Greek Hymnic Spaces

In this chapter I shall analyse some of the more important effects of how space is presented in Greek hymns. I begin by describing the hymn genre and sketching a generalized framework for thinking about space in hymns (§ 1), before applying this framework stage by stage to examples (§ 2-4). My methodology in these sections is to bring classicists’ traditional close-reading strategies to bear on an understudied topic, and it is worth emphasising from the start two important senses in which the discussion is not merely addressed to specialists on Greek hymns.¹

The first sense will remain implicit in the chapter after this point. The precision with which we can often locate hymnic performance allows – as we will see – many opportunities for nuanced analysis of hymns’ spatial orientations. This makes the study of Greek hymns especially stimulating for questions about space in other genres of text.² In the context of this volume, the range of factors which come into play in my discussions will, I hope, interest informatically minded readers by posing in a particularly complex form the challenge of how we might use technology to facilitate effective qualitative analysis of these texts.

The second sense in which readers may see this chapter in dialogue with others in the volume is made explicit in its final section. Here I demonstrate how the study of space in hymns may cast light on other authors, quite separately from my contention that it offers special opportunities and challenges. My case-study is the presentation of the island of Delos in an author represented in several of the subsequent chapters, Herodotus. Like any author, Herodotus was reconstructing rather than constructing the world for his audiences, who approached his work with a multitude of more or less defined spatial conceptions. Any attempt to capture the effects of Herodotus’ presentation of space should therefore seek out other Greek mental ‘landscapes’ for comparison, and in § 5 I show how the presentation of Delos in hymns can enhance our appreciation of Herodotus.

I thank the editors for helpful feedback. Figures 1 and 2 are based on http://d-maps.com/m/europa/grece/grece06.gif (accessed 27/06/14), in accordance with the website’s terms of use.

¹ Various further bridges from my concerns here to other chapters in the volume are mentioned below, particularly in the discussion of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo (§ 4).

² An example which I can only state in nuce here: there is an analogy between hymnists regularly having to negotiate carefully between local design and Panhellenic consumption, and Herodotus writing up his researches on local traditions (cf. Luraghi (2001)) into a globalizing whole, at some point in a career of (probably) lectures slanted towards their various locations: cf. e.g. Stadter (1992), 783, R. Thomas (2000), 257, Pelling (2011), 15. If the Histories were born of a complex and inscrutable balancing of local and universal design, what different interpretative strategies might we need to apply to spatial data mined from different passages? While hymns will not resolve this intractable question, they can at least keep us alert to its existence, and to the significance of things we cannot know.
1. The hymn genre

Hymns were a regular feature of Greek contacts with the gods. Though only a minute proportion survives, our corpus covers a range of registers, situations, and centuries.\textsuperscript{3} We have, for example, several hymns inscribed at sanctuaries (particularly Delphi and Epidaurus). Such hymns were performed in public, often before an interstate audience at sanctuaries to which the performers had made a pilgrimage (\textit{theoria}). Despite the likelihood in some cases of dissemination through texts and reperformance, it is generally reasonable to privilege one ‘original’ performance-context – whether a one-off event or a particular recurring festival. This is because public hymns had precise religious functions for a community: their basic communicative set-up is to glorify a divinity (who thus forms a second audience) in order to promote well-disposed interaction. Such a role is also pertinent to some of the hymns preserved for us through book-transmission, such as Pindar’s fragmentary \textit{Paeans} or – for a more esoteric community – the \textit{Orphic Hymns}.

However, other more ‘literary’ hymns, while remaining genuine acts of communication with a god, had a less essential role in communal worship. There was a tradition of prefacing performances of epic and other poetry with a hymn. The \textit{Homeric Hymns} present themselves as belonging to this category and, for instance, while the \textit{Hymn to Demeter} alludes to the foundation-mynths of the Eleusinian Mysteries, it was probably not performed during them.\textsuperscript{4} Further along the spectrum, the Attic dramatists present choral odes which are hymns but are (with occasional complications) performed ‘in character’, so do not constitute worship by the chorus-members. Callimachus’ \textit{Hymns} adopt a literary form particularly similar to the \textit{Homeric Hymns}, but without any demonstrable link to performance during public religious festivals. Similarly, and finally for this brief survey, one may wonder whether Castorion of Soloi’s \textit{Hymn to Pan} (\textit{SH} 310), composed of word-groups which each contain eleven letters and constitute onemetrical unit (an iambic metron), was merely an exercise, or was supposed to demonstrate genuine devotion by ingenuity.

Although hymns, like other genres, thus have few ingredients which can be called essential, the family resemblances are extensive. The spectrum of performative situations and functions has been mentioned, but the contents of Greek hymns show remarkable continuity. The basic building-blocks are a direct address to or naming of the god concerned, some description of the god’s general attributes, one or more stories which almost always involve the god in specific past situations, and prayer. Of these, only the narrative element is highly variable, occupying anything from none to almost all of the hymn.

This chapter will focus mainly on hymns that share the communal function with which I started this section. My sketch of typical contents and situations suggests that three spatial ‘frames’ will be important for our analysis.\textsuperscript{5} These are the frames of spatial reference

\textsuperscript{3} For a more wide-ranging discussion of what follows, see Furley & Bremer (2001), i.1-63. For the reader’s convenience, I have tried to select examples from their useful collection of Greek hymns, hereafter F-B.


\textsuperscript{5} I use the word ‘frame’ broadly, \textit{faute de mieux}, to cover a subject’s location, network of favoured locations, and characteristic modes of navigating and perceiving space. The start of § 2 will clarify my sense by exploring elements of the god’s ‘frame’ in detail. On the flexibility required, see the
belonging to the god, the human performers and audience, and the participants in any inset narratives. As an initial template for analysis, these frames will be considered individually, and as three pairings or a trio where the potential for overlaps and disjunctions allows for artistry. I shall consider first how the god’s frame can be constituted, then how the relationship between it and the human frame can be used to construct the relationship between worshippers and divinity, and finally cases where the narrative frame is also involved.

2. The god’s frame
To please his divine audience, the hymnist regularly displayed careful attention in describing the god’s characteristics. Many types of characteristic have a spatial component. Gods patronized particular locations – sanctuaries and favourite haunts, for example, or a favourite region (e.g. Arcadia for Pan, South Italy for Persephone). At its simplest, this generates a common type of hymnic attribute, such as Hermes ‘ruling over Mt Kyllene’.\(^6\) Local (or ‘epichoric’) specificity is valuable in a genre whose functions are, as mentioned, often defined in terms of a particular community. More often, more than one favoured location is mentioned, and these determine a privileged network which articulates the gods’ movement around the world. Alternatively, these ‘haunts’ may be defined more flexibly by types of location rather than a fixed network. The Dioscuri pinpoint ships underneath storm clouds, though ships are not fixed locations; Hermes has a particular way of crossing boundaries, whereas the goddess Hestia looks after any stable centre from which one takes one’s bearings. The mode of travel may also be special: Hermes flies on winged sandals, the Dioscuri ride horses, Kybele often travels in a chariot drawn by lions, and so on.\(^7\) Finally, besides an epichoric perspective any Greek text involving the gods can adopt a ‘Panhellenic’ perspective. In this, the main focus is on Olympus, sanctuaries open to worshippers from a large number of Greek communities, and widespread myths.\(^8\)

To demonstrate the flexibility required in our conception of the divine frame, I shall draw on two hymns to Pan. I have discussed more fully in Thomas (2011) the ingenious presentation of the god’s space in the Homeric Hymn to Pan. He is presented in ll. 1-17 in his characteristic habitat, the unstructured wilderness, moving between three altitudes (peaks, upland meadows, lower slopes). The poet not only describes Pan’s lack of spatial restraints explicitly, but also implicitly by ‘syncopating’ syntax (e.g. the correlated temporal adverbs

\(^6\) E.g. Alcaeus Hymn to Hermes fr. 308.1 Voigt Κυλλάνας ὀ μέδεις, H.Herm. 2 Κυλλήνης με δεόντα.

\(^7\) Dioscuri: e.g. Alcaeus fr. 34 Voigt. Hermes: e.g. Kahn (1978), Detienne (1997). Hestia: see e.g. Aristonous’ Hymn to Hestia at Delphi (F-B no. 2.3), where she is both a static altar and a dancing personification, both has her own altar and ministers to all altars; also Vernant (1983), ch. 5. Kybele: LIMC VIII i.758-60.

\(^8\) The term ‘Panhellenism’ appears in a wide range of scholarship, with shifting nuances. For its application to the Homeric Hymns, see e.g. Faulkner (2011a), 20-2. As described above, Panhellenic strategies are frequently juxtaposed with more epichoric touches, rather than excluding them. A third category of vague geography is rare: contrast the Epidaurian Hymn to the Mother (F-B no. 6.2), where the goddess rejects Olympus for no-man’s-land, with H.Dem., where Demeter rejects Olympus for Eleusis, a cult-site with unique local features but Panhellenic reach.
‘at one time… at another’) against the structure of grammar and topography. This freedom is contrasted later in H. Pan with a subsidiary divine frame, when Pan’s father Hermes appears on the long, directed journeys typical in his jobs as divine messenger and herald. The hymn therefore uses several means to present Pan’s free mobility coherently.

The later Epidaurian Hymn to Pan adopts an instructively different approach.9 The opening casts Pan quite traditionally, as a wild dancer and Nymph-leader with merely ‘jocular’ music (1-11). But subsequently the music he ‘pours’ from his panpipes (6) comes to destabilize the sky, sea and earth, whereas he becomes an axis of stability.

ἐς δ’ Ὄλυμπον ἀστερωπὸν ἔρχεται πανωιδὸς Ἀχώ, θεῶν Ὀλυμπίων ὅμιλον ἀμβρόται ῥαίνοισα μοίσαι. χθὼν δὲ πᾶσα καὶ θάλασσα κίρναται τεὰν χάριν· σὺ γὰρ πέλεις ἔρεισμα πάντων. (12-18)

All-singing Echo goes to starry Olympus, sprinkling the company of Olympian gods with ambrosial music. And all the earth and sea are stirred together as a favour for you, since you are the prop of all. This closing description deploys three times over (πανωιδός, πᾶσα, πάντων) the Hellenistic etymological idea of Pan as symbolising τὸ πᾶν (the universe). Echo takes his melody up to Olympus – here signifying heaven – where she ‘sprinkles’ it on the gods as if the earth were raining ambrosia on the sky.10 Alongside this inversion, Pan’s music makes earth and sea undergo a cosmogonic mixing, while the god himself remains in impervious control as a stable ‘prop’.11 This hymn therefore treats Pan’s frame with remarkable dynamism, in order to morph between and unite two quite different conceptions of the god.

3. Divine and human frames

These two hymns to Pan are unusual in their marginalization of human worshippers, and we now consider what effects are achieved when the god’s frame is aligned or not aligned with that of humans. One preliminary observation is that the human frame may focus not only on the performance location but also, for interstate festivals, on features such as the homelands and journeys of the performers and the different audience constituencies.12

The most familiar motif here is the large number of ‘cletic’ prayers, i.e. prayers for the god to approach the performers in order to grant favours directly. A straightforward example, but one with a twist, is the Paean for Apollo and Asclepius preserved with remarkably few

9 F-B no. 6.5; Wagman (2000).
10 I take ἄμβροτος as ‘ambrosial’ – ambrosia sometimes being liquid – but it may also mean ‘divine’: DGE s.v. There is probably an allusion to the special relationship between the nymph Echo and Pan.
11 Compare the mixing of Pl. Tim. 35a, 37a, 41d.
12 Hymns within drama bring a further level of complexity. For example, at E. IT 1234-82 Athenian chorus-members sing in Athens, while playing Greeks who have been sold into slavery to the dramatic space of Scythia. Their nostalgic hymn re-acts a Greek ritual and recalls Panhellenic cult-sites (Delos, Delphi, Olympus). Meanwhile the whole play constructs a certain world-view in which this hymn is embedded, e.g. that Tauris and Greece are cut off from each other by the Symplegades.
variations in four disparate contexts.  

At least under the Roman Empire, this composition seems to have been regularly dispatched when communities consulted at Epidaurus (Asclepius’ focal cult) for a paean to perform at home. The cletic prayer takes the following form:

χαίρε μοι, ἱλαος δ’ ἐπινίσεο
τὰν ἀμάν πόλιν εὐρύχορον. (Erythraean version, 19-20)

Be gracious, and propitiously visit our city with its broad dancing-ground.  

At Dion, however, we find a metrically defective replacement for the latter line, Δείων πόλιν εὐρύχορον. A hymn offered to various cities had to describe the performers’ location with almost total vagueness. At Dion, this was deemed unsatisfactory and, with a little rhythmic fudging, specificity was restored.

The Dictaean Hymn to Zeus is a good example of the more complex functioning of other cletic prayers. It has the following refrain:

ιῶ, μέγιστε Κοῦρε,
χαίρε μοι, Κρόνειε,
παγκρατές γάνος.
βέβακες δαιμόνων ἁγώμενος:
Δίκταν ἐς ἐνιαυτὸν ἐρπε
καὶ γέγαθι μολπᾶ. (1-6)

O, greatest Youth! Be gracious, son of Cronus, omnipotent lustre! You have taken your station leading the gods; come to Dicta for your birthday, and rejoice in the song.

‘You have taken your station leading the gods’ suggests the Panhellenic perspective of Zeus’ schedule on Olympus, and makes him metaphorically static. But this is offset by two distinctive epichoric features deriving from the myth of Zeus’ birth at Dicta – his designation ‘Youth’, and the birthday party being thrown for him there, to which he is to come. This basic request is crossed in the hymn’s final two stanzas with prayers for private and public benefits respectively.

ἀ[λλ’ ἄναξ, θόρ’ ἐς στα]μνία
καὶ θόρ’ εὐποκ’ ἐ[ξ πῶεα
κές λάτ]ια καρπῶν ἄθορ
κές τελεσθόρος οἴκος.
Refrain
θόρε κέξ] πόληας ἁμῶν
θόρε κές ποντοπόρος νάας
θόρε κές ν[έος πο]λείτας
θόρε κές Θέμιν κλ[ηνάν.
Refrain (27-36)

13 F-B no. 6.1, preserved at Erythrae (c. 370 BC), Ptolemais Hermion in Egypt, Athens, and Dion in Macedon (all 1st/2nd century CE). Macedonicus’ Paean to Apollo and Asclepius (F-B no. 7.5) also seems to be related.

14 The versions from Ptolemais Hermion and Athens replace τὰν ἁμὰν with the metrical and synonymous ἁμετέραν.

15 F-B no. 1. The crux γάνος does not substantially affect the present argument.

16 I have followed the supplements used in F-B.
But Lord, leap into our wine-jars, and leap into our fleecy sheepfolds, and leap into the crop-fields, and into our full-fledged households. Refrain. And leap into our cities, and leap into our sea-going ships, and leap into the young citizens, and leap into famous Law. Refrain.

Zeus should arrive by ‘leaping’ (θορεῖν) into various destinations. These leaps further unite the divine and human frames, since the hymn was performed to vigorous dancing.\(^\text{17}\) θορεῖν is also what a baby does at birth, so that Zeus’ arrival will recall, as the whole festival does, his birth. However, Zeus’ manner of leaping will be inimitable: his leaps are clearly metaphorical; and in the final wordplay he will not only inspire East Cretan lawfulness but also, in another sense of θορεῖν, ‘mount’ the personified goddess Law (Themis), to father Peace and the Seasons as only Zeus can.\(^\text{18}\) This partial alignment of divine and human frames allows some mutual empathy between Zeus and the performers (premised on them both leaping, for example), while maintaining human awe before Zeus’s powers.

Pindar’s first Hymn, by contrast, offers perhaps the most brilliant case of a stark confrontation of human and superhuman perspectives:\(^\text{19}\)

\begin{verbatim}
χαίρ’ ὦ θεοδόματα, λιπαροπλοκάμου
παίδεσσι Λατοῦς ἱμερόεστατον ἔρνος,
πόντου θύγατερ, χθονός εὐρεί-
ας ἀκίνητον τέρας, ἄν τε βροτοὶ
Δᾶλον κικλήσκοισιν, μάκαρες δ’ ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ
tηλέρατον κυανέας χθονὸς ἄστ-
ρον. (fr. 33c S-M)
\end{verbatim}

Hail, god-built one, a shoot most delightful to the children of lush-locked Leto, you daughter of the sea, unmoving wonder of the broad Earth, whom mortals call ‘Delos’ but the blessed in Olympus call a far-shining star of the dark Earth!

\begin{verbatim}
ἦν γὰρ τὸ πάροιθε φορητὰ
κυμάτεσιν παντοδαπῶν ῥιπαῖσιν· ἀλλ’ ἁ Κοιογενὴς ὁπότ’ ὠδί-
νεσσι θυίοισ’ ἀγχιτόκοις ἐπέβα
νιν, δὴ τότε τέσσαρες ὀρθαί
πρέμνων ἀπώρουσαν χθονίων,
ἂν δ’ ἐπικράνοις σχέθον
πέτραν ἀδαμαντοπέδιλοι
κίονες, ἐνθα τεκοὶ-
σ’ εὐδαίμον’ ἐπόψατο γένναν. (fr. 33d S-M)
\end{verbatim}

For in former times she was mobile on the waves for the gusts of all and sundry winds. But when the daughter of Koios stepped onto her, raging with the pangs just

\(^{17}\) The festival commemorates and imitates the original Curetes, who danced and banged their shields so that Cronus would not hear the infant Zeus bawling. The designation Κοῦρε (related to ‘Curetes’) thus forges a further, non-spatial connection between god and performers.


\(^{19}\) F-B no. 5.1. Performance-location, structure, and even principal addressee are disputed: see D’Alessio (2005), (2009). These fragments work, I think, in either order, but belong closely together given the complementarity discussed below; also, fr. 33d clarifies the metaphor ἔρνος (a ‘shoot’, i.e. rooted) and the words ‘god-built’ and ‘unmoving’ in fr. 33e.
before birth, then four pillars sprang vertically up from the Earth’s foundations and, 
shod in adamant, held the rock aloft on their capitals, at the very moment when she 
 bore and looked on her blessed brood.
Both fragments share an imaginative shift from the human, horizontal perspective to 
complementary cosmic, vertical ones. The gods see the island of Delos (whose name means 
‘clearly visible’) as a ‘far-shining’ star against the inky Aegean, in an inversion of human 
 wonder at the constellations. The metaphor expresses how illustrious Delos is, but is also 
grounded in reality, given that Delos was notable for outdoor altar-fires. The fixed stars 
could be thought of as anchored to a firmament, so that the image interacts with the 
anchoring of Delos in fr. 33d. There, we have shifted to the even less possible perspective 
from the seabed. But again, the columns anchoring the island in place still bear the imprint 
of human experience of Delos, which contained columned buildings such as the Poros 
Temple. The vertical divine perspectives, so obviously impossible for human visitors, 
imply the gods’ inimitable superiority in the world-order. Unfortunately, given the 
fragmentary nature of this text, we cannot say in detail how this may have been nuanced in 
the rest of the hymn.

4. The three frames intersect
I have so far avoided the frame of inset narratives, whose complications I now include. In 
the majority of cases, these inset narratives are chosen to overlap with the performers’ 
frame, with its two potential centres at their home city and the site of performance. We will 
see this dual overlap in a hymn where all three frames are richly interwoven, Limenios’ 
_Paeon and Prosodion to Apollo_, composed by an Athenian for the Athenian delegation to 
Delphi at the Pythais festival of 127 BC. A close reading of this composition will occupy us 
for much of this section.

First the Muses are summoned (1-3):

> ἴτ’ ἐπὶ τηλέσκοπον τάνδε Παρ[νασί]αν [
> δικόρυφον κλειτύν, ὕμνων κα[τάρ]χ[ετε δ’ ἐμῶν, 
> Πιερίδες, αἳ νιφοβόλους πέτρας ναίεθ’ Ἑλικωνίδ[ας.

The Muses are asked to leave their traditional homes, Pieria and Helicon, and to visit a third 
height of Panhellenic fame – Parnassus, above Delphi – which the performers too are

20 τέρας (‘marvel’: fr. 33c.4) also means ‘constellation’. Although it is distinctly modern to find 
overhead perspectives intuitive, because of modern cartography, aeroplanes, satellites etc, they do 
have deep roots in Greek literature: see Purves (2010) ch.1. Unusual, however, is Pindar’s emphatic 
inversion, whereby Delos is like a heavenly body when viewed from heaven.

21 Aetius attributes this to Empedocles (31A54 D-K), and – perhaps confusedly – also to Anaximenes 
(13A14). See e.g. H.Herm. 11, Aratus 10 for στηρίζομαι in celestial contexts.

22 For further information see Bruneau & Ducat (2005).

23 F-B no. 2.6.2, whose simplified orthography and line-numbers I reproduce; I have corrected their 
supplement in v. 17, which conflicts with the stone. Cf. Bélis (1992), Pöhlmann & West (2001), 74- 
85 for musical and epigraphic detail; Schröder (1999) unconvincingly doubts the traditional dating. 
My conclusions overlap in places with Vamvouri (1998). Another particularly rich case might have 
been Isyllos’ _Paeon_: F-B no. 6.4; Kolde (2003).
The correlation between the Muses’ journey and the performers’ makes particular sense in that the Muses are performance-leading (2). Parnassus’ initial epithet, ‘visible from afar’, itself suggests a radial network of light, to match the converging journeys of theoroi (Greek pilgrims are, literally, ‘viewers’) navigating towards Delphi from all over Greece.

The Paean’s main narrative is a version of the popular story of how Apollo got his title ‘Pythian’ (4), after being born on Delos, travelling to Delphi, and killing the Python (5-20, 23-30). This narrative is chosen, partly, for its overlap with Delphi, the performance-location. But it is manipulated to include the performers’ home-city as Apollo’s only stop. Limenios repeatedly connects Delos and Athens in spatial terms, most simply in 11-12:

```
tōτε λιπὼν Κυνθίαν νάσον ἐπ[έβα θεὸ]ς πρω[τό]καρ-
πον κλυτάν Αθηναῖ' ἐπί γαλ[όφωι πρῶνι] Τριτωνίδος.
```

That day the god left Kynthos’ island and set foot upon famous Attica where corn first grew, on the high headland of the lady of Triton.

Here, both Delos and Attica are connected through references to heights – surprisingly, since neither was well endowed with mountains. The connection also creates a chain extending from Parnassus in the invocation of the Muses. Moreover, we have heard that Leto gave birth

```
... πα[ρὰ λίμναι] κλυτᾶι,
χερεῖ γαλακτάες ελαιάων ὑγειόδσ'. (6-7)
```

by the famous lake, grasping the grey-green olive in her hands.

The epithet κλυτός (‘famous’) is thus shared between Delos and Athens in close proximity. It also evokes the motif of radiation, now of fame rather than light. And Athena’s designation refers to her birth by River/Lake Triton, as Apollo is born by a lake. The suggested affinity between Athena and Apollo reinforces the implication of an olive supplanting the more common palm as Leto’s support during labour; this relationship is embedded in Athens’ control over Delos, which had been restored to them in 167/6.

That this is no parochial event is shown by a trope that the world responds to Apollo’s birth. Here, this is extended to the pole and to the ends of the Earth.

```
πάξ δὲ γήλαθεσε πόλος οὐράνιος [
ν]ηνέμους δ’ ἔσχεν αἰθὴρ ἄθλον ταχυπετείς [ὁ]ρόμους, λήξε δὲ βα-
ρόθρομον Νη[πεόως] ζαμενές οἶδ’ ἄμηδε μέγας Ωκεανός,
δὲς πέριξ γ[άν] ὑγράτας ἀγ]κάλαις ἄμπεχει. (7-10)
```

24 Helicon’s snowy crags will be matched in ring composition by a snowstorm at Parnassus mentioned in the last phrase of the Paean (33, ὀλεθ’ ὑγράτι χί[όνος ἐν ζάλαι]).

25 At A. Eum. 9-11 Apollo stops in Athens similarly, and the Athenians even escort him to Delphi. The ancient scholion already reads that as politically tendentious, and contrasts Pindar who made Tanagra a particularly important stop (fr. 286 S-M). In H.Ap. Apollo goes initially to Olympus, and no intermediate stop is mentioned at all in E. IT 1234-82.

26 See e.g. RE s.v. Tritogeneia. Triton’s normal location in North Africa, along with the ‘Libyan’ reeds in the Athenians’ auloi (13), suggest in passing Athens’ ancient reach to the southern edge of the Greek world.

27 For the palm see e.g. H.Ap. 117, E. Ion 920, Call. H.Del. 210, LIMC s.v. Leto nos. 5, 6, 8. Both palm and olive appear at E. IT 1100. The Delian olive is found, but not as something grasped by Leto in childbirth, in e.g. Hdt. 4.34, Call. H.Del. 262 (see Mineur (1984)), 322, La. fr. 194.84, 203.62 Pfeiffer, Catullus 34.8. For its politics in Limenios see Vamvouri (1998), 53.
The entire heavenly pole rejoiced […] and the sky held calm the racing courses of the breezes, and the mighty thunderous surge of Nereus rested, as did great Ocean who encompasses the land about with his watery embrace.

This fermata in the world’s surge occupies its own musical ‘space’, since it is immediately preceded by a modulation, and immediately followed by a section-break.\(^{28}\) It is followed by Apollo’s journey to Athens (11-12, cited above), where he hears his first paean:

\[
\text{μελιπνοον δὲ Δίβυς αὐθὰν χέω[ν λωτός ἀνέ-}
\text{μελλέντες [ἔδειξαν ὡς μεγενόμενοι αἰώ[λ]οις καθάρι[ος}}
\text{μέλεσιν] ᾗ μὲν ἄμερον πετροκατοίκητος Ἀχ[ι]ών παιὰν ἢ παιάν.}
\text{ὁ δὲ γέγαθ’ ὅτι νόσι δεξάμενος ἀμβρόταν ὁμόροιαν}
\text{δο[rebbe]ν [νότι] ἔνθ’ ὅν ἐκείνας ἀπ’ ἄρ-}
\text{χᾶς Παιῆνον καθέκοσημες ομομέλις ἀντ[αι]τοχόνον}
\text{ἡδὲ Βάκχου μέγας τυρσοπλή[ξ ἱερος Τεχνιτῶν ἔνοικος}
\text{πόλει Κεκροπίαι. (11-20)}
\]

The Lybian reed poured out a honey-breathed sound and sang out, mingling its sweet voice with the variegated tunes of the lyre, and with it crag-dwelling Echo cried out.

\textit{Paean, Ie Paean!} And he rejoiced, for his intelligence welcomed and […] the immortal gift. Because of that, from that origin, our whole populace of autochthonous men, this great sacred thyrsus-struck swarm of the Craftsmen of Bacchus which dwells in Cecrops’ city, calls on Paieon.

The Athenians welcome Apollo with a musical mélange (cf. ‘poured’, ‘mingling’, ‘variegated’). The confusion has a spatial dimension in that it causes a dislocated Echo, who as personification ‘dwells in a crag’ but as sound travels away from it.\(^{29}\) This omen, welcomed by Apollo, allusively explains the typical repetition of the refrain in Greek paeans – ‘Ie Paian, Ie Paian’\.\(^{30}\) Apollo thus transforms an original (spatialized) confusion of noise into a source from which articulate cult music has disseminated ever since.\(^{31}\) Lines 17-20 then encapsulate both centres of the performers’ frame: paeans are sung both by the ‘autochthonous’ Athenian populace in the city of Cecrops (who was born from the earth itself), and by the professional Craftsmen of Dionysus such as Limenios’ chorus. Like Echo, Athens is both fixed in the rocks of Attica and able to disseminate the sound of paeans. Furthermore, as well as disseminating fame and paean-practice, Attica was ‘where corn first grew’ (11-12) – a reference to the Athenians’ main claim to being disseminators of culture, and one which again implies special divine favour, namely that Demeter chose to teach humans agriculture in Attica, at Eleusis.\(^{32}\)

---

\(^{28}\) Preceding modulation: from a variant of the conjunct chromatic Lydian scale (A B♭ D E♭ F G in our notation, if we disregard uncertainties about absolute pitch) to disjunct diatonic Hypolydian (E A B C D E F). Section-break: a line-break and paragraphos, but no modulation; this might imply an instrumental interlude.

\(^{29}\) The melody at ‘variegated’ (αι-ει-ό- sung to A-Bb-B) mimetically introduces the hymn’s first extant chromatic run. This run is then mimetically ‘echoed’ in πετροκατοίκητος, Echo’s epithet.

\(^{30}\) The supplement παιὰν ἢ παιάν here fits sense, metre, and the space after Ἀχ[ι]ών. Admittedly a modulation follows, where a paragraphos should take up some letter-spaces. But the paragraphos is also neglected at the modulation after 22 φιλένθεον.


\(^{32}\) For close parallels in contemporary propaganda at Delphi see Bélis (2001), 112.
The Bacchism of the Craftsmen perhaps preserves traces of the confusion of Athens’ original music. It also helps to explain why Limenios interrupts his narrative of Apollo’s journey with the following cletic prayer:

\\(\text{ἄλ]ὰ χρησμ[ωιδὸν ὃς ἔχεις τρίποδα, βαῖν’ ἐπι \thetaεστιβ[έα τάνδε Π]αρνασίαν δειράδα φιλένθεον. (21-2)}\\

But, owner of the oracular tripod, step to this ridge of Parnassus, which is divinely trodden and loves divine inspiration. Both ‘divinely trodden’ and ‘loves divine inspiration’ imply past epiphanies. But besides the very precise Delphic location given (the tripod), the passage refers to the ‘ridge of Parnassus’ rather than to Delphi itself. This is significant not only because of it resonates with the cletic prayer to the Muses (1-2) and the theme of heights, but because it is more often Dionysus than Apollo who appears on Parnassus. Straight after underlining that they are the Craftsmen of Dionysus, the chorus allude to the part-ownership of the area by Dionysus, and thus again use spatial detail (reference to Parnassus rather than Delphi) to stake their claim to special performance rights.

Limenios thereafter returns to his inset narrative. Apollo is ‘dragging up the foundations’ for Delphi, before confronting the Python and Tityos. Through Apollo’s ‘immortal hand’, the primal disorder of Delphi’s boulders coalesces into a stable cult, as the disordered noises of Athens became a source of stable cult-song through Athens’ ‘immortal gift’ (17). This stability is demonstrated, finally, by events from 279/8 BC, when Brennus led the Galatians against Delphi (31-3). As Apollo saved the Delphians from the Python and Leto from Tityos, so then he stood guard (31 ἐπεφρούρεις) for all Greeks against the incursions of ‘barbarian war’ (31-2). The Paean has elevated Athens into a traditional set of Panhellenic religious centres, and ends with a conservative gesture to the opposition of Hellenic versus Barbarian.

Limenios now switches rhythm for the Prosodion with its concluding prayers. Apollo, Artemis, and Leto (the Delian triad) are to save the Athenians and care for their Delphian hosts by visiting both groups regularly, and to come to the Craftsmen of Dionysus whose performance is linking Athens and Delphi. So far, the prayers revisit the spaces prepared by the inset narratives: Delos, Athens and its musician representatives, Delphi. But then finally and abruptly comes a prayer to increase Roman power (45-6, \(\text{Ῥωμαίω[ν] ἀρχὰν αὔξετ'}\)). We therefore end with another radiating centre of power, which dramatically explodes the Paean’s Panhellenism into a Greco-Roman unity. News of this no doubt pleased Rome’s imperial scrutinisers, at a time when the Athenian Craftsmen of Dionysus were competing aggressively for Roman support for their activities at Delphi.

---

33 Particularly, if the supplement ἑσμός is rightly inferred from Athenaios’ closely related Paean (F-B no. 2.6.1), one may connect ἑσμός… ἔνοικος πόλει ‘the swarm… which dwells in Cecrops’ city’ with πετροκατοίκητος Ἀχώ ‘crag-dwelling Echo’.

34 For Dionysus on Parnassus, see F-B ii.67.

35 \(\text{ἀπ[λέτους θεμελίους] ἀμβρόται χειρὶ σύρων (24-5, plausibly restored).}\)

36 The shared adjective ἄμβροτος is set to the same melody, though the second occurrence is pitched a fifth lower.

37 \(\text{ἐπεφρούρεις δὲ γά[ξ]}\) is plausibly supplemented with …\(\text{παρ’ ὀμφαλόν, ‘at the Earth’s navel’ – the standard way of expressing Delphi’s global centrality.}\)

To sum up this discussion of Limenios: space is implicated in almost every phrase of the hymn, including words like τηλέσκοπος, κλυτός and πρωτόκαρπος, which imply outward-radiating centres of light, fame and agricultural knowledge respectively. Limenios uses diverse overlaps among the three frames to insert Athens into a group of heights and hubs of Panhellenic cultural and cultic influence, to justify the privileged status which Apollo should accord to the present performance, and finally to subordinate Athens to the new power, Rome.

Such connections between audience and god are very often forged spatially. In particular, placing the god of the narrative frame in a landscape which is still visible encourages mental projection into the vital legendary past. A clear example comes from Philodamos’ *Paean to Dionysus*, whose opening prayer (1-4) is that Dionysus come to attend the Delphic Theoxeny festival. Subsequently, within a narrative of the god’s progress from his birthplace (Thebes), Philodamos mentions Dionysus’ first Delphic epiphany on Parnassus (21-3), which primes the audience to accept his presence on this occasion too.39

Nevertheless, disjunctions between the human frame and that of an inset narrative can also be expressive, no less than disjunctions between the human and divine frames we considered in § 3. As Apollo is travelling towards Delphi, his *Homeric Hymn* observes (225-8):

Θήβης δ’ εἰσαφίκανες ἕδος, καταειμένον ὕληι·
οὐ γάρ πώ τις βροτῶν ἱερῆι ἐνὶ Θήβηι,
οὐδ’ ἄρα πώ τότε γ’ ἦσαν ἀταρπιτοὶ οὐδὲ κέλευθοι
Θήβης ἢ μεδίον πυρηφόρον, ἀλλ’ ἔχεν ὕλη.

You reached the seat of Thebes – cloaked in forest, since no mortal yet lived in holy Thebes, nor at that stage were there yet paths or roads across the wheat-bearing plain of Thebes, but forest occupied it.

Once forested and pathless for all but Apollo, Thebes is now a major city with agriculture (cf. the proleptic adjective ‘wheat-bearing’) and religious practice. The discrepancy emphasizes the awesome antiquity of Delphi’s foundation via intervening developments in human geography.

An earlier part of the *Hymn to Apollo* misaligns human and narrative frames rather differently. Apollo’s mother Leto took a fairly neat clockwise tour of the Aegean seaboard in search of a place to give birth to him, with Delos as her ‘last resort’ in the centre (see fig. 1).40 There is thus a contrast between the Delos’ former insignificance and the island’s role at the time of performance, as the prestigious hub of radial pilgrimages. The contrast hints that historical Delos was a centre of gravity for the whole Aegean, including all the places which Leto had previously passed through, even if the main focus later in the hymn is, for political reasons, on Delos as cult-centre for the Ionians (146-64).

---

39 F-B no. 2.5. The narrative frequently *causes* some feature of the visible landscape: e.g. *H.Ap.* 382-7, *H.Herm.* 124-6, 136, *Call. H.Zeus* 14-32; at Eleusis some hymns seem to have explained the cave and/or megaras as formed where Hades and Persephone dived underground (Richardson (1974), 81-2).

40 For present purposes I have simply plotted the route as straight lines between points on a modern map, though I am well aware that one can critique this procedure: see the editors’ Introduction.
The Hymn to Apollo is concerned not only to contrast the human and narrative frames, but also to reframe the human world in a radical way. The orientation of Delos as an Ionian centre demands contextualization through Delos’ developing cultic and mercantile networks in the archaic period, as reconstructed principally from the provenances of dedications and trade-goods found there. These suggest that Delos had only scant links with mainland Ionia until c. 530 BC. Indeed, internal evidence suggests that an earlier hymn underlying parts of H.Ap. 1-181 was modified and combined with a hymn about Pythian Apollo in the sixth century, most plausibly for Polycrates’ Pythodelia festival in 522 BC. The archaeological evidence thus implies that the Hymn’s pan-Ionian festival was a recent or new phenomenon.

Figure 1: Leto's journey in H.Ap. 30-44. (Eiresiai and Aisagees are not securely located.)

41 Other relevant evidence includes Od. 6.162-7, Cypr. fr. 26 West, the spread of Delion sanctuaries (Kowalzig (2007), 72-8), and the lack of earlier Ionian political unity. I had reached my conclusion before reading the excellent overview in Constantakopoulou (2007), 38-58; cf. also Bruneau & Ducat (2005), and Kowalzig (2007), 102-10 who finds the Ionian mainland remarkably absent for most of the fifth century too.

Moreover, this part of the composition presents the primary narrator as Homer himself (the blind bard of Chios whose songs are eternal classics: 166-73), as if it were a verbatim reperformance of a much older hymn. The clever play with tradition implicitly asserts a long history of cultural prestige for the recent Ionian gathering: it is spin, designed to naturalize Polycrates’ recently and aggressively acquired control of the Aegean.\footnote{This example suggests bridges to other chapters in this volume. Brughmans and Poblome, for example, discuss a resource for reconstructing networks from provenances of one type of archaeological material. Foxhall and Rebay-Salisbury show the benefits of uniting datasets for several types of archaeological material using the CIDOC-CRM. A resource designed along these lines for Delian material would help students of the \textit{Hymn to Apollo}. Moreover for all its difficulties the hymn’s articulacy means that it should not simply be parasitic on hard archaeological data. We should seek as much synergy as possible from the two different kinds of information by creating means of uniting the cultural data contained in material remains and in texts and their interpretations.}

Literary texts can situate themselves against their predecessors, as later happened to this very passage of the \textit{Hymn to Apollo}. Whereas it presented a decentred ‘map’ of the primeval Aegean, Callimachus in his \textit{Hymn to Delos} makes Leto’s journey symbolize instead the total instability of an enlarged Greek world.\footnote{\textit{H.Del.’s presentation of space is exceptionally engaging: see e.g. Selden (1998), 362-5, 404-5. Its performance-context is unknown, so one must construe the human frame rather differently from, say, that of Limenios. For the ‘enlarged’ Hellenistic world, see also Stevens’ chapter in this volume.} Her frenzied zig-zag (fig. 2) is complemented by the island ‘Asterie’ roaming the globe until fixed and renamed ‘Delos’ at Apollo’s birth. Even mainland locations are said to ‘flee’ Leto’s approach, or to quake like Etna at Ares’ threats.\footnote{Fleeing: 70-82, 95, 103-5; here Callimachus wittily blurs mobile local nymphs and their immobile localities. Quaking: 138-47.} Although Iris, who is watching over the islands, has been posted near Chios (67, 157), Callimachus largely eschews the Aegean focus of the \textit{Homeric Hymn to Apollo}. Indeed, he wrong-foots us at 153-5, where ‘islands’ are mentioned only to be identified two lines later as the western Echinades, outside the Aegean. Despite these differences, Callimachus preserves the underlying technique of using travel in the narrative frame as a foil for the steady system of pilgrimages to Delos which contemporary Greeks knew, and which both hymns mention explicitly.
Fig. 2: Leto’s journey in Callimachus Hymn to Delos. Dots mark locations visited by Delos-Asterie while she was mobile (H.Del. 41-50, numbered; 197-9).

5. Delos in hymns and Herodotus

As mentioned in my introduction, studying the way Greek hymns present space not only illuminates that genre, but provides a sideways light on other texts too. I therefore want to stay with Delos, but now to take it as a case-study of how a comparison of the presentation of space in hymns and Herodotus can enhance our understanding of the latter.46

A simple instance is Herodotus 6.98, where Delos suffers its first ever earthquake when Datis, after respecting the island, sailed on to Tenos. Herodotus simply takes Delos’ adamantine immobility for granted, whereas we need to seek external parallels for it (such as Pindar fr. 33d above). Herodotus takes the quake as ‘perhaps a sign of coming woes’, namely the external and internal power-struggles which afflicted Greece during the reigns of Darius, Xerxes, and Artaxerxes. The shaking of Delos stands by synecdoche for the shaking of the Greek world, and Apollo chooses the island stabilized by his birth to give this prophetic sign of instability.47

46 Stadter (1992: 785-95) argues that Delos marks a boundary between Greece and the East throughout the Histories. As will become clear, I think this is too static a scheme. See also Ceccarelli’s chapter in this volume.

47 In an elegant ring-composition, Datis also receives a Delian sign on his return journey (6.118). Whether an earthquake actually shook Delos around 490 is unclear. Thuc. 2.8 alludes to Herodotus
Subsequently, chapter 8.132 gives Delos a starring role in a psychologically incisive expression of the Greek world being shattered, mentally if not militarily, by Xerxes’ campaign. After Salamis, the Greek fleet gather at Aegina and Ionian messengers beg them to sail against the quisling Strattis of Chios. But they only reach Delos:

τὸ γὰρ προσωτέρω πάν δεινὸν ἦν τοῖσι Ἕλλησι οὔτε τῶν χώρων ἐοῦσι ἐμπείροισι, στρατιῆς τε πάντα πλέα ἐδόκεε εἶναι. τὴν δὲ Σάμον ἐπιστέατο δόξηι καὶ Ἡρακλέας στήλας ἴσον ἀπέχειν. συνέπιπτε δὲ τοιούτῳ, ὥστε τοὺς μὲν βαρβάρους τὸ πρὸς ἐσπέρης ἀντίτροπον Σάμου μὴ τολμᾶν καταπλῦσαι καταρρωδηκότας, τοὺς δὲ Ἑλλήνας χρηιζόντως Χίων τὸ πρὸς τὴν ἠῶ κατωτέρω Δήλου. οὕτω δέος τὸ μέσον ἑφύλασσε σφεων.

For the whole region beyond scared the Greeks, who had no knowledge of those parts – and everywhere was also thought to be full of militia. In their imagination, they knew for sure that Samos was as far away as the Pillars of Heracles. This, then, is what came about: the barbarians were too terrified to venture to sail further west than Samos, and the Greeks – though the Chiots begged – further east than Delos. Thus fear garrisoned the space between them.

This description triply deforms Delos’s normative placement in a hymnic context such as the Homeric Hymn to Apollo. The tradition of archaic theoric links between Delos and the Ionian and Dorian East has been replaced by a chasm of ignorance and fear. The theoric centre has become a limit. A different mid-point equation is present: Aegina was felt to lie half-way between the Aegean’s old ‘centre’ and the world’s western rim. The situation is restored in 9.106, where the following year Samos and Chios join the Delian League, named after its ‘central’ treasury.

Herodotus in two earlier passages does seem to allude to traditions of Delian centrality, this time on a North-South axis. Delos is Egyptianized in passing at 2.169-70. The precinct of Sais, near the southernmost Greek outpost Naucratis, contained a sacred lake which Herodotus compares in size to Greece’s only important sacred lake, the ‘Wheel-Shaped Lake’ in Delos. Herodotus goes so far as to describe the Egyptian lake misleadingly as being faced κύκλωι (‘all around’ but literally ‘in a circle’), when it was almost certainly not a circle like the Delian lake, but rectangular or crescent-shaped. Furthermore, in this context,

(Δῆλος ἐκινήθη, repeated exactly from Hdt. 6.98) while placing the earthquake ‘shortly before’ 431: as Stadter (1992: 789) observes, Thucydidcs is substituting the Peloponnesian for the Persian Wars as the great ‘shaking’ of the Greek world; see now Rusten (2013).

48 For Delos and Ionia, see above at n. 41. For subsequent reception of the link see also Thuc. 3.104, Certamen 315-21, Hdt. 4.35 on Olen’s hymns and on the heroine Opis whose name relates her to Ephesus (Kowalzig (2007), 122). For networks as dynamic entities see Barker and Bouzarovski’s chapter in this volume.

49 Contrast Herodotus’ treatment with Diodorus’ account of the same material (D.S. 11.34): there, the Greek fleet sails relatively smoothly to Samos, with a short stop on Delos. Herodotus’ presentation of Samos here is also interesting, as often: see Ceccarelli’s chapter and Pelling’s epilogue in this volume.

50 See also the (probably Ptolemaic) myth that the Delian stream Inopus was connected underwater to the Nile: e.g. Call. H.Art. 171, Lyc. 575-6, Paus. 2.5.3, Str. 6.2.4.

51 Lloyd (1975-88) ad loc. That Herodotus used the Delian sanctuary as a familiar reference-point has implications for the make-up of his audience. For comparisons between places see Barker and Bouzarovski’s chapter in this volume.
the mention of ‘palm-shaped columns’ in a Saitic tomb glances at Delos’ most notable African feature, its famous palm tree. By contrast, the discussion of Hyperborea, the northern edge of the world, pauses for much longer on its special connection with Delos at 4.33-5.\(^52\) The stability of Delos in 6.98, its Egyptian qualities in 2.169-70, and its connection to Hyperborea in 4.33-5 all imply special holiness, and place Delos as a centre of influence with enormous latitudinal reach.

Hymns may also help us unpack Herodotus’ suggestive narrative about the Hyperborean maidens Hyperoche and Laodike (4.33-4).\(^53\) A pair of kourotrophic heroines, whose cult started in the geometric period, were by Herodotus’ time imagined as the first bringers of the Hyperboreans’ ‘sacred objects’, whose form is modelled on what the Delians offered to the heroines.\(^54\) These hiera were initially a ‘tribute’ (φόρος, 4.35.2) for Eileithyia, as in 478-455 Athens’ allies, and increasingly subordinates, brought φόρος to the central treasury at Delos. The site’s superficial ‘neutrality’ as a traditional meeting-place for Athenians, Ionians, eastern Dorian and possibly northern Greeks must have allowed the Athenians to negotiate between shared religious participation and hierarchical political league.\(^55\) In particular, Hyperoche and Laodike are simultaneously model tributaries as well as the original theoroï, sent out by their paradigmatically pious community to escort an offering.\(^56\) Their names – ‘Superiority’ and (probably: see n. 53) ‘Popular justice’ – suspiciously reflect an Athenian ideology of democratic imperialism, and have only shallow roots on Delos, as suggested by their absence from later sources including inscriptions.\(^57\)

If Herodotus is alluding here to Athens’ appropriation of the Hyperborean Maidens for its imperial rhetoric, he does so subtly. The hint can be amplified by comparison with the similar ways in which hymns are imprinted with geopolitics. As we saw above, the Homeric Hymn to Apollo also forges a connection between contemporary theoroï and a distant past in order to legitimate Polycrates’ power, which had in fact only recently begun to control Delos qua theoric centre. More directly, we are lucky to have a hymn which appears to have been performed by Athenians on Delos during Athens’ consolidation of its empire, namely Pindar’s fifth Paean (fr. 52e S-M). This narrates how Ionian émigrés from Athens captured and colonized Euboea and the Cyclades; the colonization of Delos was granted by Apollo himself (40-2). The Paean’s closing prayer implies that it is for Delian performance, and the

\(^{52}\) There may be an internal allusion. In 2.169-70 the royal tombs εἰσι ἐν τῷ ἱρῷ τῆς Αθηναίης, ἀγχοτάτῳ τοῦ μεγάρου, ἐσιόντι ἀριστερῆς χειρός and there are secretive tombs ὄπισθε τοῦ νηοῦ. In 4.34-5, τὸ σῆμα ἐστὶ ἐς ἐς τὸ Ἀρτεμίσιον ἐσιόντι ἀριστερῆς χειρός while ἡ θήκη ἐστὶ ὄπισθε τοῦ Ἀρτεμισίου… ἀγχοτάτῳ τοῦ Κηίων ἱστητορίου. (ἀριστερῆς χειρός occurs only one other time in Herodotus, with ἐσιόντι following: 5.77.4.)

\(^{53}\) Or ‘Laodoke’: 4.35.1, mss. AB; cf. Hyperochos and Laodokos at Delphi (Paus. 10.23.2), and the word θεωροδόκος. For this article, I pass over Arge and Opis, the more nebulous Hyperborean pair.

\(^{54}\) Archaeology of their cult: Bruneau & Ducat (2005), 203. Hyperborean ιερά in 4th-c. inscriptions: ID 100.49, 104(3) A8; Tréheux (1953). They are wrapped in straw; Delian dedications consist of hair wrapped around a spindle or branch (Hdt. 4.34; cf. Cratinus Deliades fr. 24 PCG, Call. H.Del. 298-9).

\(^{55}\) I assume that for convenience theoric and tribute-bearing meetings coincided in 478-455. This is not true later: Bruneau (1970), 94.

\(^{56}\) Hesychius π 2010 glosses the Perpherees, their male travel-companions, as ‘theoroï’.

\(^{57}\) Call. H.Del. 291-9 excludes them. Clement Protr. 3.45.2 borrows them from Herodotus.
narrative’s symbolically useful legitimation of Athenian control there suggests that Athenians are the most likely commissioners and performers.\(^{58}\)

One aspect of politics in the Hyperboreans’ theoric route, in other words, is how it melds pious religion and obedient tribute-bringing, in ways which hymns can illuminate. The route itself is also political. Herodotus cites it after the Delians themselves, and we may rely on the last stages of this course, which must have been public knowledge. Here, Herodotus’ information that Tenians performed the prestigious final leg, and so re-enacted the first dedication, whereas Andros was by-passed, implies the political value of being on the route and its mythical counterpart.\(^{59}\) By contrast, political manipulation of the more distant, more opaque stages is an obvious possibility. Walter Burkert (1997: 75-80) has argued convincingly that the Adriatic appears in the route, despite entailing a remarkable detour, because Herodotus received information from Deiphonos of Apollonia, an honorand at Delos who wished to cement his state into the birth myth of its eponymous deity. Pausanias (1.31.2) later offers a quite different route for the Hyperborean _hiera_, passing through Sinope on the Black Sea and ending at Prasiai, which had long been the departure-gate for the Athenian _theoria_ to Delos. The reference to Sinope may reflect the Athenian bias if this version derives from c. 436-405, when Sinope was an Athenian colony; alternatively, the whole account may date from after 166, when Athens again controlled Delos and Sinope’s ruler Pharnakes I was honoured there.\(^{60}\)

Whereas the first political touch in Herodotus 4.33-4 was Atheno-centric, the second avoids an Athenocentric construction which we find in Pausanias. This might seem awkward, but the _Homeric Hymn to Apollo_ provides an interesting parallel. There too a route (Leto’s) is presented which emphasises Delos’ contemporary catchment area, even where this conflicts with the politicized focus on Ionia later in the same poem. I have ended with an even-handed example, where Herodotus and the hymn are mutually illuminating parallels for the complexity with which different states’ involvement with an interstate sanctuary might be presented.

**Conclusions**

Though hymns are generically very different from Herodotus’ _Histories_, I hope that my partial survey of Herodotean Delos has shown the value of juxtaposing the two genres. Herodotus may presuppose common spatial ideas (e.g. Delos as a metaphorical centre, as impervious to earthquakes) which we can understand from other sources such as the many

---

58 So e.g. Rutherford (2001), 295-7. Compare Kowalzig (2007), 110-18 for similar Athenian mythopoetic activity around the refounding of the Delia festival in 425. Eupolis _Poleis_ fr. 239 PCG ἄνδρες λογισταὶ τῶν ὑπευθύνων χρῶν, apparently blurs the checking of choruses and of tribute at the City Dionysia in 422.


60 _ID_ 1497b (probably 160/59; see commentary in _ID_). For 5\textsuperscript{th}-c. Athenians at Sinope see Tsetskhladze (1997). Call. _H.Del._ 283-90 and probably _Aet._ fr. 186. Harder basically follow Herodotus. Hecataeus of Abdera _FGrH_ 264 F 7.4 also shows Athenian bias: Ὑπερβορέους… πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλλήνας οἰκειότατα διακεῖσθαι, καὶ μάλιστα πρὸς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους καὶ Δηλίους, ἐκ παλαιῶν χρόνων παρεσφηφότας τὴν εὔνοιαν. Similar politicized myths also entered the Delian hymnic corpus attributed to Olen: a Hyperborean ‘Achaiia’ came to Delos in the time of Hyperoche and Laodike and was honoured there (Paus. 5.7.8).
hymns which mention Delos. Those sources, moreover, help us to understand the suggestions of a North-South axis of influence in 2.169-70 and 4.33-5, and the shattering of space in 6.98 and 8.132. The Hyperboreans’ detailed legendary peregrination to Delos is implicated in politics, in ways which can be elucidated particularly by Pindar’s fifth Paean and the Homeric Hymn to Apollo, and more generally by the hymnic technique – frequently politicized – of bringing a narrative spatial frame into alignment with the performers’ frame.

The main body of this chapter established the basis for such comparative interpretations, by providing a basic template for thinking through how the presentation of space contributes to the hymnic task of forging favour in divine addressee(s). Throughout we have seen that spatial terms do not appear in hymns merely as self-contained literary motifs; rather, they can point to crucial elements of religious mentality.

In one standard hymnographic strategy, specifying the special locations and movements of the god demonstrates a loving attention to the god’s characteristic attributes. We saw that this divine spatial ‘frame’ can integrate a variety of spatial categories (individual places, networked places, distributed types of place, modes of travel, cosmic superstructures), while dynamic changes can occur between the start of a hymn and its end. I have therefore attempted to interpret the frame holistically rather than to focus too narrowly on one particular category.

Most often, hymns give prominence to the particularity of a divinity’s link with a localised worshipping group, and this tendency allows for contextually nuanced interpretation of the uses for which a hymn deploys spatial terms. The god’s spatial frame, now and/or in an inset narrative of the past, is placed in an explicit relationship with that of the performers and audience, most frequently by a summons to attend the site of performance or by a mention that the god has in the past been active there. It is worth underlining two principal, complementary techniques that recur. The frames of the divinity and the inset narrative may be aligned with that of the audience to construct a feeling of community between the god and the performers, whereas misalignment may create a sense of alienation and awe. This complementarity derives from a fundamental hymnic balancing act, of encouraging interaction with gods while setting them on a pedestal.
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