

CYNAETHUS' HYMN TO APOLLO

It is generally accepted that the Homeric Hymn to Apollo was not conceived as a single poem but is a combination of two: a Delian hymn, D, performed at Delos and concerned with the god's birth there, and a Pythian hymn, P, concerned with his arrival and establishment at Delphi. What above all compels us to make a dichotomy is not the change of scene in itself, but the way D ends. The poet returns from the past to the present, and takes leave of his audience; farewell, he says, and remember me ever after. He is quite clearly finishing. Whereupon there is an abrupt and unsatisfactory transition to P.

The poet of D is a Chian (172), and his outlook is Aegean. His Apollo ranges *ἄλλοτε μὲν τ' ἐπὶ Κύνθου . . . ἄλλοτε δ' ἀν νήσους τε καὶ ἀνέρας* (141-2). The catalogue of places in 30-44, which ends as a record of Leto's wanderings but begins as a survey of Apollo's worshippers, covers the Aegean and its shores, with particular emphasis on the eastern side; it does not look further west than Athens. The poet of P, by contrast, is chiefly interested in the mainland. The stories about Apollo which he considers telling in 207 ff. are all located on the mainland. In the story he chooses, Apollo sets out not from Delos but from Olympus, and the search for a temple-site takes him no further east than Euboea (216 ff.). When he gets to Onchestus, the poet cannot refrain from describing a curious ceremony to be seen there, although it has nothing to do with Apollo (230-8). Later he has to give an account of the coming of the Cretan priesthood to Delphi. He has nothing to tell us about their home-land except that they are from 'Minoan Cnossus' where many trees grow (393, 475), but their progress round the Peloponnese is described in some detail (409-29). In a word: the poets of D and P inhabit two separate worlds which barely overlap. The difference in their geographical outlook is so marked and so complete that on this ground alone we can feel sure they are different people.

Many readers have felt a stylistic difference between the two parts. To some extent this can be put on an objective basis. An industrious study by P. K. Huibregtse¹ brought to light (amid much that was inconclusive) significant differences in the average length of sentences, and in the frequency of the particles *τε* and *ἄρα*, and the fact that while the sea in P is five times *πόντος* and never *ἄλς*, in D it is five times *ἄλς* and only twice *πόντος*. A more recent article by Alena Frolíková² brings out differences in the use of Apollo-formulae and in the frequency of repetitions. It may also be remarked, for what it is worth, that the ratio of observances to neglects of initial digamma is 1.6:1 in D and 3.6:1 in P.³

I am grateful to Dr. N. J. Richardson for some helpful comments and criticisms.

¹ *De Homerische Apollhymnus*, Diss. Leiden, 1940.

² *ΓΕΡΑΣ*, Studies presented to George Thomson (Prague, 1963), 99-109.

³ I base the figures on the material collected in the edition of Allen and Sikes, pp. lxxv f., not counting *εὐοί* as initial, and not

counting neglects which are doubtful because of movable nu, etc. In the *Hymn to Demeter* the corresponding ratios (up to/after line 180) are 1.4:1, 0.8:1; in the *Hymn to Hermes* 1.0:1, 1.8:1. The fluctuations are quite large because of the shortness of the texts being compared. The differences are not so great, however, as between D and P. Allen and Sikes gave separate figures for D and P, and noted the difference; but in his later edition with

Yet the poems are not independent of each other; for there is a conspicuous parallelism between their opening sections.

1-13 ~ 186-206	Description of Apollo joining the other gods. Leto rejoices to see him
19 = 207	<i>πῶς τὰρ σ' ὑμνήσω, πάντως εὐμνον εόντα</i> ; followed by
20-4 ~ 208-13	indication of the range of possibilities
25 ~ 214	<i>ἦ ὡς σε (ὡς τὸ) πρῶτον . . .</i>
30 ff. ~ 216 ff.	itinerary of a search for an acceptable place.

The sequence is not so natural or logical that we can explain it as a traditional pattern for hymns to Apollo. Nor is it likely that two separate poets should see fit to imitate a common source to this extent. There are several other strikingly parallel passages too.¹ Many scholars since Ilgen have agreed that one poet is imitating the other, and this seems to be the truth.

Almost all of those who have taken this view agree further in regarding P as the imitation of D; and, since Wilamowitz, they have regarded it as having been designed as a continuation of D.² Their reason is that it has no beginning of its own, as it should have if it had been composed as an independent poem. It begins, without preamble,

εἶσι δὲ φορμίζων Λητοῦς ἐρικυδέος υἱός 182
φόρμιγγι γλαφυρῇ πρὸς Πυθῶ πετρῆσσαν.

But if it is obvious that this is not the opening of a poem, it ought to be equally obvious that it was not conceived as a continuation from anything in D. Apollo appears to be going up from Crisa, as in 514 ff.:

*βάν ρ' ἔμεν· ἦρχε δ' ἄρα σφιν ἀναξ Διὸς υἱὸς Ἀπόλλων,
φόρμιγγ' ἐν χεῖρεσσιν ἔχων, ἔρατὸν κιθαρίζων,
καλὰ καὶ ὕψι βιβιάς· οἱ δὲ ῥήσσουντες ἔποντο
Κρήτες πρὸς Πυθῶ.*

But Crisa has not been mentioned in what precedes, nor has any scene been set upon which *εἶσι δὲ φορμίζων* can be projected. It is a continuation not from D but from something which has disappeared.

Furthermore, it is, though not the very beginning of a poem, *from* the beginning of a poem. That is where a description of the god's typical activity belongs,³ and the question in 207 (*πῶς τὰρ σ' ὑμνήσω*;) confirms it. So P was not written as an extension of D. It is an independent poem that has lost its opening.⁴

We must ask anew: which is the imitation, D or P? When I compare the

the more docile Halliday, Allen suppressed the fact in furtherance of his unitarian opinions.

¹ 57 ~ 249 = 289 = 366; 75 f. ~ 220 f., 244 f.; 80 f. ~ 247 f., 258 f., 287 f.

² Wilamowitz, *Die Ilias und Homer*, 441, and *Pindaros*, 74 nn. 2-3; Jacoby, *S.P.A.W.* 1933, 715 ff. = *Kl. phil. Schr.* i. 179 ff.; H. T. Wade-Gery in *Greek Poetry and Life* (Essays presented to Gilbert Murray, 1936), 56 = his *Essays in Greek History*, 17; J. Humbert, *Homère, Hymnes* (Budé, 1937),

67-72; B. A. van Groningen, *La Composition littéraire archaïque grecque*, 318-23; A. Lesky, *R.-E. Suppl.* xi. 827. 18 (= 141. 18 of the Separat, *Homeros*). Jacoby and van Groningen believe that P was meant to follow on 138 or 139, replacing the personal ending of D. One earlier scholar took D as the imitation of P: A. Fick, *Bezz. Beitr.* xvi (1890), 21.

³ Cf. F. Altheim, *Hermes* lix (1924), 442.

⁴ As Hermann said, p. xxvii of his edition: 'is hymnus initio caret.' Cf. L. Deubner, *S.P.A.W.* 1938, pp. 256 f.

parallel passages, it appears to me that the answer is the opposite of that hitherto accepted. After its abrupt beginning, P proceeds smoothly to 206. From Pytho the divine citharist passes on to Olympus, and at once the house of Zeus is filled with music. The Muses sing, the younger goddesses and gods dance, Leto and Zeus look on with pleasure. It is a wholly harmonious conception. Not so the corresponding scene in D, 2-13. Here Apollo wields his bow instead of his lyre. The gods are afraid, they jump up from their chairs: only Leto stays calm beside Zeus, takes his dangerous plaything away, finds him a seat, and Zeus gives him a cup of nectar, while Leto rejoices that her son is a mighty archer. Superficially this is more dramatic and original than P. But what is best in it is borrowed from the Olympian scene in *Iliad* i: the gods jumping up from their seats as the mighty one enters, the transition to a relaxed mood, the ministration of nectar. For the rest it is a peculiar business. What is Apollo thinking of, coming into the company of the gods with his bow at the ready, as if he were Odysseus and they the suitors? It is represented not just as something he did once but as something he does regularly; and the gods jump every time, as if they had never seen the charade before. The details are not clearly thought out either. Leto remains seated, yet she is able to disarm him and lead him to his place. She unstrings the bow he is stretching, but also takes it off his shoulders.

Δητῶ δ' οἷη μίμνε παραὶ Διὶ τερπικεραύνῳ, 5
 ἧ ῥα βίον τ' ἐχάλασσε καὶ ἐκλήϊσε φαρέτρηγν,
 καὶ οἱ ἀπ' ἰφθίμων ὤμων χεῖρεσσιν ἑλοῦσα
 τόξον ἀνεκρέμασε πρὸς κίονα πατρὸς ἐοῖο
 πασσάλου ἐκ χρυσεῖου· τὸν δ' εἰς θρόνον εἴσεν ἄγουσα.

It is easier to understand what the poet is about if we suppose him to be adapting a narrative of Apollo's first coming to Olympus. He may sometimes have related this as the sequel to the god's birth, for that is a sequence that we know as typical from elsewhere.¹ But now he makes it into a habitual entry. Why? Because, I suggest, he is under the influence of P's opening, and wishes to outdo it.

This hypothesis may also explain why, on concluding the passage with Leto's happy contemplation of her son, he adds:

χαῖρε μάκαιρ' ὦ Δητοῖ, ἐπεὶ τέκες ἀγλαὰ τέκνα, 14
 Ἀπόλλωνά τ' ἄνακτα καὶ Ἄρτεμιν ἰοχέαιραν,

as if we were not to hear of her again. In the two shorter hymns just cited, the god's birth and reception among the immortals is immediately followed by the closing salutation: 6. 19 χαῖρ' ἑλικοβλέφαρε γλυκυμείλιχε, 19. 48 καὶ σὺ μὲν οὕτω χαῖρε ἄναξ. This is the pattern that our poet has been accustomed to follow, and now it prompts him to make farewell noises here. If it were really the end of a hymn, he would not have added:

τὴν μὲν ἐν Ὀρτυγίῃ, τὸν δὲ κραναῇ ἐνὶ Δήλῳ 16
 κεκλιμένη πρὸς μακρὸν ὄρος καὶ Κύνθιον ὄχθον,
 ἀγχοτάτῳ φοῖνικος, ὑπ' Ἴνωποῖο ῥέεθροισι,

for the story would already have been told. Here it serves as a kind of 'trailer' for what is to come.

¹ *Hymn* 6. 14-18, 19. 42-7; *Hes. Th.* 68 ff., 201-2.

Let us move on and compare the next passages in D and P, the passages that begin in each case with the poet's question

πῶς τάρ σ' ὑμνήσω, πάντως εὖνυμον ἐόντα; 19 = 207

In P the question comes abruptly, unheralded. But the lost beginning of the poem must have taken the form 'I will sing of Apollo, who . . .', so that the question originally had the same resumptive function as in D. It is followed in 208 ff. by a real statement of alternatives: *ἤέ σ' ἐνὶ μνηστῆσιν αἰείσω* (with several different possibilities mentioned under this heading); . . . *ἢ ὡς τὸ πρῶτον χρηστήριον ἀνθρώποισι ζητεύων κατὰ γαίαν ἔβης ἑκατηβόλ' Ἄπολλον*; In D, on the other hand, there are no alternatives, simply:

ἢ ὡς σε πρῶτον Λητώ τέκε; 25

This perfunctory treatment of the scheme surely belongs to the imitation, not to the model.

There is little to say of the geographical catalogues except that the one in D is awkwardly introduced. The two different purposes that it serves are not properly distinguished and put into relation with one another.¹ Perhaps of more significance for the question of priority *vis-à-vis* P is the speech that Leto makes to Delos in 51–60, in which she points out the island's natural poverty:

αἱ δέ κ' Ἀπόλλωνος ἐκαέργου νηὸν ἔχησθα, 56
ἄνθρωποί τοι πάντες ἀγνήσουσ' ἑκατόμβας
ἐνθάδ' ἀγειρόμενοι, κνίσῃ δέ τοι ἄσπετος αἰεὶ
δημοῦ ἀναίξει, βοσκήσεις θ' οἷ κέ σ' ἔχωσι
χειρὸς ἀπ' ἀλλοτρίης, ἐπεὶ οὐ τοι πῖαρ ὑπ' οὐδας. 60

This corresponds to a passage in P, 526–37, where the Cretan priests, installed at Pytho, ask how they are to live from this infertile place, and Apollo promises them a continual supply of animals brought in offering by worshippers. The purpose of the lines is to show that the priests' right to a share of the sacrificial meat, and the surrounding peoples' duty to provide it, are guaranteed by divine ordinance. In D this is all but lost to view. The prospect that the Delians will be able to live off their visitors becomes merely an inducement to the island to accept Apollo. This was not the most obvious argument to put in Leto's mouth. It would have been enough just to hold out fame and honour as the rewards; these are what in fact excite Delos (65). Again, D seems to borrow ideas from P.

Lastly, in 80 ff. Delos asks Leto to swear:

ἐνθάδε μιν πρῶτον τεύξειν περικαλλέα νηὸν
ἔμμεναι ἀνθρώπων χρηστήριον, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους, ἐπεὶ ἢ πολυώνυμος ἔσται.

¹ Hermann suggested that a line had fallen out after 29, with the sense 'Latona, Apollinem paritura, adiit . . .'. But she was looking for a place, not a people, and 30 ff.

is a list of peoples: *ὄσσους Κρήτη τ' ἐντός ἔχει κτλ.* The *ὄσσους* cannot be separated from the *πάσι* of 29.

There is evidently a lacuna (Hermann), but it is not after 80, as is clear from the parallels in P:

ἐνθάδ' ἐπεὶ φρονέεις τεύξαι περικαλλέα νηόν 258
ἔμμεναι ἀνθρώποις χρηστήριον,

and 247 f., 287 f. So the talk is of an oracle on Delos. There was one, at least in Hellenistic times,¹ but it was never important. In particular, it was not important to the poet of D, for he does not elsewhere allude to this aspect of the holy island, though he does acknowledge the god's prophetic role (132). What leads him to refer to it in 81, if not the fact that it is embedded in the phrase about 'founding a fair temple' which he knows from P?

I conclude from the above comparisons that D was composed with knowledge of P, and therefore later than P, and I see no evidence that would indicate the opposite. P dates apparently from about 600 B.C.² In that case, D should be assignable to the sixth century.

From internal evidence, then, we have arrived at the following picture: a sixth-century itinerant³ poet from Chios composes a hymn to Apollo which appears in our collection thrust in before the older Pythian hymn so as to obliterate its opening. But soft you . . . this is remarkably like what we are told by the learned scholiast on the first line of Pindar's second Nemean:

᾽Ομηρίδας ἔλεγον τὸ μὲν ἀρχαῖον τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ ᾽Ομήρου γένους, οἳ καὶ τὴν ποίησιν αὐτοῦ ἐκ διαδοχῆς ἦδον, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα καὶ οἱ ῥαψωδοὶ οὐκέτι τὸ γένος εἰς ᾽Ομηρον ἀνάγοντες. ἐπιφανεῖς δὲ ἐγένοντο οἱ περὶ Κύναιθον, οὓς φασὶ πολλὰ τῶν ἐπῶν ποιήσαντας ἐμβάλεῖν εἰς τὴν ᾽Ομήρου ποίησιν. ἦν δὲ ὁ Κύναιθος τὸ γένος Χίος. ὃς καὶ τῶν ἐπιγραφομένων ᾽Ομήρου ποιημάτων τὸν εἰς Ἀπόλλωνα γεγραφὼς ὕμνον ἀνατέθεικεν αὐτῷ. οὗτος οὖν ὁ Κύναιθος πρῶτος ἐν Συρακούσαις ἐρραψώδησε τὰ ᾽Ομήρου ἔπη κατὰ τὴν ξθ' ᾽Ολυμπιάδα (504/1), ὡς ᾽Ιππόστρατός φησιν (F. Gr. Hist. 568 F 5).

One of the Homeric Hymns, according to this testimony, is intrusive, the work of a Chian poet, Cynaethus (BDT) or Cinaethus (PU), who crossed the seas and recited Homer at Syracuse at the end of the sixth century; and that hymn is the Hymn to Apollo. By 'the Hymn to Apollo' the scholiast must mean the whole chimera D+P.⁴ But we can discern, as later antiquity apparently could not, that the hymn is two hymns, one of which is by a Chian and the other is not. If there is anything in what the scholiast says, it must refer to D.

¹ See the note of Allen and Halliday. Wilamowitz's assertion, 'Nur in alter Zeit konnte von einem delischen Orakel geredet werden' (*Il. u. H.*, 446 n. 2), is at variance with the evidence.

² Lines 270-1, where Crisa is said to be untroubled by the noise of horses and chariots, are usually assumed to antedate the introduction of chariot-racing at the Pythian Games in 586. The contrast is primarily between temple-sites on and off a main road, but it would certainly be odd to represent the noise of chariots as being offensive to Apollo at a time when they competed at his games. Lines 540-3, with their threat that the Cretan priesthood will

pass into the control of others if they do not conduct themselves properly, are naturally connected with the First Sacred War, but read to me less like a post-eventum prophecy than a warning in time of imminent danger. Crisa, which was destroyed in the war, is represented as a flourishing inhabited place (446). No inference as to date can be drawn from 294-9, for the temple is not said to be going to stand for ever, but to be famous for ever.

³ 174 f. *ἡμεῖς δ' ὑμέτερον κλέος οἴσομεν ὅσον ἐπ' αἶαν | ἀνθρώπων στρεφόμεσθα πόλις ἐδ' ναεταώσας.*

⁴ As do Paus. 10. 37. 5, Ath. 22b, St. Byz. s.v. *Τεμησός*.

There is no reason to doubt Cynaethus' existence. No one had any motive for inventing such a person. And it would be pointless to suppose that he did exist but did not do the things he is said to have done. Some scholars have thought 504/1 impossibly late for the first recitation of Homer at Syracuse. But if the date is of value for anything, it is for the first *recorded* recitation, which is unlikely to have been the first altogether. The only circumstances in which any recitation would have been recorded with its date would have been a victory in a rhapsodic competition. We have the choice of two alternatives. Either this first recitation in 504/1 is a fabrication of later literary chronography, like many of the dates for literary events on the Parian Marble; or it represents the first entry in a list of victorious rhapsodes. For the former it is an implausible date. For the latter it is wholly plausible: an epoch when Syracuse was just emerging into the light of history, and soon to enter on its great period of literary activity. There seems a good chance, then, that Cynaethus' recitation in 504/1 is historical and that it was known from an inscription.

There is no need for this to be the date of the Delian hymn, even if it was composed by the same man. He might have composed it half a century earlier. The source of the information that he was its author must in any case be a different one. As he is contrasted with the genuine Homeridae, and his work with the genuine work of Homer which the true Homeridae preserved, it would appear that the source was these Homeridae themselves. We know that besides reciting Homer, the Homeridae were concerned to spread his fame, and told stories about his life.¹ Other rhapsodes looked up to them as authorities.² Some of the material in the extant Lives of Homer must have been inherited from them. They were well placed to observe the doings of the renegade Cynaethus, and to bring it about that at least some of the truth about him was remembered.

Of course it did not come to the attention of everyone. When Athenaeus (22b) quotes from the Hymn as *Ὁμηρος ἢ τῶν Ὀμηριδῶν τις ἐν τῷ εἰς Ἀπόλλωνα ὕμνῳ*, he may well have the Cynaethus tradition in view, just as in 35 c he says *ὁ τῶν Κυπρίων ποιητής, ὅστις ἂν εἴη*, although he knows names of poets to whom the epic was ascribed.³ For others, however, the Hymn is simply by Homer. This is taken for granted even by such an early and (in some matters) critical author as Thucydides.⁴ He is quoting from D, the very part of the hymn that I have argued is Cynaethus' work and dates from the middle or second half of the sixth century.⁵ To some scholars it has seemed impossible that Thucydides should mistake a poem only a century old for the work of Homer. But if other people said it was by Homer, there was nothing to make him suspect otherwise; and there is no magic number of generations that must pass before a misattribution becomes current. Stesichorus is said to have known the *Shield of Heracles*, a poem composed in his own lifetime, as Hesiod's.⁶ In the late fifth century the Cyclic poems are generally ascribed to Homer, even if Herodotus voices some

¹ Pl. *Rep.* 599 e, Isoc. 10. 65.

² Pl. *Ion* 530 d.

³ 334 b, 682 e. I am not forgetting that 22 b and 25 c are only preserved in the epitome, so that it is conceivable that names have been eliminated; only it is not in the epitomator's manner to pass over the names of authorities.

⁴ 3. 104; perhaps also by Aristophanes, if *Birds* 575 is a reference to *Hymn. Ap.* 114.

⁵ There is nothing to show whether Thucydides knows it as an independent poem or joined with P. Cf. Allen-Halliday, 186 f., where however the argument that 'as Gemoll observes, if he had been acquainted with more than one hymn to Apollo he would hardly have written τοῦ προοιμίου Ἀπόλλωνος' is useless, because he did not write that. The definite article is not in the text.

⁶ Cf. *C.Q.* n.s. xxi (1971), 305 f.

doubts about one or two of them (on grounds of content, not style). It is at a later period that the claims of Stasinus, Arctinus, and the others—poets no less real than Cynaethus—find their way to the light.¹

In the Lives of Homer, certain of these poets are mentioned, but only as men who enjoy the reputation of having composed poems which were in fact Homer's work. Creophylus was given the *Capture of Oechalia* by Homer in return for hospitality, and it thereafter went under his name. Stasinus was given the *Cypria* as a dowry. Thestorides wrote down the *Little Iliad* and *Phocais* at Homer's dictation and then recited them as his own. To this extent the Lives follow the tradition not of the severe 'genuine' Homeridae who sought to dissociate alien poems from Homer, but of the less scrupulous ones whom they accused of augmenting his *œuvre*. The pseudo-Herodotean Life credits him with the Hymns without qualification.² The *Certamen*, which is here following a Life, refers specifically to the Hymn to Apollo beginning *μνήσομαι οὐδὲ λάθωμαι Ἀπόλλωνος ἑκάτοιο*. It says he composed it at Delos, and the Delians wrote it on a board and dedicated it in the temple of Artemis. The object must have existed at one time, but whether it was ancient must remain in doubt.³

As in Thucydides, we cannot tell whether this 'Hymn to Apollo' comprises P as well as D. No light comes from here on the question how and when the two hymns came to be combined. It had happened by the second century A.D.,⁴ so it is hardly just an accidental conflation resulting from omission, such as might in the Middle Ages spread from one copy to affect a whole tradition, but rather a deliberate piece of editing by scissors and paste. Another sign of this is the odd passage at the transition:

<i>αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν οὐ λήξω ἐκηβόλον Ἀπόλλωνα</i>	177
<i>ὑμνέων ἀργυρότοξον, ὃν ἠΰκομός τέκε Λητώ.</i>	
<i>ὦ ἄνα, καὶ Λυκίην καὶ Μηονίην ἐρατεινήν</i>	
<i>καὶ Μίλητον ἔχεις, ἔναλον πόλιν ἱμερόεσσαν,</i>	180
<i>αὐτὸς δ' αὖ Δῆλιον περικλύστου μέγ' ἀνάσσεις.</i>	

177–8 make an apparent end to D;⁵ 179–81 make a lame, pointless appendage to that ending. Jacoby regards them as the beginning of the 'continuation', P, designed to replace the whole passage 139–78.⁶ But they cannot be assigned to P: the emphasis is still on Delos, against an eastern backdrop,⁷ and there is a complete break between 181 and 182 *εἶσι δὲ φορμιζῶν Λητοῦς ἐρικυδέος υἱός*. The suggestion that the lines were meant to follow the description of Apollo's birth, however, was a fruitful one. Humbert saw in them a replacement for

¹ On their historicity see R. Merkelbach, *Untersuchungen zur Odyssee*, pp. 139–41.

² Ch. 9. Contrast *Vita Scorialensis* p. 29. 19 Wil. = Allen's *Vita V*, line 19, *οὐδὲν δ' αὐτοῦ θετέον ἔξω τῆς Ἰλιάδος καὶ τῆς Ὀδυσσείας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ὕμνους καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν εἰς αὐτὸν ἀναφερομένων ποιημάτων ἡγητέον ἀλλότρια, καὶ τῆς φύσεως (φράσεως Wil.) καὶ τῆς δυνάμεως ἔνεκα*. Pseudo-Plutarch and Proclus also restrict his work to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

³ *Cert.* 18, l. 316. See E. Bethe, *Ber. sächs. Gesellsch.*, Phil.-hist. Kl., lxxxiii (2) (1931), 3–7.

⁴ Pausanias, Athenaeus: above p. 165 n. 4.

⁵ Cf. Jacoby, *Kl. phil. Schr.* i, 183 n. 100, who compares Eur. *H.F.* 674 *οὐ παύσομαι τὰς Χάρτας Μούσαις συγκαταμειγνύς*; van Groningen, *La Comp.*, 313–16.

⁶ *Op. cit.* 201 f.

⁷ Deubner, *S.P.A.W.* 1938, 257 f.

143-5 (it would have been better to say 143-6), and van Groningen a replacement for 140-6.¹ These are promising ideas, but they can be improved on. Here is the passage:

αὐτὸς δ' ἀργυρότοξε ἀναξέκατηβόλ' Ἀπολλων	140
ἄλλοτε μὲν τ' ἐπὶ Κύνθου ἐβήσασα παιπαλόεντος,	
ἄλλοτε δ' ἀν νήσους τε καὶ ἀνέρας ἠλάσκαζες.	
πολλοὶ τοι νηοὶ τε καὶ ἄλσεα δενδρήεντα,	
πᾶσαι δὲ σκοπιαί τε φίλαι καὶ πρόωνες ἄκροι	
ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων, ποταμοὶ θ' ἄλαδε προρόεντες·	145
ἀλλὰ σὺ Δῆλῳ Φοῖβε μάλιστ' ἐπιτέρπειαι ἦτορ,	
ἐνθά τοι ἐλκεχίτωνες Ἰάονες κτλ.	

Wegener deleted 144-5, which are repeated from 22-3 (only with *τε φίλαι* instead of *τοι ἄδον*) and which rather spoil the connection between 143 and 146.² Now suppose the passage read:

πολλοὶ τοι νηοὶ τε καὶ ἄλσεα δενδρήεντα	143
ὦ ἀνα· καὶ Λυκίην καὶ Μηρονίην ἐρατεινήν	179
καὶ Μίλητον ἔχεις, ἔναλον πόλιν ἡμερόεσσαν·	180
ἀλλὰ σὺ Δῆλῳ Φοῖβε μάλιστ' ἐπιτέρπειαι ἦτορ.	146

The vocative attaches itself to *τοι*, and the place-names make the best of antitheses with *Δῆλῳ*. It is a perfect fit. But obviously, if 179-80 really belong here, more has happened than a chance displacement. Someone has deliberately replaced them with two lines borrowed from earlier in the poem. They have then found a place at the end of D, and been rounded off by the addition of a new line (181) similar to 146. This diagnosis has an important consequence. It implies the existence of a 'redactor' for whom D and P are still separate, and who is concerned to preserve pieces of hymn by roughly conflating them. Such a man may well have been responsible for the joining of D and P.³

But why should anybody have wanted to eject 179-80 from an original location after 143? The answer is not hard to find: because of a change in the Greek national consciousness in response to historical events. Here are Lycia and Lydia being treated as one cultural community with Greece. This is something we are accustomed to in Homer or Sappho, and, consistently with the evidence for Cynaethus' date, we can admit it very happily under the benign reign of Croesus. But after the Persians came? Then it was hardly appropriate to include those lands in Apollo's realm, and understandable that the text should be altered.

If this is right, it gives us a *terminus ante quem* for D: 547 or thereabouts. The upper limit can be set around 570, if Cynaethus is still to be alive in 504/1. The whole picture, sketchy as it is—an Ionian poet who starts his career shortly before the Persian conquest, wanders abroad, and turns up in Sicily by about 500—reminds us pleasantly of Xenophanes.

¹ Humbert, ed., 72; van Groningen, 311 f. Deubner, 263, follows Jacoby.

² Cf. Wilamowitz, *Il. u. H.*, 450 n. 1.

³ A remarkable feature of the hymn collection as a whole is the presence in it of obvious doublets: 1. 13-15/16, 17-19/20-1; 3.

96/98-101 (see below), 136-8/139; 5. 62/63, 97/98-9, 136/136a; 18. 10-11/12. But the alternatives are simply juxtaposed; the procedure is different from what has been done with D and P, and not to be attributed to the same agent.

Catalepton

92 ff. Leto was in travail for nine days and nights,

θεαὶ δ' ἔσαν ἔνδοθι πᾶσαι

δοσαι ἄρισται ἔσαν, Διώνη τε Ῥεΐη τε
 Ἰχναΐη τε Θέμις καὶ ἀγάστονος Ἀμφιτρίτη
 {ἀλλὰ τ' ἀθάναται, νόσφιν λευκωλένου Ἥρης.} 95
 μούνη δ' οὐκ ἐπέπυστο μογοστόκος Εἰλειθυια· 97
 ἦστο γὰρ ἐν μεγάροισι Διὸς νεφεληγερέταο· 96
 {ἦστο γὰρ ἄκρω Ὀλύμπῳ ὑπὸ χρυσείοισι νέφεσσιν 98
 Ἥρης φραδμοσύνης λευκωλένου, ἣ μιν ἔρυκε
 ζηλοσύνη, ὄτ' ἄρ' υἴον ἀμύμονά τε κρατερόν τε 100
 Λητώ τέξεσθαι καλλιπλόκαμος τότ' ἔμελλεν.}
 αἰ δ' Ἰριν προύπεμψαν ἐϋκτιμένης ἀπὸ νήσου
 ἀξέμεν Εἰλειθυιαν, ὑποσχόμεναι μέγαν ὄρμον,
 χρυσείοισι λίθοισιν ἐερμένον, ἐννεάπηχυν.
 {νόσφιν δ' ἦνωγον καλέειν λευκωλένου Ἥρης, 105
 μή μιν ἔπειτ' ἐπέεσσιν ἀποστρέψειεν ἰούσαν.}
 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τό γ' ἄκουσε ποδήνεμος ὠκέα Ἰρις,
 βῆ ῥά θέειν, ταχέως δὲ διήνυσε πᾶν τὸ μεσηγνύ.
 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' ἴκανε θεῶν ἔδος αἰπὺν Ὀλυμπον,
 αὐτίκ' ἄρ' Εἰλειθυιαν ἀπὸ μεγάροιο θύραζε 110
 ἐκπροκαλεσσαμένη ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα.

96 is absent from some manuscripts, including M. As Wade-Gery points out, this cannot be explained as a simple case of homoearchon-omission, for then 97 ought to be omitted too. The line is an alternative to 98,¹ or perhaps rather to 98–101, for the golden clouds go together with Hera's interference (cf. *Il.* 13. 521–5). Wilamowitz thinks that 96 was composed as a replacement 'when the obstruction of the senses by the golden clouds no longer seemed worthy of a goddess'. But this is an unlikely motive for rewriting, and it overlooks the fact that it is 96, not 98–101, that is presupposed in 110 f. Iris fetches Eileithyia from a house, not from under a golden cloud on the mountain (there can be no question of an *indoor* cloud), and there is no hint of obstruction by Hera.²

There are, then, in 97–96 and 98–101 two accounts of Eileithyia's absence which differ essentially in that in one Hera is involved and in the other she is not; and of these two, it is the version without Hera that is assumed in what follows. This is also the version that is more in accord with the rest of D. In 5–13, Leto sits beside Zeus as his consort, and Hera is simply ignored. Again in the story of Leto's search for a place in which to give birth, the whole theme of Hera's opposition, which is so important in Callimachus' Hymn to Delos, is absent. There just was not room in this poem for Hera besides Leto.

We may safely conclude that 98–101 is the secondary version, and that the other lines near by that refer to Hera, 95 and 105–6, must go with it. If we look carefully, we will see that the passage benefits from their removal. 95 does

¹ Wilamowitz, 447 n. 3; Jacoby, 170 f.

invented to suit 110, while the original version contradicted it.

² Jacoby notices 110 f. in this connection, but draws the odd conclusion that 96 was

not accord happily either with 93 or with 97; and 105-6 spoil the nice point which ἐπεὶ τό γ' ἄκουσε has if it follows straight after 103-4.

ἄλλοτε μὲν τ' ἐπὶ Κύνθου ἐβήσασα παιπαλόεντος, 141
 ἄλλοτε δ' ἂν νήσους τε καὶ ἀνέρας ἠλάσκαζες . . .
 ἀλλὰ σὺ Δῆλῳ Φοῖβε μάλιστ' ἐπιτέρπειαι ἦτορ. 146

In Thucydides 3. 104. 4, where lines 146-50 appear in quotation, the manuscripts give 146 in the form ἀλλ' ὅτε Δῆλῳ Φοῖβε μάλιστά γε θυμὸν ἐτέρφθης. The variant at the end is a natural product of quotation from memory, but we cannot follow Gemoll in explaining the ἀλλ' ὅτε or ἄλλοτε in the same way, because it does not make sense and Thucydides could not have thought it did. It seems probable that he began his quotation at 141, and that a scribe's eye jumped from ἄλλοτε there to ἀλλὰ σὺ in 146.

πῶς τάρ σ' ὑμνήσω, πάντως εὐνυμον ἔοντα; 207
 ἤέ σ' ἐνὶ μνηστῆσιν αἰίδω καὶ φιλότῃτι;

After the aorist ὑμνήσω in 207 it seems highly likely that αἰείσω was written in 208. The two forms can be hard to tell apart in minuscule; see for example the way αἰῶσω (?) is written in the sixth line of Cleanthes' Hymn to Zeus in the facsimile in R. Merkelbach and H. van Thiel, *Griechisches Leseheft*.

αὐτίκα τόνδε λαβοῦσα βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη 353
 δῶκεν ἔπειτα φέρουσα κακῶ κακόν.

τόνδε is to be emended to τόν γε (and likewise in Hymn 26. 7 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τόνδε θεαὶ πολύμυμον ἔθρεψαν); again a very easy and common minuscule confusion. ὅδε is not used in epic narrative except in the prospective ἦδε δέ οἱ . . . ἀρίστη φαίνεται βουλή and the like. In *Il.* 24. 17 τὸν δέ τ' is of course the right reading, not τόνδε δ'. There remains only Hes. *Op.* 80 ὀνόμηγε δὲ τήνδε γυναῖκα Πανδώρην, which is perhaps best understood as a reflection of what Hermes was imagined to say, ὀνομαίνω τήνδε γυναῖκα Πανδώρην.

αὐτὰρ ὁ τοῖσι συνήντητο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων, 399
 ἐν πόντῳ δ' ἐπόρουσε δέμας δελφίνι εἰοικώς
 νῆϊ θοῆ, καὶ κείτο πέλωρ μέγα τε δεινόν τε.

R. Merkelbach, *Kritische Beiträge zu antiken Autoren* (Meisenheim, 1974), pp. 1-2, proposes νῆϊ θοῆ δ' ὑπέκειτο, inferring from 416 εἰ μενέει νηὸς γλαφυρῆς δαπέδοισι πέλωρον that the divine dolphin is stationed underneath the ship. This is wrong, for when they reach Crisa Apollo leaps *out of* the ship, ἐκ νηὸς (440). δαπέδοισι in 416 therefore means (as one would expect) 'on the floor'. It is true that 401 is deplorably unclear. It would be better if the poet had written ἐκ πόντου in 400 (T. L. Agar, *C.R.* xxx [1916], 5); but the transmitted text is protected by 493-4:

ὡς μὲν ἐγὼ τὸ πρῶτον ἐν ἡεροειδέϊ πόντῳ
 εἰδόμενος δελφίνι θοῆς ἐπὶ νηὸς ὄρουσα.