

## THE “ADDRESS TO THE DELIAN MAIDENS” IN THE *HOMERIC HYMN TO APOLLO*: EPILOGUE OR TRANSITION?\*

ANDREW M. MILLER

*University of Pittsburgh*

The unity of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* has been the subject of vigorous controversy since 1782, when David Ruhnken announced that what the manuscripts are unanimous in presenting as a single work was in reality two different hymns juxtaposed:

Certius est, Hymnum in Apollinem, qui in scriptis editisque libris unus est, in binos Hymnos dividendum esse. Versus enim 165. ἀλλ' ἄγεθ' ἰλῆκοι &c. habet solitum Hymni epilogum et finem. Tum sequitur alterius Hymni initium vs. 179. ὦ ἄνα καὶ Λυκίην καὶ Μηριόνην &c. Prior Hymnus Apollinis Delii, posterior Apollinis Delphici laudem complectitur. Priorem autem eo loco, quem indicavimus, finiri, non solum ratio docet, sed etiam veterum scriptorum auctoritas confirmat. Thucydides III.104 τὸν γὰρ Δηλιακὸν χορὸν τῶν γυναικῶν ὑμνήσας ἐτελεύτα τοῦ ἐπαίνου ἐς τὰδε τὰ ἔπη, ubi verba ἐτελεύτα

\*This paper is a revised and expanded version of one delivered at the annual meeting of the American Philological Association in December, 1976. Revision was undertaken with the support of a Faculty Research Grant from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, University of Pittsburgh.

The following works are cited by the author's name alone: T. W. Allen, W. R. Halliday, and E. E. Sikes, *The Homeric Hymns* (Oxford 1936<sup>2</sup>); F. Altheim, *Hermes* 59 (1924) 430–50; E. Bethe, *Berichte über die Verhandlung der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 81 (1929); C. Cessi, *Atti del Reale Istituto Veneto* 87 (1927–28) 864–83; L. Deubner, *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 24 (1938) 248–77; F. Dornseiff, *Die archaischen Mythenzählung* (Berlin 1933); E. Drerup, *Mnemosyne* 5 (1937) 81–134; C. H. Floratos, *Athena* 56 (1952) 286–309; M. Forderer, *Anfang und Ende der abendländischen Lyrik* (Amsterdam 1971); A. Gemoll, *Die homerischen Hymnen* (Leipzig 1886); B. A. van Groningen, *La composition littéraire archaïque grecque* (Amsterdam 1958); A. Heubeck, *Τιμητικὸν ἀφιέρωμα Κωνσταντίνῳ Ι. Μερωντίτῃ* (Athens 1972) 131–46; F. Jacoby, *Sitz. der Preuss. Akad. der Wiss.* 15 (1933) 682–751; W. Unte, *Studien zum homerischen Apollonhymnos* (Diss., Berlin 1968); M. L. West, *CQ* 25 (1975) 161–70.

τοῦ ἐπαίνου non significant *finem fecit laudis choro Deliaci tributae, sed finem fecit Hymni in Apollinem*. . .<sup>1</sup>

Although Ruhnken was but the first of many scholars to deny the hymn's coherence and to propound a theory accounting for the present state of the text,<sup>2</sup> his bipartition into "Delian" and "Pythian" hymns has remained, under various guises, the reigning orthodoxy to this day,<sup>3</sup> despite the protestations and counter-arguments of a sizeable "unitarian" opposition.<sup>4</sup> A recent article by M. L. West, for example, begins:

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

<sup>1</sup>Ruhnken's famous dictum appeared in an appendix to his *Homeri Hymnus in Cererem* (Leiden 1782), not in the *Epistula Critica in Homeri Hymnos et Hesiodum* of 1749, as Jacoby and others report; see Forderer 162.

<sup>2</sup>The substantial scholarly literature on the hymn is surveyed in Drerup 81–99, Floratos 286–309, Unte 10–18, P. K. Huibregste, *De homerische Apollonhymnus* (Diss., Leiden 1940) 9–25; for the nineteenth century see A. Baumeister, *Homerici Hymni* (Leipzig 1860) 109–12.

<sup>3</sup>"Under various guises" is a necessary qualification since the notion of a purely fortuitous collocation of two fully independent hymns has struck most scholars as unacceptably simplistic. Perhaps the single most influential variant of Ruhnken's hypothesis is the "Fortsetzung" theory proposed by Wilamowitz in an appendix to *Die Ilias und Homer* (Berlin 1920) and adopted by Humbert in his Budé edition of the *Hymns* (Paris 1937); this postulates that a pre-existing "Delian" hymn was taken over and "continued" by a later (and inferior) poet with close ties to Delphi. Jacoby, certainly the most sensitive and sensible of modern anti-unitarians, combines "continuation" with "redaction"; according to his analysis the "Fortsetzer" (who is, *pace* Wilamowitz, "kein Stümper") made various changes of addition and omission in the Delian original in order to adapt it to his particular purposes. "P" itself is resolved into strata of varying dates by H. T. Wade-Gery in "Kynaithos," *Greek Poetry and Life: Essays Presented to Gilbert Murray* (Oxford 1936), now reprinted in *Essays in Greek History* (Oxford 1958).

<sup>4</sup>The unitarian defense was initiated, in curiously ambivalent terms, by Gemoll 116–17, who takes up arms against both the "Ruhnken'sche Zweiteilung" and the still more radical "analysis" of mid-nineteenth-century critics, yet admits that he too fails to gain from the hymn "den Eindruck eines einheitlichen Kunstwerks." Important contributions to the cause of unity have been made by Allen-Halliday-Sikes, Cessi, Floratos, Forderer, Heubeck, Unte, J. T. Kakridis, *Philologus* 92 (1937) 104–8, E. Kalinka, *PhW* 52 (1932) 385–94. The hymn's most pugnacious champion in this century was of course Franz Dornseiff, whose *Die archaischen Mythenzählung* appeared in the same year as Jacoby's monograph and suffered greatly from the inevitable comparisons; he restated his position in "Nochmals der homerischen Apollonhymnus: eine Gegenkritik," *Greifswalder Beiträge zur Literatur- und Stilforschung* 8 (1935), and in *Echtheitsfragen antik-griechischen Literatur* (Berlin 1939). Although all unitarians must appreciate the enthusiasm and courage with which Dornseiff took up a highly unpopular cause, it is unfortunately the case that substantive argument is overshadowed in *Mythenzählung* by fanciful hypothesizing, in the later tracts by heated polemic.

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.<sup>5</sup>

Noteworthy here, aside from the confidence with which West reports a *consensus opinionum* in favor of bipartition, is the fact that the chief grounds upon which he justifies that consensus are identical with those brought forward by his eighteenth-century predecessor, namely that (a) the first part of the poem deals with Delos and Delian Apollo, the second with Delphi and Pythian Apollo, and (b) lines 165–78 constitute a "solitum hymni epilogum et finem" in which the poet "is quite clearly finishing." The most cursory inspection of literature on the hymn reveals that these two arguments, the one based on considerations of *content*, the other on considerations of *form*, have been the mainstay of the anti-unitarian position for two centuries, while the citation from Thucydides with which Ruhnken seeks to clinch his *ratio docet* has regularly served—along with alleged discrepancies in language and style,<sup>6</sup> "geographical horizon,"<sup>7</sup> and the like—as a useful but not indispensable supplement.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>5</sup>West 161.

<sup>6</sup>Common to all anti-unitarian arguments based on linguistic and stylistic differences between "D" and "P" (see West 161 for a representative sampling) is the presupposition that such differences can be explained *only* by positing multiple authorship. In fact, of course, another possibility exists: such discrepancies as can be discerned may be part and parcel of the poet's intention in the several sections of a nevertheless unified work. It has long been a critical commonplace, for example, to contrast the "lyrische Darstellung" that marks the hymn's first two hundred lines, above all the "öfteres neues Anheben und Aufhören der Erzählung" (Gemoll 111), with the straightforwardly linear and "epic" movement of the rest. If one postulates, however, that the tale of oracle is, as position and scale of development suggest, the major item of narrative "business" on the hymn's encomiastic "agenda" or "program," in relation to which the earlier sections serve but a prelusory or preparatory function (see note 44), the shift from "lyric" to "epic" mode, with its coincident increase in the use of formulaic language, ceases to be a puzzle requiring textual surgery for its solution. (In pointing out, "for what it is worth," that the ratio of observances to neglects of digamma is "significantly" higher in "P" than "D", West fails to note that "P" makes ampler use of traditional diction—yet the two facts are clearly not unrelated.)

<sup>7</sup>Cf. West 161: "... 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." Yet cannot the co-existence in the hymn of Aegean and mainland "worlds" be simply a reflection of its double subject, Apollo's birth on Delos and his founding of the oracle at Pytho? It is scarcely inexplicable, after all, that in recounting events that happened at the heart of the Cyclades the poet should make scant reference to mainland Greece and *vice versa*. In both portions of the hymn (21, 142–45, 250–51

Of these two “perennial” arguments the former rests upon the *a priori* assumption that the Apollo who was born on Delos and the Apollo who founded an oracle at Pytho were distinct deities of so exclusive a nature that a story of interest to the devotees of the one would not be tolerated by the devotees of the other. Since this assumption is clearly open to dispute, it is not surprising that pride of place has always been given, as West gives it, to the argument from form. So self-evident, in fact, has the epilogic character of 165–78 seemed to the anti-unitarians that they have never attempted to demonstrate it in any methodical fashion<sup>9</sup> or to refute the objections raised by those who argue that the lines are and can only be transitional, effecting (in Gemoll’s words) “eine Rückkehr zum Thema nach einer Digression.”<sup>10</sup> Such nonchalant certitude seems inappropriate, however, when our understanding of a poem’s basic structure and meaning is at stake; if judgment is not to be prejudgment, it must wait upon a careful and comprehensive examination of evidence.

The logical starting-point for such an examination is a survey of the varieties of hymnal epilogue preserved in the Homeric collection. In its minimal form the epilogue does no more than salute, with *χαῖρε* or *ἔλθθι*,<sup>11</sup> the god in whose honor the hymn has been performed; such are the epilogues of *h.* XVII (Dioscuri), *Χαίρετε Τυνδαρίδαι, ταχέων ἐπιβήτορες ἱππων*, and of *h.* XXIII (Zeus), *Ἴλθθ’ ἐϋρύοπα Κρονίδη κύδιστε μέγιστε*.<sup>12</sup> More commonly, however, and especially in the more substantial hymns, the salutation is followed either by a request of some sort, or by a statement pertaining to the poet’s plans for the future, or by both. The first of these more complex epilogic types can be illustrated by *h.* XI (Athena), *Χαῖρε θεά, δὸς δ’ ἄμμι τύχην εὐδαιμονίην τε*, and by *h.* XX (Hephaestus), *Ἄλλ’ ἔλθθ’ Ἥφαιστε· δίδου δ’ ἄρετήν τε καὶ ὄλβον*.<sup>13</sup> To

= 290–91) it is stressed that Apollo’s “sphere of influence” subsumes the continental and the insular alike; see note 41.

<sup>9</sup>West himself (166, note 5) regards the *testimonium* as inconclusive: “There is nothing to show whether Thucydides knows it [D] as an independent hymn or joined with P.” To my knowledge only Jacoby 689–93 bases the original *Selbständigkeit* of “D” primarily on the authority of Thucydides. Cogent arguments against the Ruhnken/Jacoby interpretation of *ἔτελεύτα τοῦ ἐπαίνου* can be found in Allen-Halliday-Sikes 186–87, Drerup 100–102, Cessi 879–82, A. Heubeck, *WS* 79 (1966) 148–57.

<sup>9</sup>Cf. Drerup 118, note 1: “Dass die Verse 165–178, die an das Intermezzo des delischen Festes sich anschliessen, der ‘Epilog’ eines Götterhymnos sein können, hat von Ruhnken bis Jacoby noch niemand bewiesen, sondern jeder nur beweislos behauptet.”

<sup>10</sup>Gemoll 112.

<sup>11</sup>*ἔλθθι* appears in I, XX, XXIII, *ἔλαμαι* in XIX, XXI; *χαῖρε* and *χαίρετε* elsewhere.

<sup>12</sup>Cf. also XIV.

<sup>13</sup>Cf. also XIII, XV, XXII.

the second class belongs the couplet that closes the *Hymn to Apollo* itself, the single most common epilogic formula in the collection, in which the poet vows to “remember the god and another song” in future:

Καὶ σὺ μὲν οὕτω χαῖρε, Διὸς καὶ Λητοῦς υἱέ·  
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ σείο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ’ αἰοιδῆς.<sup>14</sup>

To it belongs as well the formula represented by *h. V. 292–93* (Aphrodite):

Χαῖρε, θεὰ Κύπριοι εὐκτιμένης μεδέουσα·  
σεῦ δ’ ἐγὼ ἀρξάμενος μεταβήσομαι ἄλλον ἐς ὕμνον.<sup>15</sup>

The fullest epilogues, however, combine all three elements, salutation, request, and “promise,” in such a way that a relation of reciprocity between god and singer is defined or implied. In *h. XXX* (Earth), for example, one finds an overt *quid pro quo*:

Χαῖρε θεῶν μήτηρ, ἄλοχ’ Οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος,  
πρόφρων δ’ ἀντ’ ᾧδῆς βίοτον θυμήρε’ ὄπαζε·  
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ σείο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ’ αἰοιδῆς.<sup>16</sup>

Similarly in *h. XXV* (Muses),

Χαίρετε τέκνα Διὸς καὶ ἐμὴν τιμήσατ’ αἰοιδήν·  
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ὑμέων τε καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ’ αἰοιδῆς,

and in *h. VI* (Aphrodite),

Χαῖρ’ ἐλικοβλέφαρε γλυκυμείλιχε, δὸς δ’ ἐν ἀγῶνι  
νίκην τῷδε φέρεσθαι, ἐμὴν δ’ ἔντυνον αἰοιδήν·  
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ σείο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ’ αἰοιδῆς,

the poet vows to reciprocate any honor bestowed upon the present song by “remembering” the goddesses in future.<sup>17</sup>

It is the last and fullest of these epilogic types that Ruhnken and his modern disciples discern in *h. Ap. 165–78*:

<sup>14</sup>Cf. also IV, XIX, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXXIII. The original intent of this formula is obscure; see the discussion in N. J. Richardson, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford 1974) 324.

<sup>15</sup>Cf. also IX, XVIII, XXXII.

<sup>16</sup>Cf. II.490–95, XXXI.17–19, and K. Keyssner, *Gottesvorstellung und Lebensauffassung im griechischen Hymnus* (Stuttgart 1932) 133–34.

<sup>17</sup>Cf. also X.4–6.

- 165 ἀλλ' ἄγεθ' ἰλήκοι μὲν Ἀπόλλων Ἀρτέμιδι ξύν,  
χαίρετε δ' ὑμεῖς πᾶσαι· ἐμείο δὲ καὶ μετόπισθε  
μνήσασθ', ὅππότε κέν τις ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων  
ἐνθάδ' ἀνείρηται ξεῖνος ταλαπείριος ἐλθών·  
ὦ κοῦραι, τίς δ' ὕμιν ἀνὴρ ἥδιστος ἀοιδῶν  
170 ἐνθάδε πωλεῖται, καὶ τέω τέρπεσθε μάλιστα;  
ὑμεῖς δ' εὖ μάλα πᾶσαι ὑποκρίνασθ' ἄμφ' ἡμέων·  
τυφλὸς ἀνὴρ, οἰκεῖ δὲ Χίῳ ἔνι παιπαλοέσση,  
τοῦ πᾶσαι μετόπισθεν ἀριστεύουσιν ἀοιδαί.  
ἡμεῖς δ' ὑμέτερον κλέος οἴσομεν ὅσσον ἐπ' αἶαν  
175 ἀνθρώπων στρεφόμεσθα πόλεις εὖ ναιεταώσας·  
οἱ δ' ἐπὶ δὴ πείσσονται, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐτήτυμόν ἐστιν.  
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν οὐ λήξω ἐκηβόλον Ἀπόλλωνα  
ὑμνέων ἀργυρότοξον ὃν ἡὔκομος τέκε Λητώ.

Lines 165–76, they say, comprise an expanded salutation and request, with the simple *χαῖρε* of tradition replaced by a co-ordinated *ἰλήκοι μὲν/χαίρετε δέ*, while 177–78, which begin with *αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν*, contain a verb in the future tense, and state an intention to celebrate the god in song, are functionally equivalent to the formulaic “promise” *αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ σείο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ' ἀοιδῆς*.<sup>18</sup> The correspondences are so striking, at first glance, that one almost understands why methodical *proof* has seemed superfluous, but how do they stand up to a close scrutiny of detail? Let us turn first to 177–78, lines which Deubner is not alone in regarding as “typische Schlussverse.”<sup>19</sup> Since neither *οὐ λήξω ὑμνέων* nor any similar locution is used in an epilogic promise elsewhere in the collection, the lines would, if truly “Schlussverse,” be not typical at all but unique<sup>20</sup>—but that is perhaps a mere quibble over adjectives. More significant are certain facts concerning the word *λήγω* itself. Whether construed with the genitive of a noun (e.g., *Il.* 1.210 *λῆγ' ἔριδος*, *Il.* 6.107 *λῆξαν δὲ φόνοιο*) or with a participle (e.g., *Il.* 9.191 and *Od.* 8.87 *λῆζειεν αἰείδων*), this verb in epic usage regularly denotes the cessation of an activity in which one is presently engaged; negated, therefore, it asserts emphatically that the action specified is *not* abandoned but, on the contrary, is *continued*, as in *Il.* 1.224

<sup>18</sup>See Jacoby 698–701 for the best statement of the “Ruhnkenite” position on the passage as a whole.

<sup>19</sup>Deubner 250; cf. also Altheim 439, M. van der Valk, *AC* 46 (1977) 442, H. Meyer, *Hymnische Stilelemente in der frühgriechischen Dichtung* (Diss., Cologne 1933) 20. The more cautious regard 177–78 as a *variant* of the usual formula, e.g., Bethe 8, van Groningen 315.

<sup>20</sup>Cf. Cessi 871, Forderer 185, note 72. One other epilogue (I.17–21) contains a form of *λήγω*, but there the syntax and sense are completely different; see note 23.

οὐ πω λῆγε χάλοιο, *Od.* 22.63–64 οὐδέ κεν ὥς ἔτι χεῖρας ἐμὰς λήξαιμι φόνοιο / πρὶν πᾶσαν μνηστῆρας ὑπερβασίην ἀποτίσαι, and, most pertinently, *Il.* 21.224–25 Τρῶας δ’ οὐ πρὶν λήξω ὑπερφιάλους ἐναρίζων / πρὶν ἔλσαι κατὰ ἄστυ. The most natural and idiomatic interpretation of οὐ λήξω ὑμνέων, then, is not as a predication about general future time along the lines of Euripides’ οὐ παύσομαι τὰς Χάριτας Μούσαις συγκαταμειγνύς<sup>21</sup> (“Henceforward I shall never cease to celebrate Apollo at appropriate intervals”), but as a strong assertion on the poet’s part that he will persevere in his present course of action (“I have been singing Apollo’s praises all along and I shall not stop doing so now”).<sup>22</sup> That such is indeed the intended sense of the phrase becomes even more certain when one notes that λήγω is a *vox propria* for the termination of a hymnal performance, as is clear from passages such as *h.* I.17–18 οἱ δέ σ’ αἰδοῖοι / ἄδομεν ἀρχόμενοι λήγοντές τ’, *Theog.* 48 ἀρχόμεναί θ’ ὑμνεῦσι θεαὶ λήγουσαι τ’ αἰοιδῆς, *Hes. fr.* 305 ἀρχόμενοι δὲ Λίνον καὶ λήγοντες καλέουσιν, and *Theoc.* 17.1 ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα καὶ ἐς Δία λήγετε Μοῖσαι.<sup>23</sup> Surely, therefore, when a hymnist says οὐ λήξω ὑμνέων he is announcing with all possible clarity and directness that, contrary perhaps to appearance or expectation, he is *not* bringing his hymn to an end but intends instead to proceed with further praise of the god in question.

Another point that the “Ruhnkenites” overlook is that whereas 177–78 refer to Apollo in the third person, elsewhere in the hymns the valedictory promise, like the salutation, is invariably cast in “du-Stil,” one function of the epilogue as a whole being to establish a relationship of greater intimacy between singer and god on the basis of the preceding tribute of praise.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>21</sup>*HF* 673, quoted by Jacoby 719, note 3.

<sup>22</sup>Dornseiff’s paraphrase (“Aber ich höre jetzt noch nicht auf”) was seized on eagerly by anti-unitarians, for merely by pointing out that neither “jetzt” nor “noch” is to be found in the Greek they could appear to refute him utterly (so Deubner 251, R. Pfeiffer, *Gnomon* 9[1933] 611). Neither adverb, of course, is in fact necessary to the sense. On “encomiastic” futures that look no further than the present performance, see Dornseiff 10, E. L. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1962) 21–22, W. J. Slater, *CQ* 19 (1969) 86–88. Even Jacoby 719 admits that the lines can have this force: although intended as a “Hymnenschluss” by the poet of D, the Delphic *Fortsetzer* “hat sie . . . umgedeutet und sie benutzt, um weitere Geschichten von Apollon anzuknüpfen.”

<sup>23</sup>Cf. also Nestor’s conciliatory adaptation of hymnal style in *Il.* 9.97 (ἐν σοὶ μὲν λήξω, σέο δ’ ἄρξομαι) and Theocritus’ use of ἀρχετε, πάλιν ἀρχετε, and λήγετε in the refrains that articulate the song of Daphnis in *Id.* I. Allen-Halliday-Sikes 227 claim that “οὐ λήξω has nothing to do with the epilogic formula ἀρχόμενοι λήγοντές τ’, in fact it is the contrary of it,” but in their anti-separatist zeal they are overstating the case: οὐ λήξω has much to do with the formula, which is, however, no more typical of epilogues than it is of proems. Cf. Keyssner (above, note 16) 13.

<sup>24</sup>On “du-Stil” and “er-Stil” see E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (Stuttgart 1956\*) 143–66.

“Er-Stil” such as is found in 177–78, on the other hand, is a feature not of epilogue but of the hymnal exordium, where the singer’s intent to praise the god is announced to his human audience.<sup>25</sup> The epithets (ἐκηβόλον, ἀργυρότοξον) and the honorific relative clause (ὃν ἡὔκομος τέκε Λητώ) are likewise less typical of epilogue than of exordia, as in *h.* VI Αἰδοίην χρυσοστέφανον καλὴν Ἀφροδίτην ἄσομαι, and *h.* XII Ἥρην ἀεῖδω χρυσόθρονον ἣν τέκε Πείη. The future tense itself, of course, is no less characteristic of the one type of passage than it is of the other; one need only compare epilogic μνήσομαι (II.495, III.546, etc.), μεταβήσομαι (V.293, IX.9, etc.), κλήσω (XXXI.18), ἄσομαι (XXXII.19), with proemial μνήσομαι (III.1, VII.1), ἄσομαι (VI.2), ἀείσομαι (X.1, XV.1, etc.).

The connotations of the verb λήγω, then, in conjunction with certain formal features typical of hymnal exordia, strongly suggest that the poet’s intention in *h.* Ap. 177–78 is not to take his leave of Apollo but rather to reaffirm his commitment to the task of praise upon which he has been engaged since he first announced the god as his theme of song in line 1. Far from being “typische Schlussverse,” the couplet in reality resembles the conventional epilogic promise “nur im Äusserlichen und Vordergründigen.”<sup>26</sup> But are the epilogic affinities of 165–76 equally illusory? Quite the reverse: close inspection reveals not only the elements of salutation and request seized upon by those who argue for an independent “Delian” hymn but also that very “promise for the future” which they attempt, contrary to linguistic usage and hymnal convention both, to wrest from 177–78.<sup>27</sup> Just as in *h.* XXV.6–7 the Muses’ pleasure in and honor for the present song is reciprocated by the singer’s vow to remember them in future, so here, after saluting the Delian maidens and asking them to vouch for the excellence of his songs in time to come, the poet promises in return to spread their fame wherever he wanders among men. The imperatives μνήσασθ’ (167) and ὑποκρίνασθ’ (171) are thus equivalent to τιμήσατ’ in *h.* XXV.6, while ὑμέτερον κλέος οἴσομεν (174), the promise for the future, corresponds to ὑμέων τε καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ’ αἰοιδῆς. The reciprocity inherent in the epilogic form *per se* is underscored by an emphatic use of pronouns (166 ὑμεῖς/ἐμεῖο, 171 ὑμεῖς/ἡμέων,<sup>28</sup> 174 ἡμεῖς/ὑμέτερον): “If

<sup>25</sup>Only viii, XXIV, and XXIX are cast in “du-Stil” throughout, a feature typical of the “cult” hymn as opposed to the “rhapsodic”; see Meyer (above, note 19) 2–8.

<sup>26</sup>Heubeck 139.

<sup>27</sup>Of the anti-unitarians only Altheim, it seems, perceives that the tripartite epilogic pattern of “Gruss,” “Bitte,” and “Versprechen” is fully realized within 165–76 alone; see his excellent discussion on 437–38.

<sup>28</sup>On the text of 171 see F. Marx, *RhM* 62 (1907) 620, J. Humbert, *REG* 51 (1938) 275–81; on the use of the plural for the singular see Forderer 104.



*you* advance *my* claim to be the best of singers, *I* shall see to it that *your* skill is celebrated far and wide."<sup>29</sup>

The fact that the tripartite scheme of salutation, request, and promise is so clearly realized *within* lines 165–76 is yet another reason why 177–78 can have no epilogic force: the conventional slot into which they should fit has already been filled. One might suppose that the separatists have simply applied the knife at the wrong place and that "D" really ends with 176 rather than 178<sup>30</sup>—but though 165–76 are indisputably epilogic in *form*, their *function* must be something quite different unless we are to assume that the poet has violated religious and encomiastic propriety in unprecedented fashion. In all other hymns in the collection the salutation, request, and promise are without exception addressed to the god whose praises have just been sung.<sup>31</sup> According to the "Ruhnkenites," however, the Apollo whom the poet vowed at the outset to "remember and not forget" is now summarily dismissed in the third person (and even that meager limelight he is forced to share with his sister), while the long and warmly enthusiastic apostrophe that follows is directed to another party altogether, human rather than divine, introduced no more than ten lines earlier and only tangentially connected with the avowed subject of the poem.<sup>32</sup> It is surely no accident that a procedure so opposed to the dictates of piety and decorum cannot be paralleled by other hymns.

The formal affinities of 177–78, then, are with hymnal exordia rather than hymnal epilogue, yet it is clearly impossible that they could serve to initiate an independent hymn to Apollo. Lines 165–76, on the other hand, are demonstrably framed on the model of an epilogue, yet given the identity and nature of their addressees it is highly improbable that they could serve to conclude an independent hymn to Apollo. Both the epilogic force of 165–76 and the proemial force of 177–78 make perfect sense, however, if the passage as a whole is understood as *transitional* rather than final, effecting a return to the main subject from a subsidiary topic of merely temporary interest. In lines 140 ff. the poet had broached, by means of a priamel, the conventional hymnal topic of geographical predilections or

<sup>29</sup>Cf. Forderer 107, 110.

<sup>30</sup>Such in fact is Altheim's conclusion; see note 32.

<sup>31</sup>Cf. Jacoby 698–99: "... alle Hymnenschlüsse ... stimmen (wie gar nicht anders zu erwarten ist) darin überein, dass sie *allein und einheitlich* zu dem Gotte reden, von dem der Dichter Abschied nimmt. *Einzig* der delische Apollonhymnos verlässt diese *natürliche und traditionelle Form*" (emphasis mine).

<sup>32</sup>Such is the force of this objection that when Altheim 438–39 makes 176, not 178, the last line of "D" he must explain away the poet's neglect of Apollo by asserting that the real subject of the hymn is not in fact the god himself but rather Delos, the Delian festival, and the Delian cult.

“haunts”: “Many are your temples and shady groves, all peaks are dear to you, and the utmost ridges of lofty mountains, and rivers flowing forth to the sea—but it is *Delos*, *Phoebus*, in which you take greatest delight.”<sup>33</sup> This climactic reference to *Delos* then leads, through the relative adverb *ἐνθα*, into a laudatory account of the Ionian panegyris held regularly on that island—an account that culminates (cf. 156 *πρὸς δέ*) in the praise of one particular element in the festival, the chorus of Delian maidens who perform in *Apollo’s* honor. Although this “intermezzo” (to use Drerup’s term) is formally justified by the special pleasure that *Apollo* takes in *Delos* (if he likes it as a place he must also like it as a theme), and although its relevance to the god is never allowed to disappear from view altogether (cf. 157 *Ἐκατηβελέταο θεράπναι*, 158 *πρῶτον μὲν Ἀπόλλων ὑμνήσωσιν*), there is no doubt but that by line 164 it has assumed digressive proportions and that the poet has strayed some distance from the original topic of *Apollo’s* geographical preferences. To bring this excursus to an end, therefore, he “bids farewell” to the maidens—and with them, to the Delian panegyris as a whole—by adapting the conventions of hymnal epilogue to a “secular” purpose. Because his praise of the *Deliades* in 156–64 is, formally speaking, a miniature “hymn” in itself,<sup>34</sup> this secularization of an essentially religious form strikes no jarring note; because the poet’s primary allegiance, however, is and must be to *Apollo* himself, the real subject of the hymn, decorum requires a preliminary gesture of respect in the god’s direction. This gesture is neatly executed by *ιλήκοι μὲν Ἀπόλλων*: while on the one hand the use of the third person eases *Apollo* tactfully into the background, on the other hand the functional equivalence of *ιληθι* and *χαίρε* in epilogic style gives him his due and assures him of the poet’s solicitous concern. In context, moreover, some of the literal sense of the verb (“be propitious”) is revived with apologetic force to deprecate the anger and *φθόνος* which *Apollo* might well be supposed to feel when temporarily slighted in favor of his servants.<sup>35</sup> “May *Apollo* be forgiving”—such is the implication—“and not begrudge this momentary departure from encomiastic duty strictly conceived.”

<sup>33</sup>On 140 ff. as a priamel see Dornseiff 7, Drerup 117, E. L. Bundy, *CSCA* 5 (1972) 62, note 65. For “haunts” as a hymnal topic cf. XIX.6 ff. (Pan), noting *πάντα λόφον . . . λέλογχε* (cf. *πᾶσαι δὲ σκοπιαὶ τε φίλαι*), *φοιτῇ* (cf. *ἡλάσκαζες*), *ἄλλοτε μὲν/ἄλλοτε δέ*.

<sup>34</sup>Lines 156–57 announce the theme (*δου κλέος οὔ ποτ’ ὀλεῖται* = *κλήσω, ἔσομαι*, or the like); lines 158 ff., introduced by a “hymnal relative,” are an account of typical or habitual activities (note the generalizing *τε*) such as one finds in IX, X, XIX, XXVII.

<sup>35</sup>Cf. Forderer 102: “Sozusagen eine Bitte um Entschuldigung für das Kommende.” *ιλήκω* is used with similar apologetic force in Aratus, *Phaen.* 637–38, where the tale of Orion’s assault on *Artemis* is prefaced by the words *Ἀρτεμις ιλήκωι προτέρων λόγος, οἳ μιν ἔφαντο / ἔλκῃσαι πέπλοις*.

Once he has bidden a tactful farewell to the Deliades as a theme of song, and to the Delian "intermezzo" as a subsection of his hymn, the poet in 177–78 then assures his audience, both human and divine, that despite his apparent divagation from the task at hand he still holds to his original purpose, to "remember and not forget Apollo the far-shooter." Because the formal "leave-taking" of 165–76 is itself quite lengthy, heightening the digressive effect while in reality bringing the digression to a close, the way in which he reaffirms his purpose has a peculiar aptness and verisimilitude: he vows that he will *not* stop singing of Apollo just when it might appear that he *has*. As in the opening line, encomiastic intention and encomiastic object are juxtaposed, οὐ λήξω . . . ὑμνέων being equivalent to Μνήσμαι οὐδὲ λάθωμαι and ἐκηβόλον Ἀπόλλωνα a clear echo of Ἀπόλλωνος ἐκάτοιο. The relative clause δν ἡῦκομος τέκε Δητῶ neatly recapitulates the theme (Apollo's birth) that has bulked largest in the hymn thus far and recalls the programmatic announcement of that theme in line 25 (ὥς σε πρῶτον Δητῶ τέκε).<sup>36</sup> Moreover, by echoing the line that introduces the account of geographical preferences (140 αὐτὸς δ' ἀργυρότοξε ἀναξ ἐκατηβόλ' Ἀπολλων), the epithets ἐκηβόλον and ἀργυρότοξον prepare for the imminent resumption of that topic in 179 ff.<sup>37</sup>

That *h. Ap.* 165–78 are transitional rather than epilogic is of course neither an innovative nor even an uncommon view; first propounded by Gemoll nearly a hundred years ago, it has in this century gained widespread exposure, if not acceptance, through its restatement by Allen, Halliday, and Sikes in their highly influential commentary on the Hymns. The fact that even their advocacy has made so little headway against the "Ruhnkenite" interpretation of the passage attests first and foremost, I believe, to the conditioning power of the anti-unitarian consensus itself: a mind disposed from the outset to find not one hymn but two is naturally apt to respond in a mechanical fashion to such apparently familiar cues as χαῖρε and αὐτὰρ ἐγώ and not stop to examine their context in all its

<sup>36</sup>Cf. Unte 48, Forderer 111.

<sup>37</sup>Cf. Unte 51, Forderer 111, Heubeck 137–38. 179–81 form a brief reprise of 140–46 (cf. Allen-Halliday-Sikes 227), culminating, like that priamel, in a climatic reference to Delos; 182 ff. proceed with the theme of Apollo's wanderings first sketched in ἐβίβασκες (133) and ἡλάσκαζες (142), with a shift in temporal perspective to the "hymnal present." The juxtaposition of 179–81 and 182 ff. has aroused great dissatisfaction and suspicion; cf. U. von Wilamowitz, *Pindaros* (Berlin 1922) 74, note 3 ("unverträglich"), Bethe 8 ("keinen verständlichen Anschluss"), Altheim 44 ("ein solcher Wechsel in Thema und Person kann nicht das Ursprüngliche sein"). Once 177–81 are recognized as resumptive, however, it becomes clear that no *change* of theme is involved, merely a further *development*. As for the change in person, alternation between "du-Stil" and "er-Stil" is not uncommon in the hymn; cf. especially lines 119–30.

specificity of detail. Yet another force at work, I suspect, is an *a priori* scepticism that automatically denies rhetorical sophistication to “primitive” poets and rejects its imputation by others as rampant subjectivism.<sup>38</sup>

Now that the transitional manoeuvre of 165–78 has no parallel in the Homeric corpus is a fact that cannot be disputed. It is equally certain, however, that the *Hymn to Apollo* as a whole—and, more pertinently, “D” alone—is already unique among the hymns for its structural complexity and artistic self-consciousness. For proof of this sophistication one need only turn to lines 19–29, where, rather than move in conventional hymnal fashion directly from preliminary material to central narrative, the poet pauses momentarily to profess bewilderment at the limitless variety of themes for song which Apollo in his greatness offers:

- 20 Πῶς γάρ σ' ὑμνήσω πάντως εὖννον ἐόντα;  
 πάντη γάρ τοι, Φοῖβε, νομὸς βεβλήγεται ὦδῃς,  
 ἡμὲν ἀν' ἡπειρον πορτιτρόφον ἢδ' ἀνὰ νήσους.  
 πᾶσαι δὲ σκοπιαὶ τοι ἄδον καὶ πρόωνες ἄκροι  
 ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων ποταμοὶ θ' ἄλλα δὲ προρέοντες,  
 25 ἅκται τ' εἰς ἄλλα κεκλιμέναι λιμένες τε θαλάσσης.  
 ἦ ὥς σε πρῶτον Λητῶ τέκε χάρμα βροτοῖσι,  
 κλινθεῖσα πρὸς Κύνθου ὄρος κραναῇ ἐνὶ νήσῳ  
 Δήλῳ ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ, ἐκάτερθε δὲ κῦμα κελαινὸν  
 ἐξήει χέρσον δὲ λιγυπνοῖσις ἀνέμοισιν·  
 ἔνθεν ἀπορνύμενος πᾶσι θνητοῖσιν ἀνάσσεις;

The abundance of encomiastic material which in another rhetorical situation might be viewed as an enormous advantage is here presented as an obstacle, *εὐπορία* issuing in *ἀπορία*.<sup>39</sup> Two adverbs of manner, *πῶς* and *πάντως*, define the difficulty: although Apollo is *in all ways* a worthy

<sup>38</sup>Cf. for example Deubner 250 on Dornseiff.

<sup>39</sup>The essential equivalence of the two stances, aporetic and “euporetic,” can be neatly illustrated by Call. *h.* I. 92–93:

τεὰ δ' ἔργματα τίς κεν αἶδει;  
 οὐ γένητ', οὐκ ἔσται· τίς κεν Διὸς ἔργματ' αἶσει;

and *h.* II. 30–31:

οὐδ' ὁ χορὸς τὸν Φοῖβον ἐφ' ἐν μόνον ἡμᾶρ αἶσει,  
 ἔστι γὰρ εὖννος· τίς ἂν οὐ ῥέα Φοῖβον αἶδει;

For an excellent survey of the aporetic mode in all its variety see Bundy (above, note 33) 57–77.

subject of song, a merely mortal encomiast must choose *one particular way* in which to begin if he is to say anything at all, and on what basis is he to make the choice? The *aporia* propounded in line 19 is then explained and amplified by a "summary priamel" that translates the poet's thematic *embarras de richesse* into the concrete language of metaphor (20–24).<sup>40</sup> Only when Apollo's universal "range of song" has been vividly sketched in geographical terms does the poet propose one specific theme (25 ff.), choosing, out of "all the ways" (πάντως) in which the god could be celebrated, the one "way" (ὥς) of his birth; out of all his νῆσοι, the κραναὴ νῆσος of Delos; out of all his ὑψηλὰ ὄρεα, the ὄρος of Cynthus. This dramatization of the process of poetic decision-making serves at least three distinct functions in the economy of the hymn *qua* hymn: (1) by emphasizing Apollo's boundless possibilities as a hymnal subject it directly magnifies the dimensions of his greatness;<sup>41</sup> (2) by affirming the poet's sense of responsibility toward that subject in all its vastness it reflects favorably on his character as a singer of praises;<sup>42</sup> and (3) by underscoring, through πρῶτον, the logical priority of Apollo's birth relative to all else that might be said in his celebration it suggests that the god's birth is in fact only the first item on an encomiastic "program" or "agenda."<sup>43</sup> Can one doubt that the rhetorical mastery evinced by this multi-functional aporetic priamel—*itself without parallel in the Hymns, incidentally*—is such as could easily

<sup>40</sup>On 20–24 as a "Begründung" of 19, see Bethe 15, Jacoby 703, W. Kröhling, *Die Priamel (Beispielreihe) als Stilmittel in der griechisch-römischen Dichtung* (Greifswald 1935) 58. The pairing of "mainland" and "islands" in 21, it might be noted, adumbrates in chiasmic order the hymn's twofold celebration of Delos and Pytho, the "insular" and "continental" centers of Apolline worship. The land-sea polarity is preserved in 22–24 by the movement from high up and inland (σκοπιαί, πρῶνες) downward (ποταμοί) to the shore and the sea itself (ἄκται, λιμένες θαλάσσης); see the excellent discussion by G. Roux, *REG* 77 (1964) 4–6.

<sup>41</sup>On 19 ff. as *auxêsis* cf. van Groningen 307, K. Förstel, *Amici Amico Graeco Tubingenses. K. Merentitis zum fünfzigsten Geburtstag* (Tübingen 1956) 18.

<sup>42</sup>Merely to praise Apollo is one thing; to praise him adequately, to do justice to his complexity and universal reach, is quite another. In proclaiming himself to be aware of the difference the poet is setting forth what Aristotle calls "ethical proof" (πίστις ἐν τῷ ἡθεὶ τοῦ λέγοντος): "The orator persuades by moral character when his speech is delivered in such a manner as to render him worthy of confidence" (*Rhet.* 1.2.3–4).

<sup>43</sup>"Der Dichter gleich beim ersten Thema innehält," notes Jacoby 703, "weil es eben das erste ist, was man von Apollon erzählen kann." Cf. Roux (above, note 40) 6: "Comme le poète lui-même déclare qu'il va chanter *d'abord* (πρῶτον) la naissance du dieu à Délos, il est légitime de comprendre qu'il a l'intention de chanter *ensuite* son installation à Delphes." Strictly speaking, of course, it is an entirely general "Einführung weiteren Themen" (Forderer 67) that is forecast at this point, not the specific theme of the oracle. On another occasion I shall argue that in the hymn as a whole the poet follows the programmatic "order of nature" laid down as proper for the encomium by later orators and rhetoricians—the program according to which one begins, after a suitable proem, with the laudandus' ancestry and birth

have encompassed the “Rückkehr zum Thema nach einer Digression” that lines 165–78 must, upon examination, represent?<sup>44</sup>

“Epilogue,” like “proem,” is not an absolute but a relative term, for the same conventional gestures which initiate or conclude an entire work can also initiate or conclude individual sections within it. Much—though by no means all—of the controversy surrounding the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* has arisen from a failure to recognize that fact. If in 177–78 one conventional gesture has been mistaken for another, in 165–76 another conventional gesture, or complex of gestures, though correctly identified in the main, has been radically misconstrued in the scope of its reference, with grave consequences for the understanding of the hymn as a unified work of art.

(γένος), moves on through his upbringing (ἀνατροφή) to his habits, studies, and pursuits (ἐπιτηδεύματα), and so comes at last to the crown of all, his exploits and achievements (πράξεις).

<sup>44</sup>The label “Rückkehr zum Thema” does not, of course, *exhaust* the rhetorical significance of 165–78; clearly, if the poet’s *sole* purpose in addressing the Deliades had been to dismiss them as a topic of discourse, he could have achieved the desired effect in far briefer compass. In *Isthm.* 1.33 ff., for example, after devoting some fifteen lines to praise of Castor and Iolaus, Pindar bids those heroes a courteous farewell in order to move on to a topic more strictly relevant to Herodotus’ Isthmian victory:

χαίρετ'. ἐγὼ δὲ Ποσειδάωνι Ἴσθμῳ τε λαθέα  
 Ὀρχηστίασιν τ' αἰόνεσσι περιστέλλων αἰοιδᾶν  
 γαρύσομαι τοῦδ' ἀνδρὸς ἐν τιμαῖσιν ἀγακλέα τὰν  
 Ἀσωποδώρου πατρὸς αἴσαν . . .

In this passage, as in *h. Ap.* 165–78, epilogic and proemial conventions are combined with transitional intent, but whereas the new “exordium” contains the essential features of 177–78, namely the emphatic juxtaposition of personal pronoun and adversative particle (ἐγὼ δέ = αὐτὰρ ἐγών), the “encomiastic future” (γαρύσομαι = οὐ λήξω ὑμνέων), and the specification in “er-Stil” of the preferred topic, the epilogic element is reduced to an absolute minimum, salutation without request or promise. (On the hymnal force of χαίρετ' in *Isthm.* 1.33 see W. Schmid and O. Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* I [Munich 1927] 232, note 3, W. Schadewaldt, *Der Aufbau des pindarischen Epinikion* [Tübingen 1966] 43, note 6; on the passage as a whole see Bundy [above, note 22] 45–47.) The poet of the hymn, on the other hand, develops the full tripartite pattern in such a way that while he is bringing his excursus on the Delian festival to an end he is also advancing a claim to preeminent stature in his art—a claim that can only enhance the value of the present hymn as a tribute to Apollo’s glory (cf. Floratos 299–300). Far from being indecorous, of course, such “Aufwertung des Lobes des Dichters” is a regular feature of encomiastic poetry; see E. Thummer, *Pindar: Die Isthmischen Gedichte* I (Heidelberg 1968) 82–102. (The analogy with Pindaric encomium seems to me more relevant and illuminating than the traditional application of the term σφρηγίς and comparison with passages like Theognis 19–26 and Timoth. *Persae* 229–36.) Full discussion of the poet’s self-presentation and its implications for literary theory lies outside the scope of the present study; in such a discussion *Theog.* 22–34, and indeed the whole of Hesiod’s “Hymn to the Muses,” would of course be of prime relevance.