential. Apollo as offspring of Leto features heavily in myth tradition and cultic hymns. Limenios quite explicitly mentions the birth narrative in his hymn, and it is quite possible that this final section of Athenaios’ hymn evokes this narrative.

φιλόμου—It is impossible to know what word was originally written here. Editors have disagreed over the legibility of the character that might follow the O. A more detailed discussion of the proposed variants may be found in the epigraphical

---

1170 Homeric Hymn to Apollo; Kallimachos Hymn to Apollo, Hymn to Delos, etc.
1171 Moens (1930), 51-2.
1172 Crusius (1894), 37-8; Moens (1930), 52; Bélis (1992), 79-80.
commentary. It is sufficient here to note that, in this final strophe, we should expect that Apollo is described, and the meaning of any supplement should give good sense as an epithet of the god. O. Crusius’ proposal of φιλόμαχον (war-loving), could refer back to the episodes of violence in Strophe 3. However, Apollo, while an archer, does not typically exalt in battle itself, in the way that Ares might. Crusius does cite Pindar, fragment 164, as precedent: φιλόμαχον γένος, but there is no precedent for this as an epithet of Apollo. It does appear in association with Athene, however.\footnote{Cf. Aeschylus, \textit{Seven against Thebes} 120: σὸ τ’ ὄ Διογενές φιλόμαχον κράτος.} P. Moens preferred φιλόμουλπος (music-loving), harking back to Strophes 1 and 2.\footnote{These two options do seem to echo Apollo’s portrayals in the two \textit{prooimioi} of the \textit{Homeric Hymn to Apollo}. He is both god of the bow and god of the kithara.} This too would be exceptional as an epithet for Apollo—but this sort of difficulty only carries so much weight as Athenaios’ hymn so often presents unusual descriptive adjectives/epithets. Moens cited Pindar, \textit{Nemean Odes} 7.9: πόλιν φιλόμουλπον, as precedent. Here a city is described such, but it would pose no great difficulty to transfer the term to a divinity. Th. Reinach’s proposal of φιλόχορον seems a better fit, and A. Bélis drew attention to this option once more—it had been largely discarded once editors had rejected the possibility of reading a X on the stone. If however there are no clear traces following the O (some editors made arguments for the apices of a M or N), or, in fact, actually traces of the X, then Reinach’s suggestion is once more viable. φιλόχορον (chorus-loving) would give good sense, but again the supplement would be unprecedented as an epithet of Apollo.\footnote{As precedent we see Pan so described in Aeschylus, \textit{Persians} 448.} I offer, as yet one more alternative, φιλοχωρον
(region-loving), which would tie nicely into the possible prayers for the safety of Athens and Delphi in this strophe.

δαάμοιο

—This is the Doric spelling for δῆμος, the *deme*. We can assume that here reference is made to either Delphi of Athens, with the intent of beseeching the god(s) to prosper and protect. In the Pythaïdes inscriptions, we read that the *theoria* was sent on behalf of the health and safety (ἐφ’ ὑγείᾳ καὶ σωτηρίᾳ) of all the citizens, children, women, as well as friends and allies. Delphi would quite suitably belong to the category of “friends and allies,” particularly as the Athenians have control over the Amphytiony at this point. Additionally, in the closing prayer of Limenios’ hymn, we find the imperative σῶζε (protect/save) occurring in the first line (34). Following, several groups are named: Athens, those who dwell at Delphi, and the Romans. We may assume that Athenaios at minimum refers to Athens in this prayer, possibly by δαάμοιο, but it is likely that the prayer as a whole makes reference to more than one group.

---

1176 Moens (1930), 52-3.

1177 Crusius (1894), 37 would include the Hyperboreans as a possibility as well, as he felt it might appropriately refer to any community under Apollo’s care. Moens was more confident that Athens was meant, as the poet was an Athenian.
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Chapter 5: An Aesthetics of Difference

Prior chapters have approached Athenaios’ hymn in several ways: history, text and epigraphy, as well as philology. This final chapter takes a step back, away from the text proper, and concerns itself with poetic technique; it raises the question of how awareness of poetic technique can and should shape our appreciation for texts.

Scholarship has largely neglected Athenaios’ hymn. M.L. West’s enthusiastic and romantic rhapsodizing of the epigraphical hymns in the introduction to his Ancient Greek Music,\textsuperscript{1179} as well as F. Graf’s various references in his recent Apollo,\textsuperscript{1180} have drawn attention more recently. However, by being late (Hellenistic) and derivative (no new mythical content) it seems unlikely that large numbers of scholars will turn their collective attention to these texts. The prevalent attitude can be seen clearly in The Cambridge History of Classical Literature (1985). I give two examples for reference: 1)

\textsuperscript{1179} West (1992b), v, 288-301. In his preface, M.L. West informs the reader of his memorizing one of the hymns, and on his first trip to Greece, singing it loudly amidst the ruins of Delphi. We are treated to the anecdote that his (to become later wife) travelling companion nearly dislodged the stone inscriptions mounted in the museum.

\textsuperscript{1180} Graf (2009), varia.
the essay “Hellenistic Poetry: Minor Figures,” makes mention in passing of “numerous paeans,” including those from Delphi. He notes that of Aristonoos (dating it to 222 BCE) and that of Limenios, but he fails even to even that of Athenaios. He devotes the space of a single sentence to these texts, beginning with the “mediocre” verses of Isyllus and closing with the “awkward” hexameters of Maiistas.\footnote{Bulloch (1985), 616.} In the same volume, the essay, “The Homeric Hymns,” manages to utterly neglect the shorter hymns, while stating that, “…their language and style are derivative, ‘sub-epic’, and in places clearly Hesiodic.”\footnote{Baron, Easterling, and Kirk (1985), 110.} As if being Hesiodic was some great failure of artistic competence? If this opinion says something true for the minor Hymns, how much more should we find the Delphic texts lacking? It is small wonder that readers of the classics are largely unaware of their existence.

In this chapter, I will discuss what I would like to call an \textit{aesthetics of difference}. My goal is to argue that texts perceived as derivative, late, or unoriginal actually may represent underappreciated heights of poetic achievement. For the purposes of scope, I will maintain focus on exploring the possibility of reading in a specific way, without attempting to apply it at length to the whole of Athenaios’ hymn, or to other Greek texts.

I begin by attempting to demonstrate that innovation was traditional and rewarded when done well. Furthermore, I hope to show that creativity and innovation were often required, and that it was within the context of the \textit{expected} and the \textit{recognizable} that change and variation might be permitted, expected, and appreciated.\footnote{I have found López-Ruiz (2012) to be a helpful, parallel, approach. She states the matter nicely, “…a literary artifact crafted through knowledge and respect for inherited traditions but bound to become a}
practice has its roots in instrumental competition, and can be seen at a deeply philological level in mythical and cultic texts. Careful attention to what remains the same and what changes, what surprises and what satisfies expectations—I am calling this an *aesthetics of difference*—permits a fresh appreciation for many ‘formulaic’ texts, and insists that we stop neglecting later works that seem merely to pass down the genealogical data of previous poetic generations. Myths change over time, and even when the narrative appears stable, the words through which the myth is expressed vary and change. This seems obvious enough. Yet change is often perceived as something negative, particularly when considered in the context of ancient Greece.

This chapter will explore the tension between tradition and innovation at a philological level. Interpretive issues will be set aside, and the focus will instead be on the under-studied implications of continuity and innovation, similarity and difference, expectation and innovation. My argument is that creative modification (change) was demanded and expected by Greek audiences, but that appreciation was dependent upon the audience’s ability to ‘recognize’ narrative. An *aesthetics of difference* only functions when one knows what one is looking at.\(^\text{1184}\) I suggest that the performance of these hymns at festival is best understood within a context of *re-performance*—the repeated enactment of the festival itself, as well as the (re)performance of other songs throughout the day, as well as the memory of all prior ‘performances’ in the mind of the audience. A

---

\(^\text{1184}\) Athenian tragedy would offer an immediately obvious *comparandum*. The achievement of each playwright was directly highlighted against the productions of prior years. Plays were about events long ago and far away, but events and characters that the audience was already intimately familiar with. Changes were marked and significant, and intentional in the hands of the playwright.
heightened awareness of this fact permits a new appreciation of composition, continuity, innovation, and intention. I take the following statements as axiomatic: 1) Language is inherently subjective, contextual, and changing—it is used and abused. 2) Art demands creativity and innovation, but is unavoidably informed and constrained by the past.

Nomos as Model for Innovation in Mythological Narrative

The Pythian Games at Delphi offer an interesting and useful *comparandum* for thinking about what a tradition of innovation might look like and how it might function.1185 The mythographer Hyginus informs his readers that Apollo founded the Pythian Games after he slew the *drakōn*.1186 It is unclear exactly when historical competition first occurred at Delphi, but archaeology offers some evidence that the cult of Apollo Pythios began c.1000-800 BCE, with an increase in dedications as well as growth in the nearby village, closer to 800.1187 It is possible that the festival dates to this time period. The contest of interest belonged to the more recognizable form of the Pythian Games that was established after the first “Sacred War,” when the new Delphic League (Amphictyony) suddenly expanded the breadth of the competitive program. It

---

1185 For a general description, see Kyle (2007), 137-140, and notes 1-4 (bibliography) on page 361. Cf. also Tzachou-Alexandri (1989), 69-79, and notes (bibliography) on pgs. 80-1, (and relevant to this discussion of music, see figure 120 on page 119-120 “Figurine of a Aulos Player,” also in FD V., 129 ff., no. 183 pl. 35.) Cf. also Scott (2014), 73-4.

1186 Hyginus, *Fabulae* 140: *Pythonem sagittis interfecit (inde Pythius est dictus), ossaque eius in cortinam coniecit et in templo suo posuit, ludosque funebres ei fecit, qui ludi Pythia dicuntur.* “He killed the Python with arrows (hence he is called Pythius), and cast its bones into the cauldron (tripod) and placed it in his temple, and he established funerary games for it, the games which are called ‘Pythian.’” The *Homerica Hymn* is silent on the matter.

1187 It is noteworthy that Homer already knows of the Delphi as famous for its wealth (*Iliad* 9.404-5) and as the site of an oracle (*Odyssey* 8.79-81).
appears that in 586 BCE the Pythian Games were re-established in a manner self-consciously imitative of, but not identical to, the Olympian Games.\footnote{Pausanias 10.7.2-7. The expansion was significant in scope. The Pythian games then offered sixteen competitions, compared with Olympia’s thirteen. These contests in 586 seem to have rewarded prizes of tripods, possibly golden, funded from that “Sacred War.” At the 2\textsuperscript{nd} quadrennial celebration of the games in 582 BCE, the prizes appear to have become the more traditionally expected crowns. Cf. Pausanias 10.7.5. These crowns, at some point, became consistently those made of laurel, Apollo’s sacred tree, specifically those growing in the Tempe valley. The Pythian contests would continue to expand and change over the centuries, well into the Roman period. E.g. an additional kithara-playing contest was added in 558 BCE. Cf. Kyle (2007), 138.} The Greek historian Strabo, writing of that early 6\textsuperscript{th} c. BCE expansion by the Amphyctionies, provides details regarding the newly expanded scope of the competition. Both athletic contests and additional musical formats were added. Most relevantly, Strabo comments that while the original practice of kitharoedes (those who sing to the accompaniment of the kithara) performing a paean for the god continued, competitions for aulos-players and kitharists who played without singing (χωρίς ὀδὴς) were added. In each event, the artist would perform a certain melos that Strabo says bore the moniker of nomos Pythikos.\footnote{Strabo, \textit{Geography} 9.3.10. τι μέλος δ ἀκάλεσται νόμος Πυθικός. Cf. West, M.L. (1992b), 212-13.} These would be purely instrumental competitions, focusing on the virtuosic skill of the musicians.

\begin{quote}
A nomos (νόμος), for Greek music, meant something like an established or traditional form.\footnote{Cf. Anderson (1994), 53-4, 66; Comotti (1989), 16-17, 33, 71; West (1992b), 215-17. It may be helpful to remember that νόμος elsewhere is used to describe laws and customs that are considered habit and convention, and derives from the verb νέμω. The closely related νομός, which refers to pasture suggests nicely the nature of habit and the role of suitability. Cf. \textit{LSJ} s.v. νόμος and Chantraine (1965) s.v. νέμω. Fascinatingly, Farmer (1957), 250 ponders that there might be a near-eastern connection with the Semitic neum, “intoned utterance of soothsayer and prophet.” Further, pgs. 276-7, he comments that Plato’s concern in Laws, 657 suggests that there was, in Greece, a tension between the strictly prescribed rules for the nomoi, and the popular demands of the ‘pleasure-seeking’ crowds.} It is unclear precisely what the term meant, or if it always meant the same thing. It may have referred to a fixed melody, or simply an established mode and
form that allowed for a degree of variation. One thinks of the flexibility of Irish reels, American jazz standards, or (probably better) the '12-bar blues’ as possible comparanda.\footnote{The 12-bar blues is a particularly useful a a figure of comparison, as there is no formally required rhythm, tempo, key, lyric, or even melody, and yet it is unmistakable when played, in spite of the fact that it can be played for extensive periods due to extreme malleability. M.L. West finds Indian ragas a useful comparandum, referring to them as, “Prescriptive modal-melodic structures.” Cf. note 66, page 217, in West (1992b).} It would be a mistake to assume that a nomos carried the same constraints and exactitude of a modern classical piece. M.L. West would like to see a slight distinction in the usage of the word nomos within musical poetry, and about music. In poetic usage, he would define it as melody, “with a definite identity or character.” Birds songs offer an excellent example of what is meant here, but it can also refer to the different natures of, say, funeral lament, and a wedding hymenaios.\footnote{West (1992b), 215. Cf. Pindar, Nemean Ode 5.25: ἁγεῖροι παντοῦ νόμοιν. Apollo leads the singing of “all sorts” of nomoi. (West’s note 61 incorrectly cites 5.35.) Aeschylus, Suppliants 69: ἱανινόοις νομοις, Ionian nomoi serve as songs of lament. Euripides, Helen 187-8: Ναϊς δρέποι φύγαναν πύκνων έγειρα γορέν, a ravished Naiad casts forth a "nomos of distress." It would seem that one way in which nomoi may be distinguished is the use to which they are put—they are suited for particular contexts. Cf. Schlesinger (1939), 56 for commentary on aulos tuning, which in light of Plutarch, On Music 67 (prohibitions on changing tuning, rhythm, or harmony of a nomos) suggests that the fixed tonality of an aulos (drilled holes) would require specific instruments for specific songs; this would suggest physical limitations imposed by the instrument itself.} On the other hand, as a technical term, he wishes for something more specific, wanting to define it as, “…a specific, nameable melody, or a composition in its melodic aspect, sung or played in a formal setting in which it was conventionally appropriate.”\footnote{West (1992b), 216.} What this essentially amounts to is a claim that a nomos is something more than mere genre, style, or mode. In other words, it would be identifiable, recognizable. There were apparently a great number of nomoi, and one might expect that these tunes would make up, to a large extent, the...
musical repertoire of a working musician. West argues, and I would agree, that a nomos was something more than a key or a kind of song, but something less than a Western opus with every note scripted.

The nomos Pythikos mentioned by Strabo was a musical representation of Apollo’s famous duel with the drakōn, previous guardian and possessor of the Delphic Tripod. The (re)performative representation of this mythical event was a broad tradition at Delphi, touched upon variously in other ritual contexts. For example, the Steptarion festival seems to have, in some form, represented this episode. Some have thought that the festival featured a re-enactment of Apollo’s fight with the serpent, and his subsequent flight to Tempe for purification. Plutarch offers varying explanations of the significance of the ritual activities, but he makes it quite clear that, for many at least, the actions were associated with the story of conflict over the site of Delphi between

1194 Some were described by the name of a deity (e.g. Athene’s nomos, which was apparently featured as part of the Pan-Athenian Festival in Athens in a similar manner as the nomos Pythikos in Delphi; cf. West (1992b), 216-7, whereas others were linked to place, cult, ethnic origins, or even author. While not to be taken as completely accurate, Plutarch’s On Music 1-7 claims to offer a history and description of the better known Greek nomoi. The accuracy is suspect as he seems to assume a lyric component when other authors distinguish between vocal and purely instrumental music. Pausanias, Geography 10.7.4-5 makes it quite clear that there were both instrumental and sung performances at the Pythian Games, starting in 586 BCE, but that the pipe nomos, which was accompanied by a voice was soon canceled, while the purely instrumental form was retained. See also Schlesinger (1939), 81.

1195 Many do not realize that Western music, until quite recently, did not actually put ‘all the notes’ on the page. Composers were in the habit of employing a short-hand called figured bass. The score would include melody, bass-line, and series of sub-linear symbols indicating the harmonic progression and voicing. These scores could be adapted by skilled musicians to full orchestral scale, or a solo organ performance. In much the way the today’s rock ‘chord-charts’ function, there was a great deal of freedom granted to the individual performer to adapt the piece to both taste and performative competence. Even once it became more common to write full scores, many composers still preferred (and continued) to compose in figured-bass, and fill in the rest afterwards. Handel’s famous Messiah was composed in this manner

1196 Plutarch includes this festival in his list of three that occur every 8 years: the Steptarion, the Herois, and the Charila. Plutarch, Greek Questions 12. Very little is known of either the Herois or Charila.

1197 Cf. Dempsey (1918), 154-161; Farnell (1907), Vol. IV, 293-295. The ritual seems to have included the erection of a hut on the threshing-floor that was then burned down by a band of boys who then fled the scene.
Apollo and the *drakōn*. Most pertinent, Plutarch notes that poets and storytellers were in the habit of portraying this event in competitive theatrical performances.

Strabo explains that the *nomos Pythikos* followed an established format of five divisions, each movement depicting a separate scene in the well-known narrative: ἄγκρουσις, ἄμπειρα, κατακέλευσις, ἱμβοι and δάκτυλοι (a paired title), and σύριγγες. He goes on to define these terms for the reader. While Strabo’s definitions are helpful, the labels themselves have interesting and potentially significant meanings and connotations that are easily lost once the more familiar vocabulary of the ‘definitions’ is overlaid. Strabo claims that the original composer of this song (*melos*) was a certain Timosthenes, a fleet-commander or admiral for the 2nd Ptolemy who also

---

1198 Plutarch may not have actually seen it this way (being a priest at Delphi he would have some expertise), as his dialogue challenges some of the more mythical assumptions. *On the Failure of Oracles* 15 (Moralia 417F-418D). For a discussion, cf. Harrison (1912), 424-429. Dempsey (1918), 158 is of the opinion that the enactment would have occurred in a large open area in front of the portico of the Athenians. Circled with seating, he suggests that the slaughter of the *drakōn* would have been ritually performed/re-enacted during the Stepteron. Ghiron-Bistagne (1976), 251 sees this as a ‘pre-dramatic’ activity, a sort of sacred drama showing the victory of light over darkness (torches were involved) and having some sort of funerary characteristics (the burning hut as a funeral pyre? Cf. also Hyginus, *Fabulae* 140 where the Pythian games were described as funerary – NB. however, that the Steptarion and the Pythian Games are distinct).

1199 Plutarch does not seem to approve of this practice, as he feels it raises contradictions with actual ritual praxis, something he would have had some knowledge of as a priest at Delphi in charge of the Oracle. *On the Failure of Oracles* 15 (Moralia 417F-418D): ποτε πρὸς ὄφιν τῷ θεῷ περὶ τοῦ χρηστηρίου μάχην γενέσθαι καὶ ταῦτα ποιητὰ καὶ λογογράφους ἐν θεάτροις ἀγωγόμενους λέγειν ἐῶντες, “That once a battle occurred, between a god and a snake, concerning the oracle, and poets and story-tellers tell of these events when they compete in the theater.” Farnell (1907), vol. IV, 292 notes that both Plutarch (*Moralia* 674 D, 638C) and Pliny (*Natural History* 35.35) mention paintings featuring in a contest at the Pythian Games as well. One can only wonder if the battle with the *drakōn* was featured, as it was a seemingly popular topic in graphic portrayals.

1200 Strabo, *Geography* 9.3.10. It may be assumed that this was not the only *nomos* constituted of more than one movement. Landels (1999), pgs. 154-155 discusses the many-headed *nomos* supposedly composed by Athene to commemorate the slaying of the Gorgon by Perseus. Cf. Pindar, *Pythian Ode* 12.18-27. This was also a competition piece designed to exploit the πάμφωνον capability of the *aulos*, particularly with respect to the death shrieks of the dying Gorgon.
was known for a work on harbors.\textsuperscript{1201} Keeping in mind his profession, and how this may influence his vocabulary, I now consider this Timosthenes’ selection of labels.

According to Strabo the first segment, the ἄγκρουσις, was a sort of prelude (προοίμιον) to the events of the myth, however the label ἄγκρουσις itself refers to “a pushing back,” an action often used in nautical contexts to refer to a ship backing water.\textsuperscript{1202} While it is unclear exactly how this semantic force applies to a musical composition, it is suggestive that a προοίμιον, rather than being a relevant introduction to, or setting up of, the narrative to come, may actually be a temporary ‘reversal’ or hesitation, a holding off from the topic to come. If this possibility has any merit, it suggests that the performer may have essentially been free to do whatever he or she wished for this portion of the composition. In fact, when one considers the two introductory sections within the \textit{Homer Hymn to Apollo},\textsuperscript{1203} one sees this type of freedom. If the introductory material was intentionally designed to resonate with later segments in a work, so much the better—however, none of this will be immediately obvious during the προοίμιον. In a musical context, it would be possible for the performer to introduce specific motifs and rhythmic patterns that would reappear in

\textsuperscript{1201} Strabo, \textit{Geography} 2.1.40 notes that the geographer Eratosthenes relied quite heavily on this work; Strabo finds both of these sources to be full of errors. Agathemerus, a 3\textsuperscript{rd} c. CE geographer, in his \textit{Geographica} 1.2, claims that Timosthenes added to the traditional 4 winds, bringing the total to 12, and deserves credit for beginning to use them to indicate directions, much like a modern compass. Timosthenes was active in the early 3\textsuperscript{rd} c. BCE, during the reign of Ptolemy II, Philadephus. Due to the dating, it would seem that Timosthenes was not the original author of the \textit{nomos}, but may have been responsible, as part of Ptolemy’s conscious investment in Greek culture, for re-invigorating this particular musical piece.

\textsuperscript{1202} \textit{LSJ} s.v. ἄνάκρουσις. Cf. Thucydides, \textit{Peloponnesian War} 7.36.5. προοίμιον is quite common whereas ἄγκρουσις is exceptionally rare. As such, it is unsurprising that a definition would be called for, and both ancient and modern readers are likely to be grateful to recognize such a recognizable term as προοίμιον. This ‘prelude,’ alas, says nothing useful in this specific context, but instead disguises a unique and defined musical composition under a generic (and poorly defined/understood) vocabulary item.

\textsuperscript{1203} \textit{Homer Hymn to Apollo} 1-18, 179-206.
further sections, but which for the moment appear to simply give evidence to the artist’s creative capacity before they turn to the more narrowly bounded and prescribed material and format.

Following this introductory overture would come the ἀμπείρα, the initial onset, or attack (κατάπειρα) of the contest between Apollo and the drakōn. It is worth noting that this is not the battle proper, but merely a skirmish, meant to introduce the combatants to each other (and one would assume, to the audience). Specific musical motifs, techniques, and rhythms would likely be arranged in such a way that the audience could hear the presence of two separate ideas or forces. Perhaps there was a sort of musical stichomythia interspersed with longer ‘descriptive’ sections.\textsuperscript{1204} The audience would be introduced to the antagonists. The vocabulary reported by Strabo is quite interesting here. The meaning of ἀμπείρα may easily obscure that of κατάπειρα, rather than aid. (Note that they share the same root/base, featuring only differing prepositions. κατάπειρα has to do with “making a trial of, testing,” and in naval terms it refers to the execution of maneuvers, as well as (and this resonance is quite interesting here) making trial of a new ship, putting it through its paces.\textsuperscript{1205} This section of the competition would be the musical equivalent of description and epithets, warnings and hissings, an introduction to the characters, but no real violence or action as of yet.

\textsuperscript{1204} Cf. Collins (2004) on stichomythia as a form of competitive speech, E.g. Pg. 28-9. “Tragic stichomythia in Aeschylus, like tragic lament, above all represents an improvised verbal dexterity; it is not an actual one insofar as it involves previously-composed poetry that is memorized and performed. Nevertheless, stichomythia is best understood as a formalized poetic adaptation of a ‘live’ mode of contestation.”

The κατακελευσμὸς was then the contest proper (ἀγών) wherein the combatants strove to win. It would seem appropriate that the central segment of the performance would depict the significant event, the main action of the narrative. Of all the subdivisions, this one particular narrative moment of focus is so familiar that one might think it possibly the most constrained as far as audience expectations. Yet, the moment of combat itself, an inherently non-musical event, would call most strenuously upon the skill of the performer.\textsuperscript{1206} The sound of bow, of arrows, of hissing, and of pain—here we see what the musician can do with their instrument.\textsuperscript{1207} It is perhaps proper that this violent conflict between Apollo and the drakōn is here referenced with the same term that would also appropriately describe the musical competition itself—in this striving, only one instrumentalist will emerge as a victor. Again, the gloss potentially obscures a possible insight into this musical piece offered by Timosthenes’ label. κατακελευσμὸς generically describes the activity of “calling to, encouraging,” and at sea it specifically describes the calling of time to the rowers.\textsuperscript{1208} The first option, that of the combatants calling to each other, is suitable for an epic battle. Consider the narrative examples that may be found in Homer’s Iliad as heroes clash on the plains of Troy: Cf. Diomedes and Pandarus in Book 5, who exchange speeches and spear-throws, as well as the well-known exchanges of Hector and Achilles in Book 22.\textsuperscript{1209} It seems reasonable to assume that the κατακελευσμὸς contained a certain amount of back-and-forth between the combatants. It

\textsuperscript{1206} Cf. Perrot, S. (2012), 345-361. The author explores the interesting tension between music and noise, meaningful voice and inarticulate sounds.

\textsuperscript{1207} In similar fashion to the twang of string applying equally well to bow and kithara (note that Apollo is god of both), the hiss of the breath seems a suitable description of both drakōn and wind-instrument.

\textsuperscript{1208} LSJ s.v. κατακελέω.

\textsuperscript{1209} Homer, Iliad 5.274-310; 22.250-374.
is however, the latter sense noted, the nautical meaning, that may be particularly enlightening. In Aristophanes’ *Frogs*, a fantastical *comparandum* may be found—Dionysos asks for help in rowing a boat: κατακέλευε δῆ. ¹²¹⁰ What follows is a remarkable moment in Greek theater, where onomatopoeic play with words, as well as nonsense syllables, provide the oar-strokes. The guide Charon opens with, “ὦσοπόπ, ϋσοπόπ,” and is followed by the chorus of frogs crying, “βρεκεκέκεξ κοάζ κοάζ, βρεκεκεκέξ κοάζ κοάζ.” ¹²¹¹ It is reasonable to expect that the musician employed various ‘pyrotechnics’ on their instrument to re-create the sounds of battle. In addition to melody, additional techniques would be deployed to reproduce non-musical effects, and it seems likely that these special effects could have been intensely metrical, or rhythmic, in nature.

Next was the victory celebration, of ἱαμβοὶ and δάκτυλοι, or more specifically as Strabo describes it, the victory *paean* (ἐπιπαιανισμός). ¹²¹² Ἐπιπαιανισμός would be a *paean* sung in victory, here over the vanquished foe. To describe this section as a ‘*paean*’ is particularly interesting as it suggests that this seemingly ambiguous form/genre could be musically apprehended by an audience through melody, rhythm, or form alone; it would be recognizable without ritual narrative, an expression of *hiē paean!* or reliance on cretic measures. Alternatively, (this is a potentially troubling lens), this movement was viewed as a *paean* precisely because it was *expected* to be one. That is to say, in this case, genre would be external and prior to content and from. There is no specifically nautical understanding associated with either ἐπιπαιανισμός or the ἱαμβοὶ and δάκτυλοι, but one

¹²¹⁰ Aristophanes, *Frogs* 207.
¹²¹¹ Aristophanes, *Frogs* 208-10.
¹²¹² Oddly enough, this term seems to be a *hapax*, appearing only in this passage. However, the meaning is clear.
may easily understand the applicability of a “victory song” to the context of actual naval warfare. Judging by the labels Strabo provides, it would seem that this section made use of two specific metrics: the long-short (˘) of iambic and the long-short-short (˘˘˘) of dactylic. He additionally points out that dactylics are employed for praise (ὕμνος), and iambic are for reproach and blame (κακισμός)—apparently, the victory song would have incorporated both of these meters and the associated genres and attitudes, praise for Apollo and blame for his defeated foe. There was a long tradition of using iambic poetry in a derogatory manner, and one need only to recall that epics such as the Iliad and hymns such as the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* are composed of dactylic hexameter to see the background here. The *Homeric Hymn* offers a useful precedent for such activity.

After his defeat of the *drakōn*, Apollo exults over his defeated foe.

Finally, the σύριγγες depicted the death of the beast, which Strabo explains involved imitating the failing, last breaths of the *drakōn* as it expired (ἔκλειψις). This gloss, ἔκλειψις, describes the failure, cessation, or extinction of the foe. It is somewhat odd that the death of the *drakōn* would occur after the victory song, but there is precedent—the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* waits until after Apollo’s speech to have the foe die: ὃς φάτ’ ἐπευχόμενος· τὴν δὲ σκότος ὃσσε κάλυψε. Strabo has made an obvious connection between the sound of “pipes” (σύριγγες) and the hissing and wheezing of the *drakōn* as it gasps out its life and dies, yet in the *Homeric Hymn* this wheezing occurs

---

1213 *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 362-370. Granted that this text only offers dactylic hexameter, it is worth remembering that this hymn in praise of the deity contains him engaging in an iambic type activity, and it is the conventions of genre and meter that here forbid the use of iambics which might have been more appropriate to his speech as victor.

1214 LSJ s.v. ἔκλειψις.

1215 *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 370.
before Apollo’s speech: μέγ’ ἀσθμαίνουσα. 1216 N.B.: In Athenaios’ hymn, line 24, we read: ἱσὺρήγμαθ’ ἰείς ἀνώπε[υτ’]. This seems an easy association to make, and Strabo is probably correct. Yet, it may be worth considering that in the nautical context, the word σύριγγες seems to have been used to describe the sound of wind in the rigging. 1217 Such a reading would suggest that this is a moment of departure, as sails would not have been used during naval conflict due to the utter lack of rapid maneuverability they would afford during combat. This reading is the less likely, but attention to the following section in the Homeric Hymn grants a modicum of resonance: after he secured the oracle and built his temple, Apollo went to look for priests, and found them—Cretan merchants sailing in a swift ship on the open sea. 1218

Strabo’s account is not the only mention we have of the nomos Pythikos. It is informative to compare his description with that found in Pollux’s Onomasticon. 1219 Once more there are five divisions, but the precise descriptors and ‘events’ differ somewhat: πεῖρα, κατακελευσμὸς, ἱαμβικὸν, σπονδεῖον, and καταχόρευσις. Pollux also offers definitions for his labels. The performance begins with an examination of the location—a testing to check its suitability for the contest (agōn). The next two segments have familiar descriptions, but the definitions differ; Pollux designates them as the “challenge” and the

---

1216 Homeric Hymn to Apollo 359.
1217 Dionysius of Halicarnassus, On Literary Composition 16. He considers that nature is a source of vocabulary, by fact of words that sound in imitation to that which they describe. χρεμετισμὸς ἵππων καὶ φριμαγμὸς τράγων πυρὸς τε βρόμον καὶ πάταγον αἰνέμον καὶ σφυριγμὸν κάλων. It is worth noting that he describes the sound of flame with βρόμον, related to the Zeus epithet in Athenaios’ hymn.
1218 Homeric Hymn to Apollo 399-401.
1219 Pollux, Onom. 4.84. τοῦ δὲ Πυθικοῦ νόμου τοῦ αὐλητικοῦ μέρη πέντε. The adjective αὐλητικοῦ suggests that this nomos might have other versions, and in fact Strabo, Geography 9.3.10 could be read as suggesting that there were two separate, but related, contests—one for the aulos and one for the cithara. προσέθεσαν δὲ τοῖς κιθαρῳδοῖς αὐλητάς τε καὶ κιθαριστὰς χωρὶς ᾠδῆς, ἀποδώσοντας τι μέλος ὁ καλεῖται νόμος Πυθικὸς. The possibility of a duet is unlikely.
“fight.” He explains that, during the iambikon, the musician produces blasts on his instrument meant to represent the bellowing and teeth gnashing of the drakōn as it is shot with arrows. Following this is the exhibition of the god’s victory, and then, finally, the victory dance.

A third source must be briefly mentioned, in spite of its problematic nature. A scholiast on Pindar’s 12th Pythian ode comments upon the nomos as well. This ode was composed to honor a certain Midas who had won an aulos competition at the Pythian Games, but it would appear that it was not the nomos Pythikos in which he competed—Pindar suggests he told the story of Perseus and the Gorgon. This scholiast lists six sections, with cryptic explanations: πεῖρον (the attack against the beast), ἰαμβὸν (verbal abuse before the fight), δάκτυλον (from Dionysos, who first gave oracles from the tripod), κρητικὸν (from Zeus; with no further comment), μητρὸν (because the oracle is Gaia’s), and σύριγμα (the whistling/hiss of the serpent). One can only assume that there is some confusion at work. However, if we lump ἰαμβὸν with δάκτυλον, as in Strabo’s version, we have five sections, albeit in a different order. It is

---

1220 προκαλέω and μάχομαι.
1221 καὶ τὰ σαλπιστικὰ κρούματα καὶ τὸν ὀδοντισμὸν ὡς τοῦ δράκοντος ἐν τῷ τετοξεῦσθαι συμπρίοντος τοὺς ὀδόντας.
1222 δηλόω is defined (LSJ) as “manifesting, exhibiting, disclosing, revealing, making known, etc.”
1223 ὁ θεὸς τὰ ἐπινίκια χορεύει.
1224 Scholia to Pindar, Pythian Ode 12, hyp. 24-32.
1225 ὁτι ἀπεπειράθη τῆς μάχης τῆς πρὸς τὸ θηρίον.
1226 διὰ τὴν λιθουργίαν τὴν γενομένην αὐτῷ πρὸ τῆς μάχης.
1227 ἀπὸ Διόνυσον, ὁτι πρῶτος οὕτως δοκεῖ ἀπὸ τοῦ τρίποδος θεμιστεῦσαι.
1228 ἀπὸ Δίως.
1229 ὁτι Γῆς τὸ μαντεῖον ἔστι.
1230 τὸν τοῦ ὄφειος συριγμόν.
worth noting this scholiast shares πείρον with both Pollux and Strabo (more closely with Pollux, in simplex), but σώριγμα with Strabo (σώριγγες). It would seem that there was a lack of consistency over time. More specifically, the existence of multiple separate, detailed, descriptive accounts (Pollux and Strabo are the most comparable) of how one might divide and label this particular musical *nomos* suggests the provocative possibility that the format could, and did, shift over time.\(^{1231}\) It will be helpful to compare the details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strabo</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἄγκρουσις</td>
<td>προοίμιον</td>
<td>prelude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμπειρα</td>
<td>κατάπειρα</td>
<td>onset/testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατακελευσμός</td>
<td>ἀγών</td>
<td>contest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἰαμβοὶ and δάκτυλοι</td>
<td>ἐπιπαινισμός</td>
<td>victory celebration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σύριγγες</td>
<td>ἐκλείψις</td>
<td>death of the <em>drakōn</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollux</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>πεῖρα</td>
<td>διορά</td>
<td>testing, examining the location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατακελευσμός</td>
<td>προκαλεῖται</td>
<td>challenging, summoning the <em>drakōn</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἰαμβικὸν</td>
<td>μάχεται</td>
<td>fighting the <em>drakōn</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σπονδεῖον</td>
<td>δηλοῖ</td>
<td>revealing the victory (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταχόρευσις</td>
<td>χορεύει</td>
<td>dancing the victory dance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{1231}\) Strabo writes in the late 1\(^{st}\) c. BCE, and makes use (so he says in *Geo.* 9.3.11) of Ephorus as a source for Delphic history, who was himself a writer of the mid-4\(^{th}\) c. BCE. Pollux is writing in the middle of the 2\(^{nd}\) c. CE. It is likely, therefore, that Strabo represents a much older form, as far as description goes. However, writing later than his sources, we might expect his understanding and interpretation to be shaped by his own time. As such, Strabo as a source will necessarily be problematic, in that we cannot assume he properly understands earlier practice, and it seems likely that his definitions well reflect later traditions that the labels which he seeks to define. As such, we may expect his definitions to more closely parallel with Pollux while the actual labels differ widely.
There are clear differences, yet the story is obviously the same, and overlap in terminology persists, notably with (ἁμ)πειρα, κατακελευσμὸς, and ἵαμβικὸν. What is particularly interesting is how vocabulary may stay the same, while the associated event shifts. The narrative structure remains largely consistent, and the modifications seem mostly to be ones of emphasis and clarity—that is, giving more time to develop certain moments in the narrative as others are compressed, expanding the scope of the beginning and the end, focusing on different types of virtuoso opportunities by exploring the sounds of battle or the sounds of death, and making it clear how each portion belongs to the whole in topic and order. Most interesting is what remains central to the composition—the portrayal of the actual combat.

Another means by which we may gain insight into this event is through the lens of actual performers. We hear of certain aulos players: Sakadas of Argos and Pythokritos of Sikyon. At the founding of the nomos Pythikos in 586 BCE, Sakadas was victorious. He also won at the next two celebrations of the Pythian Games, where crowns were awarded. However, the following six occasions were won by Pythokritus, who also competed at Olympia, and was apparently famous enough to have a statue made in his honor. He is said to have been portrayed as “a little man, holding his auloi.” What

\[1232\] Cf. Plutarch, On Music 8 (Moralia 1134); Pausanias Geography 2.22.8 (here we find referenced τὸ αὐλῆμα τὸ Πυθικὸν; 6.14.10; 10.7.4-5. Pausanias suggests that the animosity of Apollo to aulos-players stemming from the unfortunate Marsyas was overcome by this Sakadas; this suggests that his accomplishments at the Pythian Games were such as to ‘redeem’ the aulos as an instrument worthy of Apollo’s concern and praise. See also Henderson (1957), 380. He notes that Sakadas is the earliest known virtuoso, but that the instrument he played upon was transformed over the next few centuries, by increasing the number of holes in the aulos, as well as a number of metal attachments as aids for the managing of these holes and producing a wider array of pitches. As concerns the progressive nature of musical composition and competitive performance, one must assume that technological progress was accompanied by significant developments in melodic complexity and form as well.

might be gained from this brief foray into biography is a strong sense that the *nomos Pythikos* was without doubt more than a matter of technique.

These famous competitors surely won by means of something stronger than demonstrating a better tremolo technique. Rather, they must have innovated as they performed, following the constraints of a recognizable *nomos*, presenting something that was both recognizable and familiar to the audience, but in such a way that they placed the stamp of their own ingenuity and talent on it.\(^{1234}\) There were rules and expectations that had to be balanced with creativity and virtuoso expressiveness. What is more, the ability of a single individual to win multiple years in a row suggests a habit of re-composition and re-creation, that would allow the performer to return again and again, offering up the ‘same-old’ in a freshly impressive demonstration of ability that followed the progressive march of musical taste and development (*Pythokritos*’ wins would stretch over a period of twenty-four years). Sakadas and *Pythokritos* alone produced *nine* variants of this *nomos*, and to this, we must add in all of the defeated competitors’ compositions. It would seem that, with the bounds of a *nomos*, one tightly framed by mythical narrative, there remained a tremendous amount of room for artistic exploration and risk in the pursuit of victory.

As classicists, we are accustomed to think of narratives largely in the form of texts, but images and sounds may also ‘perform’ familiar stories. The *nomos Pythikos* offers an example of how an audience might expect innovation as well as reward creativity provided that it be embedded in, and shaped by, tradition. Competition

\(^{1234}\) A more classical example: tragic theater heavily favored known myths which each play-write brought to fresh life with their own idiosyncratic choreography, melody, and lyric—with significant changes to plot and character. (cf. the variants on Orestes).
encourages comparison—obviously one performance is ‘better’ than another is, and victory may be achieved through either quality or content.

Western classical music has trained us as listeners to evaluate performances only in terms of quality—interpretation has become a matter of phrasing and emphasis, of tone and texture. Ancient Greece was originally a culture of oral performance and improvisation was welcome and expected. In this sense, a jazz performance might serve as a good model. Any jazz standard has an established nomos and form—but the achievement of a performance (particularly a live performance) extends beyond the interpretation of the song, and includes an expectation and demand for each performer, in each performance, to contribute and offer something personal, something fresh. Each performance is a re-performance, seeking to distinguish itself from, yet situate itself within, previous (re)performances.\footnote{T2} The nomos Pythikos offers a relevant comparandum for thinking about textual compositions such as Athenaios’ hymn to Apollo.

This nomos demonstrates change on a micro and a macro level. Each performance would be unique, embodying change as a means by which each performer would seek to win the contest. Additionally, over time, the contest itself seems to have changed. We cannot know for certain, but it seems likely that, as the format changed, it would impose itself on composition and performance; conversely, each performance would also contribute to the expectations that the format sought to codify. Each expression arising from, and being compared to, tradition is shaped by that tradition, but then itself becomes

\footnote{T2} Jazz offers a wide variety of options through which one may innovate, yet remain recognizable: chorud substitution, melodic modification and extension (especially through use of chromaticism), musical and rhythmic quotation, etc.
part of tradition (memory), which then shapes not only future expressions, but the
tradition itself. Artistic creation arises within a discursive context, but once expressed it
becomes part of the context itself. Tradition that demands or embraces creativity will
inevitably change over time.\textsuperscript{1236}

Every four years at the Pythian games, multiple compositions would be
performed, which we must assume demonstrated creativity and idiosyncratic
expression—to evaluate an instrumental performance only in terms of accuracy of pitch,
or quality of vibrato would seem unlikely. At these contests, multiple innovations and
changes would occur as part of the \textit{agon}, and, over the centuries, it would appear that the
\textit{agon} itself seems to have shifted, yet both the expression and tradition would remain
familiar and recognizable to audiences, while also demonstrating significant change. It is
likely that the cumulative effects of creative and innovative performance would gradually
bend the macro-tradition into new shapes.

\textbf{Competitive Innovation}

I assert that the aesthetic demands of competitive performance reveal a powerful
mechanism for change and innovation, and that for ancient Greece this was accomplished
largely in the medium of mythological narrative.\textsuperscript{1237} That final addition of ‘mythological

\textsuperscript{1236} While it is possible to live in denial of change, it is far easier to acknowledge that change itself may have been traditional.

\textsuperscript{1237} I take any labels of ‘cultic’ as unimportant, as we have little to no understanding of the performative context of anything we might wish to call purely ‘cultic’ song as it might differ from ‘other’ contexts. Public performative contexts in ancient Greece were clearly cultic, to one degree or another. The Greeks are less concerned about the theological contents of their hymns than modern Christians are. The songs are meant to please—both audience and god—not to inform.
narrative’ needs little comment, as the Greeks preferred to re-articulate and re-express the same stories again and again, rather than invent new ones. While no particular expression of myth should be considered canonical or normative in the context of ancient Greece, there was clearly a canon of myth from which both poets and performers were expected to source their compositions, a canon with which all audiences might be reasonably expected to be familiar.

As for performative context, it is an underappreciated fact that festivals often incorporated a great deal of performance. At the Greater Dionysia in Athens, a total of twelve plays would be performed over three days, and we may assume that contests such as the nomos Pythikos would have included a similarly limited, yet competitive group of performers. Beyond the competitive contest, cultic practice itself would often include song (such as the Pythaïdes and Athenaios’ hymn). An interesting comparandum can be found in book one of the Iliad (1.472-5), where the Achaeans, upon returning the daughter of Chryses, are said to have sung to Apollo all day long.

οἳ δὲ πανημέριοι μολπῇ θεόν ἴλασκοντο
καλὸν ἀείδοντες παιήνα κοῦροι Αχαιῶν
μέλποντες ἐκάεργον· ὁ δὲ φρένα τέρπετ' ἄκούσων.

All day long, they appeased the god, singing a handsome paean
The Achaean youth celebrated the far-working one with song and dance
And hearing, he delighted in his heart

The poet here uses a substantive adjective to describe these worshipers: πανημέριοι – Those who sang ‘all day.’ This word is also employed by Hesiod to refer to the
grasshopper who sings of summer: he, πανημέριός, pours forth his voice.\textsuperscript{1238} Again, compare this to Euripides’ \textit{Ion} where the lowly hero sings, “O Savior! O Savior! Be Blessed! Be Blessed O son of Leto!” as he, παναμέριος, sweeps the god’s paving-stones.\textsuperscript{1239} The point of these comparisons is that song (the act of singing), to the Greeks, was not necessarily an isolated event, a single text sung and then done. It would seem that extended periods of song and performance were both possible and likely common, whether in the context of performance (a ritual context) or sacrifice (also a ritual context). Therefore, one must ask: what are they singing? There are two options I find highly unlikely: 1) the same song over and over, 2) different songs that are distinct, as modern taste prefers. I think it far more likely that \textit{differing} songs were sung, not necessarily different songs. What I mean by this is that creativity, innovation, and variation would be employed as they elaborated upon a chosen \textit{nomos}, and deployed as they sang composed \textit{meloi} (not necessarily separate \textit{nomoi}) belonging to the same genre, and quite likely recounting thematically similar narratives.

Such a hybrid can be seen in book two of Apollonios’ \textit{Argonautica}. Around burning offerings the young Greeks dance and sing, “καλὸν Ἰηπαιήον’ Ἰηπαιήονα Φοίβον,” and then Orpheus with his lyre tells of how Apollo slew πελώριον Δελφύνη – the mighty δράκων on Parnassus.\textsuperscript{1240} Kallimachos echoes this blend of the choral and narrative soloist in his \textit{Hymn to Apollo} when he recounts the archer’s \textit{aristeia}: ἰὴ ἰὴ παἰήον, ἵει βέλος ... τὸ δ’ ἐξέτι κείθεν ἀείδη - Hey! Hey! Savior! Shoot an arrow! …

\textsuperscript{1238} Hesiod, \textit{Shield} 395.
\textsuperscript{1239} Euripides, \textit{Ion} 123: ὦ Παιάν ὦ Παιάν, εὔαίον εὔαίον εἰης, ὦ Λατοῦς παῖ.
\textsuperscript{1240} Apollonios, \textit{Argonautica} 2.701-13.
From then until now this chant praises you. These brief examples demonstrate two kinds of repetition:

1) Musical praise extending over time: throughout a day, ritual, or festival.

2) Musical praise as a practiced tradition in literature and cult.

Both kinds of performance offer the possibility of comparison—no performance exists in isolation or ex nihilo. Where there is comparison, one is able to recognize difference. Where difference may be noted, one is able to appreciate, evaluate, praise, or reject said difference. In a competitive context, such as the nomos Pythikos, the comparison is between performances in close sequential proximity. Additionally, there is a role for memory, in that previous competitions tend to linger in memory—e.g. “Last year’s festival/song/contest/weather/etc. was better.” This function also can be understood as active for every performance, even when singular and solitary. If Athenaios’ hymn were the only hymn sung at the festival, any prior observation of, or participation in, the festival will echo in the memory, leading to a comparison. Even at the founding occasion of Pythaïdes festival, all prior hymns to Apollo could readily resonate in the minds of the audience.

The mythological narrative is not new. The musical accompaniment may be new; the vocabulary may be fresh and innovative. Yet, the composition and performance will belong to the tradition of hymning Apollo, and be assimilated into the literary genealogy. Comparisons would be made. I think comparisons should be made, as it will help us appreciate what the ancient audience appreciated – an aesthetics of difference.

1241 Kallimachos, Hymn to Apollo 103-4.
We all too easily forget the extensive temporal dimensions of processions, large public sacrifices, and competitions. More than one musical piece would have been performed.\textsuperscript{1242} As additional evidence, I offer the associated \textit{theoria} inscriptions from the Treasury of the Athenians.\textsuperscript{1243} These functioned as public records of decrees granting praise and honors to festival participants. Limenios and Athenaios, currently accepted as the authors of these hymns, appear in the lists from 128/7 BCE.\textsuperscript{1244} Along with members of the great chorus, several \textit{kitharistai} and \textit{auloi} players are also listed, along with solo vocalists specializing in singing to the \textit{cithara}, as well as enough comic and tragic actors to suggest multiple theatrical productions. If, as seems likely, the Delphic hymns were performed by members of this or another delegation, any reading that does not take into account the fact that they were \textit{one} musical moment among many will ignore context. It is impossible to know the contents, topics, or specific genres of the additional performances, but it is likely that Apollo narratives featured heavily. Some scholars have argued that \textit{both} of the epigraphical hymns could have been performed at the same festival.\textsuperscript{1245} One of the loudest objections by editors to this idea has been that they simply

\textsuperscript{1242} I would argue that the \textit{Homeric Hymn to Apollo} actually offers something of a representation of what this might look like: \textit{prooimia}, hymn, break, \textit{prooimia}, hymn. As if it were a literary ‘recording’ of a festival competition. If so, the reader ought not to read the text cumulatively, but as competing narratives in contrast.

\textsuperscript{1243} \textit{Fouilles de Delphes} III 2, nos. 11, 47, 49, 48. Sequential embassies to a festival (138, 128, 106, and 98 BCE).

\textsuperscript{1244} They are among the \textit{technitai Dionysios} mentioned. There are problems in that neither is among the named composers, and the name Athenaios is common enough that the listed singer’s father bore the same name. Not to mention the continuing difficulty of the \textit{theoria} lists consistently providing patronymics, the second hymn provides Limenios with his patronymic, and ethnicity, but Athenaios receives neither in his title line. \textit{FD} III, 2 no. 47.

\textsuperscript{1245} Bélis (1988); Bélis (1992); Furley and Bremer (2001).
have too much of the same mythological content. However, this, I argue, is an argument without merit, as most performance seems to have recycled the same content, and it is in the juxtaposition of such similarity that differences shine and can be judged.

The Limits of Tradition

As an exercise in the role of difference, I turn briefly to the shorter Homeric Hymns, which by their nature as a collection of texts from various times and places, suggest that there was some degree of consistency to the form of a hymn, but also reveal the flexibility and malleability intrinsic to the form. With respect to first lines, while some do invoke a Muse, or Muses, the majority simply name the deity addressed, perhaps add an epithet or two, deploy a verb of singing, and then proceed. For the purpose of comparison, I list below the first line of the Homeric Hymns:

The Homeric Hymns: first hexameter lines.
(1) – first line is missing
(2) Δήμητρ’ ἥκομον σεμνὴν θεῶν ἄρχου’ ἀείδειν
(3) Μνήσομαι οὔδὲ λάθομαι Απόλλωνος ἐκάτοιο
(4) Ἔρμην ὤμει Μοῦσα Διὸς καὶ Μαιάδος υἱόν
(5) Μοῦσα μοι ἔννεπε ἔργα πολυχρύσου Ἀφροδίτης
(6) Αἴδοιν χρυσοστέφανον καλὴν Ἀφροδίτην
(7) Ἄμφι Διώνυσον Σεμέλης ἐρυκυδέος υἱὸν
(8) Ἀρες ὑπερμενέτα, βρισάρματε, χρυσοπήληξ
(9) Ἀρτεμίν ὤμει, Μοῦσα, κασιγνήτην ὕκομον ἐμείνα
(10) Κυπρογενῆ Κυθέρειαν ἀείσομαι, ἦτε βροτοίσι
(11) Παλλάδ’ Αθηναίην ἐρυσίπτολοι ἄρχομ’ ἀείδειν
(12) Ἡρην ἀείδω χρυσόθρονον, ἦν τέκε Ῥείη
(13) Ἀμήναὶ’ ἥκομον, σεμνὴν θεῶν, ἄρχομ’ ἀείδειν

(14) Μητέρα μοι πάντων τε θεόν πάντων τ' ἄνθρώπων
(15) Ἡρακλέα Διὸς υἱόν ἀείσομαι, ὃν μέγ' ἄριστον
(16) Ἡστῆρα νόσων Ασκληπιίδον ἄρχομ' ἀείδειν
(17) Κάστορα καὶ Πολυδεύκε' ἀείσεο Μοῦσα λίγεια,
(18) Ἐρμῆν ἀείδο Κυλλήνιον Ἀργειφόντην
(19) Ἀμφὶ μοι Ἐρμείαο φίλον γόνον ἐννεπε Μοῦσα,
(20) Ἡφαίστον κλυτόμητιν ἀείδεο Μοῦσα λίγεια,
(21) Φοιβε σὲ μὲν καὶ κύκνος ὑπὸ πτερύγων λίγ' ἀείδει
(22) Ἀμφὶ Ποσειδάωνα θεόν μέγαν ἀείσεο Μοῦσα λίγεια,
(23) Ζήνα θεόν τὸν ἀριστον ἀείσομαι ὡς μέγιστον
(24) Ἑρμῆν ἀείδω Κυλλήνιον Ἀργειφόντην
(25) Ἐρμῆν ἀρχωμαι Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ Διὸς τε·
(26) Κισσοκόμην Διόνυσον ἐρίβρομον ἄρχομ' ἀείδειν
(27) Ἀμφὶ Διὸς κοῦρους ἀλκιώπιδες ἔσπετε Μοῦσαι
(28) Ἀμφὶ Διὸς κοῦρους ἀλκιώπιδες ἔσπετε Μοῦσαι

Some statistics and analysis are called for here. To begin with tradition, it is
widely accepted that the first word of the first hexameter describes the theme of epic
poetry. In this context, we should expect the name of the deity addressed. Out of the
thirty-two hymns with extant first lines, twenty begin by naming the divinity. Of the
twelve which do not, nine invoke gods whose names metrically cannot begin a hexameter
line: Apollo, Aphrodite, Dionysos, Athene, and Poseidon. The remaining three—the
Kouroi, Hermes, and Asklepios—could have begun their hymns. Note that Hermes does
begin hymns 4 and 18, a precedent the poet of hymn 19 breaks. Of the twelve that do not
begin with the name of the deity, four begin with ἅμφι, suggesting an alternate formula.
An additional five of these begin with an epithet of the divinity.\textsuperscript{1247} Only three hymns begin with a word other than a divine name, an epithet, or ἄμφι — hymns 3, 4, and 5. Of these three, two are longer hymns and we ought not to be overly surprised to find them less formulaic. The result of this particular lens of comparison is to resolve the appearance of variation—with respect to the initial word and theme, the Homeric Hymns are remarkably consistent.

This does not hold true as the lens is shifted. To begin, nine of the hymns invoke the muses (less than half) in the first line, and two of those utilize the plural form.\textsuperscript{1248} Of these nine occurrences, four place the Muses in the final dactyl, two place them in the penultimate, and only one claims the first dactyl. There is a two to one preference for the Muses appearing after the caesura. Additional information is available by considering the verbs associated with these goddesses. There is significant variation, not only in verb choice, but also in form, as well as the option of a simplex versus complex verb: ὑμνεῖ (twice), ὑμνεῖν … ἄρχεο, ἔννεπε (twice), ἀείσεο, ἀείδεο, ἔσπετε, ἀείδειν … ἔσπετε. There is a clear resistance to simply following the rut of tradition. Granted, some of this variation would be due to the requirements of meter and the shifting requirements of epithets and word placement. The two hymns for Demeter demonstrate that it was possible to follow precedent in detail:

Hymn 2: Δῆμητρ’ ἡδόκομον σεμνήν θεᾶν ἄρχομ’ ἀείδειν
Hymn 13: Δῆμητρ’ ἡδόκομον σεμνήν θεᾶν ἄρχομ’ ἀείδειν

\textsuperscript{1247} I have counted Phoibos as a proper name rather than an epithet, otherwise hymn 21 would belong to this category here.

\textsuperscript{1248} For the purposes of this comparison I look only at the first hexameter. A consideration of the second line will shift some of these statistics of inclusion, but also introduce more variables and vocabulary, only serving to affirm my primary aim of demonstrating a practice of variation over frozen formulae.
On the other hand, the three hymns for Aphrodite demonstrate the reality of variation:

Hymn 5: Μουσάοι μου ἔννεπε ἔργα πολυχρύσου Ἀφροδίτης
Hymn 6: Αἰδοίην χρυσοστέφανον καλὴν Ἀφροδίτην
Hymn 10: Κυπρογενὴ Κυθέρειαν ἀείσομαι, ἦτε βροτοῖσι

Additional variation is present by means of occasional epithets for the Muses, such as λίγεια, et al.

Other options were available to the poet who either dispenses with the Muses or defers speaking of them until later in the poem. However, after the diversity of expression involving the Muses, tradition seems to reassert itself here. Of thirty-two hymns, nine involve the Muses in the first line along with a verb, five do not invoke the Muses and have no verb in the first line (hymns 7, 8, 14, 24, and 29), leaving eighteen for consideration here. Of these, seven employ ἄρχωμαι ἀείδειν, and four use ἀείσομαι.

Further, three more use the variant ἀείδω, one prefers ἀείδει, and yet one more makes use of αἰδοίην. There is a distinct lack of individuality here; however, there are two hymns, 3 and 25, that do push the boundaries of the traditional formula. Hymn 25 utilizes ἄρχωμαι with a genitive object, and Hymn 2 (to Apollo, which is unique in many ways) begins with Μνήσομαι οὐδὲ λάθωμαι. Before the overwhelming ‘sameness’ becomes too strict, we must remember that this seemingly formulaic pattern is offset by all those hymns which invoked the Muses—the sum total of variety throughout all of the first hexameter lines in the Homeric Hymns is quite astonishing.

---

1249 It should be noted that the same verbs feature heavily with the Muses as well.

1250 Hymn 25, being to the Muses and Apollo, resonates with another tradition here. Μουσάον ἄρχωμαι brings to mind the first line of Hesiod’s Thogony: Μουσάον Ἑλικονιάδων ἄρχομεθ ἀείδειν. Granted, Hesiod makes use of the infinitive, but the use of the initial genitive is sufficient to evoke a resonance, and it is grammatically unnecessary to fit the infinitive into the line, which also must make room for Apollo.
To further demonstrate and test these observations, let us briefly note the opening hexameter lines of the epic hymns by Kallimachos; it has been argued that Kallimachos self-consciously worked with the *Homeric Hymns* in mind.\(^{1251}\) Imitation would not be the correct word here, but a degree of intertextuality and resonance has been demonstrated, and it is fair to say that tradition and genre exerted some degree of force.

**The Kallimachean Hymns: first hexameter lines.**

1. Ζηνὸς ἔοι τί κεν ἄλλο παρὰ σπονδῆσιν ἀείδειν
2. Οἶον ὁ τῶπόλλωνος ἐσεῖσατο δάφνινος ὀρπηξ,
3. Ἀρτεμίν (οὐ γὰρ ἐλαφρὸν ἀειδόντεσσι λαθέσθαι) | ὑμνέομεν
4. Τὴν ἱερήν, ὦ θυμέ, τίνα χρόνον ἔτασσε, ἀείσεις | Δῆλον
5. Ὀσσαι λοτροχόοι τὰς Παλλάδος ἔξιτε πάσαι,
6. Τὸ καλάθος κατιόντος ἐπιφθέγξασθε, γυναῖκες | Δάματερ

Kallimachos is less consistent in placing the name of the addressed deity in the first dactyl. Granted, Apollo would not fit, but his citation of the god’s name is not only elided, but this line is narrative commentary rather than topical or vocative in nature. For hymns 4 and 6, he has embraced a creative modification of displacing the thematic proper noun until the first dactyl of the *second* line, both retaining and violating tradition. Hymn 5 could have placed its topic in the first dactyl, but the very nature of the theme, Pallas’ *bath*, would be far more distinctive and distracting than a slightly deferred placement in the line. None of these hymns invokes the Muses. Only two of them incorporate verbs of singing in the first line, and rely on the very traditional ἀείδειν and ἀείσεις. Hymn 1, to Zeus, is most traditional, both in placement of theme and verb. Hymn 4 defers its theme until the start of line 2, but still places the verb in a familiar location. Hymn 3 reverses the innovation by displacing the traditional verb ὑμνέομεν until the start of line 2, but quite

\(^{1251}\) Acosta-Hughes and Cusset (2009).
traditionally locates the thematic name at the beginning of line 1. Kallimachos is demonstrating his ability to follow, manipulate, and violate, the rules.\textsuperscript{1252}

It is my opinion that these texts clearly demonstrate that variation is \textit{normative} in observable Greek literary and compositional practice, but that the variation (itself a tradition) tends to stay within certain boundaries, which can be quite narrow. That is not to say that larger variations do not occur, for they certainly do.\textsuperscript{1253} However, I assert that, while there are expectations empowered by the weight of precedent, these texts read in such a way that we should assume a very real appreciation for, and an expectation of, innovation. An \textit{aesthetics of difference} pays tribute to, and emphasizes, the fact that it is precisely in this tension between tradition and variation where the poetic effort and genius should be sought.

\textbf{Contemporary Comparanda}

More narrowly relevant to this dissertation, it is worth glancing briefly at a parallel between the two Delphic hymns that also illustrates this point. Rather than examine first lines, here I choose to consider when Apollo, the hymns’ thematic focus, first appears as subject matter. Unlike epic hymns, other genres are free to defer and/or

\textsuperscript{1252} During my undergraduate studies in music theory, my theory professor informed us that we had to learn all of the rules, in order to learn how to break them. To break a rule, we had to first be aware of its existence and purpose, and consciously \textit{choose} to break it for a specifiable reason.

\textsuperscript{1253} One may assume that overly excessive violations constituted bad art and poor taste, and as such, were quite unlikely to be copied, re-performed, or taught. The result being that we are short of examples of badly done innovation, and overly influenced by that which was successful and praised.
elliptically approach their subject matter. The Delphic hymns work in this way. Here are excerpts from the epigraphical hymns:

Мόλετε, συνόμαιμον ἵνα Φοῖβον ὑιδ[Ϊ]σι μέλψητε χρυσεοκόμαν, ὄς.

Come! So that you may celebrate your blood-brother with songs, Bright-One, Golden-Hair. - Athenaios’ hymn, lines 3-4.

Μέλπετε δὲ Πύθιον χ[ρ]σεοχαίταν ἐ[κα] τὸν εὐλύραν φοῖβον, ὃν ἔτικτε Λητῶ

Sing of the Pythian one, the golden-haired far-shooter, well-lyred Phoebus, whom Leto bare. - Limenios’ hymn, lines 4-5.

Several similarities are immediately obvious. Both of these texts use imperatives to command the Muses to sing. Both prefer Phoebus rather than Apollo and both make note of his golden hair. Both make use of the relative pronoun to pivot to further material.

On the other hand, differences are also apparent. Athenaios emphasizes that Apollo is brother to the Muses, all offspring of Zeus, whereas Limenios chooses instead to reference the well-known birth narrative, and pivots to this account by emphasizing his mother. While both texts mention Apollo’s golden hair, each uses a different vocabulary to do so: χρυσεοκόμαν versus χ[ρ]σεοχαίταν. They both have an imperative, but Athenaios uses his to set up a purpose clause. Limenios provides a longer series of epithets. In addition, the word order varies substantially. The intent of these lines is nearly formulaic—to invoke the Muses to sing of Apollo. However, the exact language by which this is accomplished diverges widely. These lines, while remarkably similar, manage to be quite individual and distinct.

A great deal has already been said as to how the text of Athenaios’ hymn may be read against earlier Greek literature. Limenios’ hymn, it would appear, should be read in
much the same way, with the addition of Athenaios’ text as being superbly proximate in both time, theme, and place, and thereby supremely ‘loud’ in memory. Attention to difference emboldened by a backdrop of similarity, in this case, suggests that Limenios’ text reaches more assertively for traditional, formulaic language (piling up of epithets, addition of birth narrative, etc.) but risks becoming bombastic with his long string of descriptive titles in asyndeton.

The flexibility of approach available to, and exhibited by, the poets is quite impressive. For something as traditional as noting of whom the poet sings, there are many ways to get started, and each manipulates the traditional material and forms to suit their own tastes. Similarities and differences produce interesting relationships between texts; they both bind them to tradition, yet strive to demonstrate poetic distinctiveness. A glance at an earlier text from the same tradition reveals not only a tradition of ‘same’ and ‘different’ but also shows that different texts will interact in different ways.

The *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* may be divided into two sections, a Delian and a Pythian. With no concern for arguments for or against a unitarian composition, it is clear that each half begins with its own sort of *prooimion* / invocation and as such, it serves as a useful *comparandum*. In the opening lines of the Delian section, the god is named far-shooting Apollo (Ἀπόλλωνος ἑκάτωοι), with bright bow (φαίδιμα τόξα) which Leto hangs on a golden peg (πασσάλου ἐκ χρυσέου).

In contrast, the Pythian section begins by calling him Lord (ἀνα), the famous son of Leto (Λητοῦς ἐρικυδεος). He is said to be playing his lyre (φόρμιξ) with a golden plectrum (χρυσέου ὑπὸ πλήκτρου).

---

1254 *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, 1-9.
1255 *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, 179-185.
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great deal more language available in these passages, but the above suffices to note how differently the god might be introduced, yet reveals common threads, such as the presence of golden or shining accoutrements. Limenios employed some of this descriptive language, but it would seem that Athenaios, while not directly invoking the vocabulary, evokes more strongly the scene found early in the Pythian prooimia, as a throng of female goddesses crowds about Apollo, singing and dancing.

With this brief examination of texts and lines, I hope to demonstrate that there is both constancy and change over the centuries. This says nothing new, as we have always been aware that Greek narrative and even religion was variable and open-ended. The scholar of Greek religion, John Gould, expressed it nicely:

…though the response to experience crystallizes, on the one hand as ritual, on the other as myth, and both involve repetition and transmission from generation to generation, there is always room for new improvisation… Greek religion is not theologically fixed and stable, and it has no tradition of exclusion or finality: it is an open, not a closed system. …. The same absence of finality is characteristic of Greek myth….Greek myth is open-ended; a traditional story can be re-told, told with new meanings, new incidents, new persons, even with a formal reversal of old meanings…. The improvisatory character of Greek myth is not just a literary fact, not only the source of its perennial vitality in literature, but also the guarantee of its centrality in Greek religion. It is not bound to forms hardened and stiffened by canonical authority, but mobile, fluent and free to respond to a changing experience of the world.¹²⁵⁶

Poets ask, “How should I hymn you?” of the god.¹²⁵⁷ Yet, this seemingly open-ended approach to inspiration and creativity seems largely to have played out in traditional narratives on well-explored topics. Greek religion and myth were certainly not fixed in form or detail (one kind of canon or norm), but there was a tradition of working

¹²⁵⁷ Cf. Homeric Hymn to Apollo 19, 207; More comically, cf. Pindar, Hymn 29, wherein he casts his net across the whole of Greek myth as possible topoi. In practice however, the quandary appears purely rhetorical, as hymns in honor of the god invariably turn towards matters of his birth and his oracle.
within the already established world of myth – that tradition would be a different kind of norm. It was normative for poets to rework traditional material, to exercise creativity while producing new works that remained recognizable to audiences. However, the much stronger parallelism of the two epigraphical hymns hints at a far more nuanced, yet insistent, degree of variation and continuity than we have access to in most cases, or have assumed to be present. These hymns were composed and performed, either for the same festival, or for two sequential instances of the same festival, likely ten years apart, by composers/performers who knew and worked with each other, and who quite likely heard each other’s pieces performed. The similarities are quite strong, but it is those very similarities that sharpen and make more obvious the differences. It is, I argue, the choice to imitate or to innovate that most deserves attention as being central to artistic effort and achievement. Against the context of prior texts and performances, we are able to judge creative ability, risk, and achievement. Most often, we lack immediately comparable texts and have little sense of which texts may have been most present in the mind of the composer. An aesthetics of difference leads the reader to value clusters of texts that have often been derided as derivative, as it is in moments of similarity where we may find narrow, but intentional and careful, difference.

1258 It is as if there is an unexpressed assumption that the limited extant corpus of Greek cultic hymnody somehow represents a majority of actual performative practice. That is to say, we oddly assume that the Greek sang the same songs over and over again. Surely successful works would have an extended life-cycle of (re)performance, but the nature of festivals, with their extremely competitive format, all but demands that we assume an overwhelming flood of creative output over the centuries. We must grapple with the reality that we likely possess a tiny fraction of Greek hymnody, and our difficulties over authorship, dating, and performative context for many (including the longer Homeric Hymns) suggests that the texts that we have may not have actually experienced much of a performative lifespan. They seem to have quickly become ‘texts’.
Apollo and the Drakōn

The competition between god and guardian features heavily as the central performative moment in both of the epigraphical hymns at Delphi. While these two texts are not, strictly speaking, agonistic—that is to say that they are not performed in a competitive context in pursuit of a crown—they are situated firmly in tradition of hymning the god by means of this narrative. This, as we have seen, often did take a competitive form, as with the nomos Pythikos. Hymns to Apollo, and narrative (including pictorial versions) accounts of his battle with the drakōn are so common as to almost be part of the background scenery at Delphi. This conflict is caught thickly in a web of potential genealogy, intertext, and tradition. I am uninterested in fully untangling that web at this moment, and also have no intention of interpreting how the new text would contextualize itself, how it would claim meaningful significance as a statement of politics or authority—I leave this to other scholars. I am here interested instead in a

Fontenrose (1959) and Ogden (2013) excellently catalogue the variants, not only of the Apollo narrative, but other mythological narratives that seem similar, albeit with different names assigned to the varied roles (e.g. Cadmus and Zeus both have their own snaky foes to vanquish).

The amount of ink spilled in argument over the significance of gender and/or previous owners of the oracle in this narrative is impressive. For significant pieces, each pointing to a very rich bibliography on the matter, cf. Sourvinou-Inwood (1987), who argues that, based on archeological evidence against the ‘previous owners’ myth, there is no good reason to buy into any narrative of gendered acts of violence, but rather we should see all variants as collectively endeavoring, in their own way, to increase the prestige of the oracle; Strolonga (2011), who discards any focus on gender for a didactic emphasis on the importance of reciprocity and gift-giving in each of the variants; Quantin (1992), who reads tragedy as shaper of cult, suggesting that Apollo embodies Athens, and mediates a transformation of Gaia as oracular force in Hesiod to an origin story behind the more regulated oracle at Delphi—he sees no cultic or archaeological continuity, but rather an invented connected conceived in order to coincide with political and cultic needs; in this case the myth of previous owners becomes positive and useful. More aggressive readings of gender, politics, and society as motive force behind change in myth can be found in works by well-known scholars. For an example of a developmental/evolutionary approach to change in myth, see Burkert, (1979a); for a consideration of change in myth as reflective of the dynamics of power and authoritative discourse, see Kowalzig (2007); for a gendered and authority centered reading of change in myth, see Clay (2006).
narrow, detailed, and philological examination of similarity and difference as illuminating poetic practice. I am concerned with the *aesthetics of difference*. Therefore, this following section will limit itself quite narrowly to exploring the specific descriptive vocabulary employed and deployed in depiction of Apollo’s foe. Each source will be briefly addressed. I intentionally limit this survey to texts predating the epigraphical Delphic hymns. The goal is not comprehensiveness, but merely to demonstrate the presence of both diversity and tradition in similar manner as has been seen earlier in this chapter.

The *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* is oldest, and likely the best-known version of the event.\(^{1261}\) The narrative is split, encompassing a short episode regarding a spat between Zeus and Hera. In this account, a female *drakaina* with no given name is slain by Apollo. She has no role as guardian, but is a pest to the locals. Relevant vocabulary is found in lines (300) δράκαιναν... (302) ζατρεφέα, μεγάλην, τέρας ἄγριον, (304) πέλε πῆμα δαφωνόν…(374) πέλωρ.

*Iphigeneia among the Taurians* by Euripides contains, towards the end, a choral hymn detailing how Apollo acquired the oracle at Delphi, not only slaying the *drakōn*, but also resolving the vengeance of Gaia which his actions aroused, as he transferred ownership from Themis to himself. The actions and difficulties of Apollo may be read as a sort of loose analogy for Orestes’ own difficulties regarding the guilt of matricide and

---

\(^{1261}\) The matters of authorship, performative context, and dating are contested. Cf. Burkert (1979b) for a careful consideration of the matter. He would date the hymn early, to 522 BCE, give authorship to Cynaethus of Chios (one of the Homeridae), and set it with a rather unique festival held by Polycrates of Samos in honor of both Apollos of Delos and Delphi (the festival was held on Delos). There is a certain amount of politics to the matter of dating. The priority of Aeschylus’ *Eumenides* (458BCE) or the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* is relevant to argument that attempt to read the politics of gender into the event. A peaceful transition by female goddesses would be replaced by violent, male, overthrow. This, of course, seems to overlook that other versions have a male serpent.
the avenging Erinyes. The account given here presents a male *drakōn* with no given name, who is slain by Apollo. The vanquished foe was guardian of Themis’ oracular tripod of which Apollo then took ownership. Relevant vocabulary is found in lines (1245-8) *ποικιλόνωτος ύινωπός δράκων σκιερά κατάχαλκος εὐφύλλωι δάφνει γάς πελώριον τέρας.*

In his *Hymn to Apollo*, Kallimachos offers up an *aetion* for the ritual cry of ἱὴ ἱὴ παιῆον, singing that it was the people of Delphi who first called out to Apollo in this way as he shot his foe. In this account, Apollo slew a male wild beast, which is then described as a snake, violently with arrows. No specific mention is made of name or guardianship. Relevant vocabulary is found in lines (100) *δαμόνιος θήρ* (101) *αινός ὄφις*.

In his *Hymn to Delos*, Kallimachos has Apollo prophecy while still in his mother Leto’s womb. His foe is described in similar, yet differing terms. A male snake will be killed by Apollo in the future, one unnamed, but who encircles Mt. Parnassus. Mention of

---

1262 Apollo was originally responsible for instructing Orestes to commit the murder, and yet he was unable to purify him afterwards. Both Aeschylus and Euripides treated the matter. Aeschylus’ *Eumenides* opens with an account which explicitly removes all violence from Apollo’s acquisition of the tripod—violence which Euripides has quite blatantly reinserted. Hints of the *drakōn* in Aeschylus do appear: 1) in a potential word play in line 34 where the infinitive of δέρκομαι, δρακεῖν, gives voice to the Pythias’ vision of the Erinyes, whom she saw within the temple, and who are called γοργόνας in lines 48 and 49. These goddesses are often depicted in graphic representations as having snakes in their hair. 2) Again in line 166, the chorus uses this verb in compound form, προσδρακεῖν, to give voice to how they view the *omphalos*, stained with blood. The chorus complains about Apollo’s endorsement of the matricide, and accuses him of defiling his own dwelling; and one immediately recalls the variants wherein Apollo had to be purified after his duel. It is possible that the adjacent word in each line here is designed to suggest possible visual manipulation, or vocabulary in disguise: ὀφθαλμοῖς δρακεῖν and ὀμφαλῶν προσδρακεῖν. Aeschylus is the only tragedian to use this form, and uses it only once more elsewhere, in the *Agamemnon*, 600-1: τί γὰρ γνωστὶ τοῦτο φέρεις ἥδου δρακεῖν. This in reference to the return of Agamemnon. The grammar is clear here, but an eerie resonance arises when we note a scholiast on Lycophron (*scholia vetera et recentiora partim Isaac et Joannis Tzetzae*) in Scholion 1114, line 1a, where he notes that Clytemnestra was called a *drakaina*. Other texts contain variants as well: Alkeios, *Paean*, as it is reported to us, contains no reference to a snake or violence; Aristonoos, *Paean* has a voluntary transmission of Delphi from Gaea and Themis to Apollo through the persuasion of Athene, but also hints that Apollo had to be purged of some pollution in Tempe.
the tripod strongly suggests a role of possession or guardianship. Relevant vocabulary is found in lines (91) ὁφίς μέγας (92) θηρίον αἰνογένειον (93) περιστρέφει ἐννέα κύκλως.

In the version by his contemporary, Apollonios of Rhodes, the Argonautica, we see the Argonauts sacrifice to Apollo. They dance in a chorus, singing καλὸν Ἰηπαιήνον Ἰηπαιήνα Φοῖβον, and then they are treated to a song by Orpheus on his phorminx, wherein the combat is narrated. Apollo killed Delphynes on Parnassus with his arrows. No indication of tripod or oracle is made. The gender of this serpent is unclear due to the declension of the noun and adjective. The relevant vocabulary is found in line 2.706: Δελφύνην … πελώριον.

I avoid considering sources later than the 2nd c. BCE, but find it important to cite at least one scholiast on Apollonios of Rhodes, as he refers to a lost text of Kallimachos, as well as another poet named Leandrios. I quote the full passage for reference:

ὅτι <Δελφύνης> ἐκαλεῖτο ὁ φυλάσσων τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς χρηστήριον, Λεάνδριος καὶ Καλλίμαχος εἶπον δράκαιναν δὲ αὐτὴν φησιν εἶναι, θηλυκῶς καλουμένην Δέλφυναν, αὐτὸς ὁ Καλλίμαχος.

Leandrios and Kallimachos said that the (male) guardian of the oracle in Delphi was called ‘Delphynes.’ However, Kallimachos himself says she was a drakaina, called Delphyna, with a feminine gender.1263

tὴν δὲ ἀναιρεθέσαν δράκαιναν <Δέλφυναν> καλεῖσθαι θηλυκῶς φησι Λεάνδριος.

Leandrios says that the defeated drakaina was called Delphyna, with a feminine gender.1264

It would seem that the same author could freely draw from not only a diversity of nouns by which to describe the beast, but might at will alternate genders as well. In fact, when

---

1263 Scholia on Apollonios of Rhodes, Argonautica (scholia vetera), pg. 182, line 1 (2.706).
1264 Scholia on Apollonios of Rhodes, Argonautica (scholia vetera), pg. 182, line 16 (2.711).
we review the previous examples, a great number of neuters are employed concomitantly with any gendered nouns. Before considering the vocabulary of the Delphic hymns, it will be worthwhile to consider the collected vocabulary. There is no strong organizing principle to the lists below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nouns:</th>
<th>Adjectives:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>δράκαινα (f)</td>
<td>ζατρεφέα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δράκων (m)</td>
<td>μεγάλην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δφις (m)</td>
<td>μέγας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θήρ (m)</td>
<td>ἄγριον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θηρίον (n)</td>
<td>δαφοινόν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τέρας (n)</td>
<td>ποικιλόνωτος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πῆμα (n)</td>
<td>οἴνωπός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πέλωρ (n)</td>
<td>κατάχαλκος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δελφύνην (m/f)</td>
<td>πελώριον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>δαμόνιος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>αίνος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>αἰνογένειον</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To begin with, the nouns demonstrate a great deal of variance. The nature of Apollo’s foe remains a constant, but the specific choice of noun employed emphasizes to varying degrees the bestiality or personhood of his foe. The adjectives emphasize, for the most part, three different modes of description: 1) size, 2) appearance, and 3) danger. Any of the three is capable of emphasizing the ‘bigness’ of Apollo’s foe. By this, I do not mean size, but quality—that is to say, the adjectives enhance the need for, and difficulty of, vanquishing and removing the monster. What I find truly remarkable is that this narrative of Apollo slaying his foe, so common as to be ubiquitous in Greek art, intrinsic to the persona of Apollo, and an unavoidably rehearsed aspect of Delphic history, so
consistently avoids any formulaic expression or standardization of vocabulary. With this observation in mind, I turn now to Athenaios’ hymn.

The lines in the epigraphic hymn dedicated to narrating this episode are, sadly, quite fragmentary, so we only have a portion of this section of the text. Four extant words are comparable to the above-examined vocabulary. In this fourth strophe, the tripod is mentioned in line 21, and line 22 begins with what may be confidently restored as ἔφροσσει. This version of the narrative involves a violent acquisition of the tripod which can be detected by the presence of συρίγμαθ’ ἰεὺς ἀθώπε[υ] in line 24. This line neatly sets this account in parallel with the previously discussed nomos Pythikos. In between, in lines 22 and 23, additionally we find the following three vocabulary items: δράκων, αἰόλον, and ἑλικτὰν. δράκων, like the preceding verb of guarding, is quite strictly traditional in nature, having strong precedent in earlier literature. The latter terms, however, appear to be newly employed in this context. However, they are satisfyingly appropriate. As discussed in Chapter 4, the adjective αἰόλον is fitting in three possible ways: 1) in reference to the quick and agile movements of snake, 2) as a description of the scattering of light striking upon the serpent’s scales, and 3) as suggestive of the wriggling of worms, grubs, and larva to be found in a rotting corpse. Again, as discussed in Chapter 4, the adjective ἑλικτὰν invokes both movement and posture appropriate to a serpent—winding coils. It is my opinion that Athenaios has, as he does repeatedly, reached back for long traditional ways of talking about mythical matters; he has chosen to

1265 I note new to this context, for they may be found in Sophokles, Trachiniai 11: ἄλλοτ᾿ αἰόλος δράκων ἑλικτός, when Achelous comes to woo Deianeira, taking the shape of various beasts. Again in line 834, referring to the δράκων whom death bare, which supplied poison for the centaur.
juxtapose the familiar and the expected with innovation that, while without precedent, offers a superbly clear and understandable meaning. He both embraces and expands the lyrical tradition, and he does this by following a poetic practice of creativity within bounds that is itself a tradition. It is unfortunate that we have lost the remainder of these lines, but even this small extant sample makes it clear that Athenaios employed an *aesthetics of difference* as he broke poetic ground by highlighting novelty against convention. He retained a strong recognizability for his narrative while exploring new textual and semantic possibilities.

Far less remains in the closely related hymn by Limenios. While numerous editors have been happy to reconstruct nearly the entire episode in both hymns, the stone itself presents very little in this case. I print the mostly complete words that seem to have to do with the snake combat: (27) παῖδα Γα[ᾶς] τ’ ἐπεφυζες ιοίζ, (29) ]θηρ’ ἄ<ι> κατέκτ[α]ζ, (30) σύργμ’ ἀπ’… From these remains, it is possible to see that some violent combat is narrated, involving what is likely a child of Gaia, possibly a male, wild beast, and one which dies in a traditional manner, breathe hissing as it expires. These lines are particularly complex as it seems (in the opinion of most editors) that a second combat against the monster Tityos is enfolded within the fragments having to do with the serpent.

The tripod is mentioned in line 22, but it is unclear how it is associated with the combat sequence (N.B. In the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, the oracle appears to have been founded *after* Apollo defeated his foe.). It is difficult to say anything with certainty due to the extremely fragmentary nature of the text, but there is no obvious parallel here with Athenaios’ hymn beyond σύργμ’. However, the text clearly belongs to the mythological tradition of this combat.
The corollary to this *aesthetics of difference* is that traditional practices of restoring and supplementing texts by comparison, relying on similar and prior texts, becomes quite dangerous, if not impossible. If, as can be easily seen, Limenios’ text diverges so wildly from Athenaios’ in spite of being so similar, how can it be admissible to assume that prior texts in the Apolline tradition can not only fill narrative *lacunae*, but provide vocabulary as well? Athenaios’ own text makes it quite clear that he unabashedly innovates. The sheer diversity and preponderance of singular employments of vocabulary should caution us. An appreciation for the nature of difference has guided my own attempts to read and restore this epigraphical text.

**Conclusions**

The aim of this chapter has been to suggest that the meaning and artistic achievement of compositions, such as Athenaios’ hymn, may be dependent on innovative expression that responds to, and works within, tradition—rather than worrying over any violation of, or adherence to, perceived norms. The *agôn* of competition is present, especially in a festival context, even if it is only a competition with one’s peers of past years or generations. Innovation and creativity embedded in and shaped by tradition, as well as aesthetic demands, can serve as a powerful mechanism for the changes we see in mythological narratives.

I suggest that cultic and mythological literature (such as this epigraphical hymn) requires careful and serious attention to the tension between traditional narrative and the demand for artistic innovation and creativity imposed by audience, patron, and
competitive motives. By saying this, I want to suggest it is time that we consider moving beyond prioritizing discovery or reconstruction of ‘original’ versions, documenting their ‘evolution,’ or seeking causes to explain the effects of change. We need to consider whether trying to explain or justify variations and changes as primarily guided by the discourse of political or theological power is best practice. These remain interesting and fruitful ways of reading, but I am inclined to think there is a very real need to explore how the aesthetics of difference, surprise, satisfaction, recognition, and inter-text might function within mythological narrative.

To do this well, cultic texts and myths will need to be read within the context of their full literary tradition—both the immediately local (time and space) as well as the broader and deeper web of history, memory, and texts. A comparative approach should illuminate ways in which artists innovated and transgressed, while simultaneously conserving, reinforcing, and re-expressing traditional Greek identity. I suggest that the value and artistic achievement of such compositions should be understood as innovative artistic expressions that are in response to, and shaped by, tradition as well as popular taste, and not as violation of, or adherence to, a perceived standard or norm. This would be a poetics of difference rather than canonization. Innovation is not deviation to be derided or disguised, or an evolution to be justified, but a necessary and desirable aspect of Greek mythological and musical practice. Variation in mythical narrative was common, expected, and when done well, it was praised.

1266 It may well be that those texts which have often before been dismissed as “late” or “derivative” may prove to be some of the most fruitful subjects for this method of reading, and may in turn inform how we approach older texts.
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