

## HOMERIC HYMN TO APOLLO, 171<sup>1</sup>

Among the departures from the direct tradition in Thucydides' quotation of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* at 3.104, perhaps the most interesting is line 171. The MSS of the *Hymns* give ὑποκρίνασθε (ὑποκρίνεσθ' M) ἀφ' ἡμέων (ἀφ' ὑμέων ET—iotacism). The majority of Thucydides' MSS give ὑποκρίνασθαι ἀφήμως, but ἀφήμως is corrected by a second hand in FJ and by the first hand in H to εὐφήμως. Each tradition exists in blissful ignorance of the other. In Aristides' quotation of lines 169–72 (κατὰ τῶν ἐξορχουμένων 559D, p. 245 Keil), the MSS in general agree with the direct tradition of the *Hymns*: ἀποκρίνασθε (ἀποκρίνασθαι A) ἀφ' ἡμῶν (ἀφ' ὑμῶν DU). But the reading in R is a correction. The original reading, which has been erased, was . . . φ . . . ως. Aristides, who as his introductory remark shows (καταλύων τὸ προοίμιον in Aristides clearly comes from Thucydides' ἐτελεύτα τοῦ ἐπαίνου) is quoting from Thucydides, appears to have read εὐφήμως in his text of Thucydides, but this has been replaced at some stage in the tradition by ἀφ' ἡμῶν; the MSS tradition of Aristides has been 'corrected' from the direct tradition of the *Hymns*. If Aristides had εὐφήμως in his text of Thucydides, the corrected reading of FJH is not the result of minuscule confusion of *a* and *eu*, nor of Byzantine editorial interference, but an ancient conjecture. But despite the improvement in its pedigree, and the approval of, among others, Wilamowitz and Cassola,<sup>2</sup> εὐφήμως is an unattractive reading. This *lectio facillima* all too obviously represents an attempt to extract some sense from the puzzling ἀφήμως. It is difficult to see how the reading of the majority of Thucydides' MSS and that of the MSS of the *Hymns* could have arisen from εὐφήμως.<sup>3</sup>

ἀφήμως in Thucydides is explained by the schol. as ἡσύχα, ἀθρόως, and Hesychius glosses with ἐν κόσμῳ, ἡσυχῇ. That is, ἀφήμως is formed either from *a*-privative plus φήμη, or from *a* θροιστικόν plus φήμη. The former is clearly impossible in context. At best, ἀφήμως might be pressed to yield the sense 'silently', 'without speaking', but not 'calmly', 'quietly', 'peacefully'. The latter formation would have to mean συμφώνως, ὁμοφώνως. Though φήμη usually denotes 'rumor', 'fama', 'omen',<sup>4</sup> at Soph. *Phil.* 846 it means 'utterance' (λόγων φάμαν). ἀφήμως remains a possibility, but not an attractive one. We are offered a word unattested elsewhere, demanding an unusual nuance for φήμη. It is difficult to see how any Greek hearing the word could fail to interpret it as *a*-privative plus φήμη = 'fama', i.e. as meaning 'ingloriously'. F. Marx<sup>5</sup> corrected the reading of the direct tradition to ἀμφ' ἡμέων, suggesting

<sup>1</sup> My thanks to Professor I. G. Kidd for reading and commenting on a first draft and to Mr R. C. M. Janko for vigorous discussion and encouragement.

<sup>2</sup> U. Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Die Ilias und Homer* (Berlin, 1916), pp. 454 f., F. Cassola, *Inni Omerici* (Verona, 1975), pp. 497 f.

<sup>3</sup> Minuscule error is ruled out by the gloss of Hesychius and the scholiast to Thucydides.

<sup>4</sup> Wilamowitz, p. 454.

<sup>5</sup> *Rb.M* 62 (1907), 620; Marx is followed by T. W. Allen in the Oxford text, by T. W. Allen—W. R. Halliday—E. E. Sikes, *The Homeric Hymns* (Oxford, 1936), p. 226, J. Humbert, *Homère, Hymnes* (Paris, 1936), p. 86, R. Weil—J. de Romilly, *Thucydide, II 2* (Paris, 1967), p. 74; Humbert later suggested (*REG* 51 (1938), 275–81) that ἀμφ' may have been written ἀφ' to procure a dactylic fifth foot—ὑποκρίνασθαι ἀφ' ἡμέων for Marx's ὑποκρίνασθ' ἀμφ' ἡμέων.

that ἀμφ' ἡμέων was actually written ἀφ' ἡμέων. The correction is easy, and the sense acceptable, if flat; 'do you all answer about me'. But whether ἀφ' ἡμέων in the MSS of the *Hymns* represents a corruption of ἀμφ' ἡμέων or an orthographical variant, it is difficult to see how such a familiar and lucid phrase as ἀφ' ἡμέων (which can even be twisted into something like Greek—'do you all answer prompted/inspired by me'; cf. Xen. *Cyr.* 3.3.53 ὁ ἀπὸ τῶν πολεμίων φόβος) could be altered to the perplexing *hapax* ἀφήμωσ. Common sense suggests that if one reading arose from the other, corruption would move in the opposite direction.

Since none of the traditional readings is entirely satisfactory, we may reasonably raise the possibility that the line is corrupt in both traditions. The original reading may have been ὑποκρίνασθε σαφηνέως. σαφηνέως is used with verbs of speaking at Aesch. *PV* 781, Hdt. 1.140, 3.122, 6.82; it ends a hexameter, as here, at *Theognidea* 963. The loss of sigma is easy in uncial script after epsilon. ΤΠΟΚΡΙΝΑΣΘΕΣΑΦΗΝΕΩΣ becomes ΤΠΟΚΡΙΝΑΕΘΕΑΦΗΝΕΩΣ. The unintelligible *αφηνεως* is then corrected, consciously or otherwise, to give the different readings found in the MSS of Thucydides and those of the *Hymns*. The change from *αφηνεως* to ἀφήμωσ, ἀφ' ἡμέων, is not difficult, and would be still easier if loss of sigma were combined with careless writing of M for N, since only a single letter need then be changed (omission of E or substitution of N for Σ) to give the surviving variants (with ἀφήμωσ later corrected to εὐφήμωσ). This orthography assumes of course that the same corruption has taken place independently in both traditions, at a date subsequent to 300 BC. But it is possible that the corruption predates Thucydides. I take it that Thucydides had read a text in the epichoric Attic script, and that this text was derived ultimately from a text in Ionian script, either a performer's copy or the copy made on Delos.<sup>6</sup> In an Athenian copy of the fifth century, or a Delian copy made in the seventh, sixth, or fifth century, the loss of four-barred sigma after epsilon would be easy.<sup>7</sup> The substitution of M for N would be especially easy for anyone copying from an Ionian script of the archaic period, when M frequently has only a short fourth bar to distinguish it from N. It is fairly clear from the disagreements between the direct tradition of lines 146–50, 165–72, and Thucydides' version that, at least for the verses in question, the textual tradition of the *Delian Hymn* had already bifurcated in the archaic or Classical period. We may suppose either that the exemplar of both traditions had the nonce word *αφηνεως* (or *αφημεως*), which was then corrected independently to ἀφήμωσ and ἀφ' ἡμέων, or that the exemplar already had the makeshift ἀφήμωσ (i.e. that Thucydides actually wrote ἀφήμωσ), and that the text has remained static in the indirect tradition, while in the direct tradition ἀφήμωσ has been corrupted, or corrected, further into ἀφ' ἡμῶν, which is then ionicized to ἀφ' ἡμέων.

σαφηνέως makes excellent sense in context. The girls of Delos, sharing the

<sup>6</sup> *Certamen* 320, p. 237 Allen. The date of the Delian copy is unknown, but it was presumably sufficiently early to make the connection with Homer's alleged performance on Delos plausible; perhaps sixth century.

<sup>7</sup> The confusion is entirely possible in a Delian text; the use of H for ε and E for η,

which is characteristic of Ceos, is not applied consistently in Delian inscriptions; see L. H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* (Oxford, 1961), p. 296. The suggested errors would also be possible in Chian script (see Jeffery, Plate 65), the other obvious contender (*hAp* 38, 172).

poet's confidence in his excellence, when asked who writes the sweetest songs, are to reply unanimously (*πᾶσαι*) and unambiguously/truthfully (*σαφηνέως*)— 'a blind man, who lives in rocky Chios'.

*University of St Andrews*

C. CAREY